

Legislature of Ontario Debates

First Session of the Thirtieth Legislature

Tuesday, October 28, 1975 – Friday, November 28, 1975

INDEX

The index for the first session of the Thirtieth Legislature appears at the back of Volume 2.

INDEX

The index for the first session of the Thirtieth Legislature appears at the back of Volume 2.

Ontario

Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT — DAILY EDITION

First Session of the Thirtieth Legislature

Tuesday, October 28, 1975

Speaker: Honourable Russell Daniel Rowe
Clerk: Roderick Lewis, QC

THE QUEEN'S PRINTER
PARLIAMENT BUILDINGS, TORONTO
1975

CONTENTS

An alphabetical list of members of the Legislature of Ontario, together with lists of members of the executive council and parliamentary assistants, appears as an appendix at the back of this issue.

Daily contents of proceedings also appears at the back of this issue. Reference to a cumulative index of previous issues can be obtained by calling the Hansard Reporting Service indexing staff. Phone 965-2159.

Hansard subscription price is $15.00 per session, from: Sessional Subscription Service, MGS, 9th Floor, Ferguson Block, Parliament Bldgs., Toronto, M7A 1N3. Phone 965-2238.

LEGISLATURE OF ONTARIO

Tuesday, October 28, 1975, being the first day of the first session of the 30th Parliament of the Province of Ontario for the despatch of business pursuant to a proclamation of the Honourable P. M. McGibbon, Lieutenant Governor of the province.

TUESDAY, OCTOBER 28, 1975

The House met at 3 p.m.

The Honourable the Lieutenant Governor, having entered the House, took her seat upon the throne.

Hon. P. M. McGibbon (Lieutenant Governor): Pray be seated.

Hon. Mr. Welch: I am commanded by the Honourable the Lieutenant Governor to state that she does not see fit to declare the causes of the summoning of the present Legislature of this province until a Speaker of this House shall have been chosen according to law; but today, at a subsequent hour, Her Honour will declare the causes of the calling to this Legislature.

Her Honour was then pleased to retire.

Clerk of the House: Members of the legislative assembly, it is my duty to call upon you to select one of your number to preside over your deliberations as Speaker.

Hon. Mr. Davis moves, seconded by Mr. Lewis, that the hon. member for the electoral district of Northumberland (Mr. Rowe) be Speaker of this assembly.

Are there any further nominations?

I then declare the nominations closed, and declare the Hon. Russell D. Rowe Speaker of this assembly.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. Speaker in the chair.

Mr. Speaker: Hon. members, please accept my humble thanks for the high honour and the privilege that you have given me today. I am grateful to the Premier (Mr. Davis) and to the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Lewis) for moving and seconding my nomination, and to all hon. members for the confidence that they have expressed in me by allowing me to continue to serve this House as Speaker.

I am mindful of my responsibility to protect the rights and privileges of each one of you. In a few moments I will, on your behalf, address Her Honour, the Lieutenant Governor, using the traditional words which have been used in this House and in other parliaments for centuries. Those words are all the more meaningful to me today, because I am aware that difficult days may lie ahead. I ask for your co-operation and for your prayers that I may be given the wisdom to serve you well, with fairness and impartiality. Without your support, there is little that I, as Speaker, can do. With your support, I am confident that together we can serve the people of this province.

I feel the Speakership is a trust which must be exercised not for the benefit of any party or group, but for the benefit of each and all of you. I am not Solomon, and although my middle name is Daniel I cannot lay claim to divine judgement. I do promise you, however, that I will serve you to the very best of my human capacities. Therefore, mindful of the responsibilities that you have placed before me, and hopeful of your assistance and co-operation, I accept the office of Speaker of this honourable House, which you have been pleased to confer on me.

This House will now adjourn during pleasure.

The Honourable the Lieutenant Governor then re-entered the House, and took her seat upon the throne.

Hon. Mrs. McGibbon: Pray be seated.

Mr. Speaker: May it please Your Honour, the legislative assembly has elected me as their Speaker, although I am but little able to fulfill the important duties thus assigned to me. If, in the performance of those duties I should, at any time, fall into error, I pray that the fault may be imputed to me and not to the assembly, whose servant I am and who, through me, the better to enable them to discharge their duty to their Queen and country, hereby claim all their undoubted rights and privileges, especially that they may have freedom of speech in their debates, access to your person at all seasonable times

and that their proceedings may receive from you the most favourable consideration.

Hon. Mr. Welch: Mr. Speaker, I am commanded by the Honourable the Lieutenant Governor, to declare to you that she freely confides in the duty and attachment of the assembly to Her Majesty's person and government; and not doubting that the proceedings will be conducted with wisdom, temperance and prudence, she grants, and upon all occasions will recognize and allow, the constitutional privileges. I am commanded also to assure you that the assembly shall have ready access to Her Honour upon all suitable occasions and that their proceedings, as well as your words and actions, will constantly receive from her the most favourable construction.

The Honourable the Lieutenant Governor, was pleased to open the session with the following gracious speech.

SPEECH FROM THE THRONE

Hon. Mrs. McGibbon: Mr. Speaker and members of the legislative assembly of Ontario:

I am pleased to welcome you to the opening of the first session of the 30th Parliament of Ontario, and especially so to those hon. members whose first term of office is now beginning.

In this brief session, my government will deal primarily with the following critical issues: Inflation, rents, mortgage interest rates and tenant security.

Our province faces times which will require a demonstration of co-operation in placing the common good above other interests. The government, in its concern over the economic health of the province and the problems of inflation and unemployment, supports the decision of the government of Canada to launch a nation-wide attack on these problems.

Notre province se trouve à une époque où la coopération sera indispensable et où il faudra placer le bien commun avant tout autre intérêt. Se préoccupant du bien-être économique de la province, ainsi que les problèmes de l'inflation et du chômage, l'Ontario appuie la décision du gouvernement du Canada, qui vient de prendre des mesures à l'échelle nationale pour lutter contre l'inflation.

The government appeals to the people of Ontario to be resolute in this fight against inflation and to make the programme work.

Ontario firmly believes that to be most effective, the programme should be applied as uniformly as possible throughout Canada. The government has therefore decided that the national programme should apply directly to the public sector in Ontario in the same way as with other sectors in the economy.

Ontario has made representations to Ottawa to improve the anti-inflation programme. These include the need for a firmer approach to price controls, tighter expenditure restraints by the federal government in its own operations and a re-evaluation of the $600 limit on pay increases at the lower end of the scale.

The Ontario government has led the way during the past year in restraining its own expenditures and reducing the growth of its civil service. These measures will be continued in reinforcement of the national programme.

[3:15]

Ontario's economy is making a good recovery after the setback experienced in the first part of this year. Unemployment, which rose to 7.3 per cent in Canada this summer, reached a high in Ontario of 6.4 per cent in June and has since fallen to 5.8 per cent. So far this year 102,000 new jobs have been created in this province.

You will be asked to proceed with amendments to the Development Corporations Act and the Municipal Act to establish an industrial parks programme which will offer financial aid to municipalities to acquire and service facilities for this purpose.

The province recognizes its responsibilities to senior citizens in a weaker economic position in our community and will introduce a new rent supplement programme retroactive to April 1, 1975.

The government intends to introduce a programme retroactive to July 30, 1975, to protect tenants against unjustified rent increases. In addition, new legislation will be brought forward to provide security of tenure for residential tenants.

Several appeals have been made to the federal government to insulate residential mortgage rates from the direct influence of monetary policy decisions and so relieve the burden of increased mortgage interest rates on owner-occupied residences. In the absence of federal action, Ontario is prepared to proceed on its own.

Legislation will be introduced to treat the assessment of condominiums in the same way as single-family dwellings.

You will be asked to approve legislation to regulate retail sales activities on Sundays as well as on certain public holidays. The proposed legislation seeks to reaffirm Sundays and holidays as days of restricted commercial activity, to protect workers and in the interests of preserving and enhancing family life.

The government is convinced that the acquisition of all firearms must be strictly controlled as a means of combatting increasing and tragic incidences of violence in our society. The government has urged repeatedly that this can best be dealt with through amendments to the Criminal Code of Canada. The federal government now appears to agree with this position and has indicated that it will be taking early action on the national level along the lines which Ontario has proposed. In the event that there is any undue delay in this matter, the Ontario government is prepared to introduce legislation to cover this province until such time as a national programme is in place.

It is my government's aim to provide the people of Ontario with assured energy supplies at competitive prices and with minimum harm to the environment. Because of the very high capital costs of developing new energy production facilities, the government has directed Ontario Hydro to pursue the possibility of increased interprovincial exchanges of electricity by the development of regional transmission grids with the aim of providing electricity to Ontario at the lowest cost consistent with adequate systems security.

You will be asked to approve legislation for orderly allocation of natural gas supplies, in the event of possible shortages before additional supplies become available.

Above all, my government urges the people of Ontario, whether as individuals or as corporate consumers, to co-operate in saving energy to help reduce overall consumption and waste of resources.

The measures outlined in this address and others that will be presented in the course of this session face up to the economic and social problems of Ontario and offer a challenge to this Legislature to work responsibly in the interests of the people of our province. My government is aware that agreement on the serious nature of present problems does not necessarily mean a consensus on appropriate solutions. At the same time, the government is confident of the capacity of this assembly to do the job at hand and to do it effectively.

In our Sovereign's name, I thank you.

God bless the Queen and Canada.

The Honourable the Lieutenant Governor was then pleased to retire from the chamber.

Prayers.

ESTIMATES

Hon. Mr. Welch: Mr. Speaker, I have a message from the Honourable the Lieutenant Governor, signed by her own hand.

Mr. Speaker: By her own hand, Hon. P. M. McGibbon, the Lieutenant Governor, transmits estimates of certain sums required for the service of the province for the year ending March 31, 1976, and recommends them to the legislative assembly, Toronto, Oct. 28, 1975.

I beg to inform the House that to prevent mistakes, I have obtained a copy of Her Honour's speech, which I will now read.

(Reading dispensed with.)

JUDICATURE AMENDMENT ACT

Hon. Mr. McMurtry moved first reading of bill intituled, An Act to amend the Judicature Act.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Mr. Speaker: I beg to inform the House that Mr. Lewis, the member for Scarborough West, is recognized as Leader of Her Majesty's Loyal Opposition.

I beg to inform the House that the fourth and fifth reports of the Ontario Commission on the Legislature have been presented to the Clerk of the House during the interval between parliaments.

Hon. Mr. Welch moves that the speech of the Honourable the Lieutenant Governor to this House be taken into consideration on Thursday next.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. Speaker: Hon. Mr. Welch moves that private bills will not be considered at this session, such bills to be taken up at the beginning of the next regular session of this Parliament.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. Speaker: Hon. Mr. Welch moves that in consideration of the estimates for the fiscal year 1975-1976, only those votes consideration of which was not completed by the pre-

vious assembly be considered at the present session and as follows:

By committee of supply, in the total of 33 hours, 30 minutes, the estimates of the following ministries: Treasury, Economics and Intergovernmental Affairs, Health, Social Development, Natural Resources, Resources Development, Education, Office of the Premier, Cabinet Office, Office of the Lieutenant Governor;

By a standing committee on estimates, in a total of 14 sitting days commencing tomorrow; such committee to have authority to sit concurrently with the House and to permit substitutions on the customary notice to the chairman; such committee to be composed as follows: Mr. Edighoffer, chairman; Messrs. Angus, Bounsall, Cassidy, Drea, Eakins, Eaton, Kennedy, Leluk, Lupusella, McCague, McEwen, Norton, O'Neil, Samis, Sargent, Villeneuve, Wildman and Williams; the estimates of the following ministries: Industry and Tourism, Labour, Energy and Housing.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Speaker, I would like to speak to that motion if no one else would.

I find great difficulty in letting this motion pass without saying a few words expressing my unhappiness with it being put at all. We are beginning a session of the 30th Legislature and the government is asking for a review of something that happened at the 29th Legislature. The people of Ontario spoke on Sept. 18 last and that Legislature, the 29th Legislature, has gone into the history of the political annals of this province. I find it much more than strange that we pick up a piece of a budget which was the budget of the 29th Legislature and not the budget of the 30th Legislature. I find it unreasonable that a new Legislature should be expected to deal only with certain selected estimates and not with all of the estimates.

[3:30]

It is my opinion—and I think I am correct in this—that if this motion was not put the affairs of the province could be carried on without any difficulty. The 29th Legislature passed a motion of interim supply; the spending of the $11 billion-odd is legal and is proper. It is unfair, particularly to those new members who are here, to say these estimates and no others can now be debated.

I fail completely to understand why this is being done. Perhaps it is my devious mind that leads me to conclude that the government has introduced this type of motion to stall.

The government is here to govern; the Premier (Mr. Davis) has seen fit to advise Her Honour to call a session at this time. He has indicated it is going to be a short session; but what he wants, I believe, is to be able to withdraw from the sittings of this House for a substantial period while the sittings go on, with his cabinet, to go through the motions apparently of dealing with public business but in the meantime not to deal immediately, properly and quickly with the public business at hand.

I am not going to debate this any longer nor am I going to suggest to anyone that this be an issue which forces a division at this point, but—

Interjections.

Mr. Lewis: Why not?

Mr. Singer: All right. If the hon. Leader of the Opposition wants to stand, let him do so.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Mr. Singer: I just want to say that I, as one member, object—

Mr. Lewis: Enough postulating.

Hon. Mr. Henderson: Why doesn't the member see if he can get any support?

Mr. Speaker: Order please. The hon. member for Wilson Heights may continue.

Mr. Singer: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I just want to say that as one member I feel this kind of objection should be voiced and should be voiced loudly and firmly; I want to say for myself that I object to being used in this manner by the Premier. If he wants to get about the business of the province let him do it, but let him not introduce this kind of peculiar posturing, this kind of selective dealing with a part of the money expenditure, depriving the members of the 30th Legislature of the full opportunity to debate public expenditures.

If he wants to talk about expenditures let him bring in the new budget. That's what the issue is.

Hon. Mr. Welch: Mr. Speaker, perhaps one or two comments should be made at this time, very briefly.

The hon. member has asked to be heard loudly and clearly and he has accomplished that particular part of his presentation.

Secondly, and with greatest respect, the member for Wilson Heights has overlooked the fact that the last Parliament, the 29th Parliament, in its last session did, in fact,

formally concur in a number of estimates and in order to expedite the business of this House and to get on with the legislation, meetings were held. It comes as no surprise to members of this House or to various caucuses that an understanding was arrived at with respect to those estimates considered by the last session of the 29th Parliament—many of which have already been formally concurred in. All of them, of course, will have to come together in the general vote for supply which will follow upon the completion of the estimates as set out in the motion. To impute that type of cheap motive to my leader is just completely irresponsible.

Mr. Lewis: The minister's motivations have always been expensive.

Interjections.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. Shall this motion carry?

Motion agreed to.

Mr. Bullbrook: There is certainly nothing cheap about the Tory leader at all.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: We have one anyway. We have a leader.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. House leader.

Interjections.

Mr. Lewis: I would give it about 10 days.

Hon. Mr. Welch: Is that a prediction?

Mr. Speaker: Hon. Mr. Welch moves, seconded by Mr. Deans, that the hon. member for the electoral district of Lake Nipigon (Mr. Stokes) be appointed Deputy Speaker and chairman of committees of the whole House; and that the hon. member for the electoral district of Simcoe East (Mr. G. E. Smith) be appointed deputy chairman of committees of the whole House for this assembly.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. Speaker: The clerk has received from the chief election officer and laid upon the table the roll of the members elected at the general election of 1975.

Hon. Mr. Welch: Mr. Speaker, before moving the adjournment of the House, perhaps I could share with members our timetable for the next couple of days. Tomorrow, following the usual formalities, we will consider the estimates of the Treasurer (Mr. McKeough) in committee of supply in the House. Tomorrow morning at 10 o'clock, the standing committee on estimates will meet and will start with the estimates of the Ministry of Industry and Tourism. On Thursday, of course, we will have the address in reply to the Speech from the Throne, the mover and the seconder, following which we will resume estimates. On Friday of this week we will continue with estimates, both in committee of supply and in the standing committee on estimates.

Hon. Mr. Welch moved the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to.

The House adjourned at 3:37 p.m.

APPENDIX

ALPHABETICAL LIST OF MEMBERS OF THE LEGISLATURE OF ONTARIO

(125 members)

First Session of the Thirtieth Parliament

Speaker: Hon. Russell Daniel Rowe **Clerk of the House: Roderick Lewis, QC**

Member	Constituency	Party
Angus, I.	Fort William	NDP
Auld, Hon. J.A.C.	Leeds	PC
Bain, R.	Timiskaming	NDP
Belanger, J. A.	Prescott and Russell	PC
Bennett, Hon. C.	Ottawa South	PC
Bernier, Hon. L.	Kenora	PC
Birch, Hon. M.	Scarborough East	PC
Bounsall, E. J.	Windsor-Sandwich	NDP
Breaugh, M.	Oshawa	NDP
Breithaupt, J. R.	Kitchener	L
Brunelle, Hon. R.	Cochrane North	PC
Bullbrook, J. E.	Sarnia	L
Burr, F. A.	Windsor-Riverside	NDP
Bryden, M.	Beaches-Woodbine	NDP
Campbell, M.	St. George	L
Cassidy, M.	Ottawa Centre	NDP
Conway, S.	Renfrew North	L
Cunningham, E.	Wentworth North	L
Davidson, M.	Cambridge	NDP
Davis, Hon. W. G.	Brampton	PC
Davison, M.	Hamilton Centre	NDP
Deans, I.	Wentworth	NDP
di Santo, O.	Downsview	NDP
Drea, F.	Scarborough Centre	PC
Dukszta, J.	Parkdale	NDP
Eakins, J.	Victoria-Haliburton	L
Eaton, R. G.	Middlesex	PC
Edighoffer, H.	Perth	L
Evans, D. A.	Simcoe Centre	PC
Ferrier, W.	Cochrane South	NDP
Ferris, J. P.	London South	L
Foulds, J. F.	Port Arthur	NDP
Gaunt, M.	Huron-Bruce	L
Germa, M. C.	Sudbury	NDP
Gigantes, E.	Carleton East	NDP
Givens, P. G.	Armourdale	L
Godfrey, C.	Durham West	NDP
Good, E.R.	Waterloo North	L
Grande, A.	Oakwood	NDP
Gregory, M. E. C.	Mississauga East	PC
Grossman, L.	St. Andrew-St. Patrick	PC
Haggerty, R.	Erie	L
Hall, R.	Lincoln	L
Handleman, Hon. S. B.	Carleton	PC

Member	Constituency	Party
Henderson, Hon. L. C	Lambton	PC
Hodgson, W.	York North	PC
Irvine, Hon. D. R.	Carleton-Grenville	PC
Johnson, J.	Wellington-Dufferin-Peel	PC
Johnston, R. M.	St. Catharines	PC
Jones, T.	Mississauga North	PC
Kennedy, R. D.	Mississauga South	PC
Kerr, Hon. G. A.	Burlington South	PC
Kerrio, V.	Niagara Falls	L
Lane, J.	Algoma-Manitoulin	PC
Laughren, F.	Nickel Belt	NDP
Lawlor, P. D.	Lakeshore	NDP
Leluk, N.G.	York West	PC
Lewis, S.	Scarborough West	NDP
Lupusella, A.	Dovercourt	NDP
MacBeth, Hon. J. P.	Humber	PC
MacDonald, D. C.	York South	NDP
Mackenzie, R.	Hamilton East	NDP
Maeck, L.	Parry Sound	PC
Makarchuk, M.	Brantford	NDP
Mancini, R.	Essex South	L
Martel, E. W.	Sudbury East	NDP
McCague, G.	Dufferin-Simcoe	PC
McClellan, R.	Bellwoods	NDP
McEwen, J. E.	Frontenac-Addington	L
McKeough, Hon. W. D.	Chatham-Kent	PC
McKessock, R.	Grey	L
McMurtry, Hon. R.	Eglinton	PC
McNeil, R. K.	Elgin	PC
Meen, Hon. A. K.	York East	PC
Miller, Hon. F. S.	Muskoka	PC
Miller, G. I.	Haldimand-Norfolk	L
Moffatt, D.	Durham East	NDP
Morrow, D. H.	Ottawa West	PC
Newman, B.	Windsor-Walkerville	L
Newman, Hon. W.	Durham North	PC
Nixon, R. F.	Brant-Oxford-Norfolk	L
Norton, K.	Kingston and the Islands	PC
O'Neil, H.	Quinte	L
Parrott, Hon. H. C.	Oxford	PC
Peterson, D.	London Centre	L
Philip, E.	Etobicoke	NDP
Reed, J.	Halton-Burlington	L
Reid, T. P.	Rainy River	L
Renwick, J. A.	Riverdale	NDP
Rhodes, Hon. J. R.	Sault St. Marie	PC
Riddell, J.	Huron-Middlesex	L
Rollins, C. T.	Hastings-Peterborough	PC
Rowe, R. D.	Northumberland	PC
Roy, A. J.	Ottawa East	L
Ruston, R. F.	Essex North	L
Samis, G.	Cornwall	NDP
Sandeman, G.	Peterborough	NDP

Member	Constituency	Party
Sargent, E.	Grey-Bruce	L
Scrivener, Hon. M.	St. David	PC
Shore, M.	London North	L
Singer, V. M.	Wilson Heights	L
Smith, G. E.	Simcoe East	PC
Smith, Hon. J. R.	Hamilton Mountain	PC
Smith, R. S.	Nipissing	L
Smith, S.	Hamilton West	L
Snow, Hon. J. W.	Oakville	PC
Spence, J. P.	Kent-Elgin	L
Stephenson, Hon. B.	York Mills	PC
Stokes, J. E.	Lake Nipigon	NDP
Stong, A.	York Centre	L
Swart, M.	Welland	NDP
Sweeney, J.	Kitchener-Wilmot	L
Taylor, **Hon. J. A.**	Prince Edward-Lennox	PC
Timbrell, Hon. D. R.	Don Mills	PC
Villeneuve, O. F.	Stormont-Dundas-Glengarry	PC
Warner, D.	Scarborough-Ellesmere	NDP
Welch, Hon. R.	Brock	PC
Wells, Hon. T. L.	Scarborough North	PC
Wildman, B.	Algoma	NDP
Williams, J.	Oriole	PC
Wiseman, D. J.	Lanark	PC
Worton, H.	Wellington South	L
Yakabuski, P. J.	Renfrew South	PC
Young, F.	Yorkview	NDP
Ziemba, E.	High Park-Swansea	NDP

MEMBERS OF THE EXECUTIVE COUNCIL

Hon W. G. Davis	Premier
Hon. R. Welch	Minister of Culture and Recreation
Hon. J. A. C. Auld	Chairman, Management Board of Cabinet
Hon. R. Brunelle	Minister without Portfolio and Chairman of Cabinet
Hon. T. L. Wells	Minister of Education
Hon. G. A. Kerr	Minister of the Environment
Hon. L. Bernier	Minister of Natural Resources
Hon. J. W. Snow	Minister of Transportation and Communications
Hon. M. Birch	Provincial Secretary for Social Development
Hon. C. Bennett	Minister of Industry and Tourism
Hon. W. D. McKeough	Treasurer, Minister of Economics and Intergovernmental Affairs
Hon. A. K. Meen	Minister of Revenue
Hon. W. Newman	Minister of Agriculture and Food
Hon. S. B. Handleman	Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations
Hon. F. S. Miller	Minister of Health
Hon. J. R. Rhodes	Minister of Housing
Hon. D. R. Irvine	Provincial Secretary for Resources Development
Hon. D. R. Timbrell	Minister of Energy
Hon. J. P. MacBeth	Provincial Secretary for Justice and Solicitor General
Hon. J. R. Smith	Minister of Correctional Services
Hon. M. Scrivener	Minister of Government Services
Hon. H. C. Parrott	Minister of Colleges and Universities
Hon. J. A. Taylor	Minister of Community and Social Services
Hon. B. Stephenson	Minister of Labour
Hon. R. McMurtry	Attorney General
Hon. L. C. Henderson	Minister without Portfolio

PARLIAMENTARY ASSISTANTS

Mr. F. Drea	Assistant to the Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations
Mr. R. G. Eaton	Assistant to the Minister of Agriculture and Food
Mr. D. A. Evans	Assistant to the Minister of Energy
Mr. N. G. Leluk	Assistant to the Minister of Culture and Recreation
Mr. L. Maeck	Assistant to the Minister of Natural Resources

CONTENTS

Tuesday, October 28, 1975

Motion that Mr. Rowe take the chair as Speaker, Mr. Davis, agreed to 3

Speech from the Throne, the Honourable the Lieutenant Governor 4

Transmitting estimates of certain sums required for the services of Ontario, the Honourable the Lieutenant Governor 5

Judicature Amendment Act, Mr. McMurtry, first reading 5

Motion for consideration of certain estimates, Mr. Welch, agreed to 5

Motion to adjourn, Mr. Welch, agreed to 7

Appendix: Alphabetical list of the members of the Legislature of Ontario 8

No. 2



Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT — DAILY EDITION

First Session of the Thirtieth Legislature

Wednesday, October 29, 1975

Speaker: Honourable Russell Daniel Rowe
Clerk: Roderick Lewis, QC

THE QUEEN'S PRINTER
PARLIAMENT BUILDINGS, TORONTO
1975

CONTENTS

A list of the speakers taking part in the debates in this issue of Hansard appears, in alphabetical order, at the back of this issue.

Daily contents of proceedings also appears at the back of this issue. Reference to a cumulative index of previous issues can be obtained by calling the Hansard Reporting Service indexing staff. Phone 965-2159.

Hansard subscription price is $15.00 per session, from: Sessional Subscription Service, MGS, 9th Floor, Ferguson Block, Parliament Bldgs., Toronto, M7A 1N3. Phone 965-2238.

LEGISLATURE OF ONTARIO

WEDNESDAY, OCTOBER 29, 1975

The House met at 2:00 p.m.

Prayers.

Mr. Deans: Mr. Speaker, before you move to the orders of the day, I wonder if you, as the guardian of the rights of the members and visitors to the House, might be able to make a statement to the House with regard to yesterday's action by certain people outside the House, both with regard to those who were hurt in a scuffle that ensued on the steps of the Legislature—

Mr. Sargent: Can't hear him back here.

Mr. Deans: That's one of the hazards of being so far away isn't it—with regard to the actions of the group outside and with regard to the actions of the various police forces who were involved?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, on a point of privilege, I wonder if I might refer to that particular matter and communicate to the members of the House, without passing any judgement on what happened yesterday because I'm not familiar with the facts, that I have, Mr. Speaker, written to you to formally request, and I will read the letter: that the Office of the Speaker undertake a full investigation of the difficulties which arose outside the Legislature yesterday involving Metro Toronto Police officers, protective staff of the Legislature and a group of demonstrators. Specifically, I would ask that your office consider whether excessive force may have been used, inadvertently or otherwise, by any police officers or members of the protective staff. I would appreciate receiving a report from you at your earliest convenience.

Mr. Speaker: I might say that this investigation is under way at the present time.

Mr. Deans: Would you permit me, on the point of privilege, to ask whether the report which is being asked for by the Premier would be made to the Legislature or in answer to the letter?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I have no objection at all, on whatever report is made as to where it goes, as long as we all know what's in it.

Hon. Mr. Snow: Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to introduce to the hon. members, students from two schools in our great town of Oakville. In the west gallery, a group of students from St. Mildred's Lightbourne School and a group of students from the Oakwood Public School.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Peterborough.

Mrs. Sandeman: On a matter of personal privilege, Mr. Speaker. I was very grateful to you for the splendid floor plan of the House but I wonder if I could ask why it is necessary to identify the female members of the House by their marital status. This distinction is not conferred upon the male members.

Mr. Speaker: To answer the point of privilege very briefly, it has always been customary to do it that way. We will review the situation though.

Mr. Lewis: It's time to change customs.

Mr. Bullbrook: The Minister of Labour (B. Stephenson) isn't so designated.

Mr. Nixon: We know her status.

RENT REVIEW

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: Mr. Speaker, I would like to report to the House on my plans for the introduction of rent review legislation.

Mr. Lewis: Which version?

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: As the members will recall, I indicated this legislation would be introduced as soon as possible. One very important influence on this legislation is the federal programme on wage and price controls and the federal plans and funding in respect of housing.

We recognize the need to ensure that any rent review programme will be established having careful regard for the supply problem that may be created. The Hon. Barney Dan-

son, Minister of State for Urban Affairs, has, following my earlier request, called a meeting of provincial ministers for Monday, Nov. 3, to discuss rent control, the federal housing package and the proposed CMHC budget for 1976.

Because of the importance of these discussions, I believe it advisable to withhold our legislation until I have the benefit of the federal position.

Mr. Singer: These terrible people.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: However, it is my intention that the rent review legislation will, in any event, be introduced next week. Although the discussion of next Monday is important to the final form of the bill, I wish to state today that it will not change the basic principles of our proposed legislation. That is to say, our bill will provide for a rent review board empowered to review rent increases within limits determined under the Act. In appropriate cases the board will be able to allow increases or roll back rents.

For the benefit of tenants who are being asked to or have signed leases on or after July 30, 1975, rent increases in excess of those permitted under our bill will be rolled back to the date of the new lease and landlords will be required to refund those amounts. The right to these refunds will not be affected by the fact the tenant has signed a lease on or after July 30, 1975.

Mr. Lewis: In bits and pieces it lurches out.

DUMP TRUCKS

Hon. Mr. Snow: Mr. Speaker, on June 25 last my predecessor, the former Minister of Transportation and Communications, tabled the dump truck inquiry report.

The major recommendations of that ministerial inquiry dealt with control of entry, inspection of dump trucks and trucking rates.

Mr. Martel: They dumped a few Tories out.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Hon. Mr. Snow: As a consequence, today I am introducing amendments to the Highway Traffic Act under the Public Commercial Vehicles Act in response to those major recommendations.

The bill to amend the Public Commercial Vehicles Act reinstates control of entry into the industry by way of application to the Ontario Highway Transport Board and the licensing of dump trucks under the Public Commercial Vehicles Act to operate within regions which will be prescribed by regulation.

Licences granted to dump truckers under the Act will be restricted with respect to the number of vehicles that can be operated under the licence.

The region or regions authorized and the number of vehicles to be operated will be determined by the Ontario Highway Transport Board.

The amendment also includes grandfather provisions for those persons now holding licences to haul the materials specified in the bill.

Under the terms of the amendment a new licence will be granted, restricting the holder's operations to a region of the trucker's choice and to the number of vehicles which he has operated under his previous licence in 1975. Any person holding this authority, but whose vehicles are not exclusively licensed for the transportation of such materials, will be able to apply to the transport board for grandfather privileges.

It is my intention to provide the necessary statutory authority toward implementing a mandatory inspection programme for dump trucks—a programme to be prescribed in the regulations under the Highway Traffic Act. The programme under consideration will require a mandatory inspection twice a year according to prescribed standards, and all vehicles having passed that inspection will be required to display a sticker indicating compliance. The absence of such a sticker on a loaded dump truck will constitute an offence and enforcement agencies would have the power to remove the vehicle from the road.

Another recommendation deals with the covering of loads on dump trucks and here I would like to advise the House that my ministry is drafting regulations for the mandatory covering of vehicles carrying specific commodities when travelling on hard-surfaced roads. There is, in this bill to amend the Highway Traffic Act, an amendment to give authority for the regulations to apply only to these hard-surfaced highways.

The effective date of these regulations has not been determined as yet, since the ministry is in communication with the industry in order to determine the earliest feasible date. The matter of rates is very complex, thus it will require much in-depth study by government. I can assure you, Mr. Speaker, that this study is in progress at the present time.

There are also a number of additional recommendations in the inquiry report which are under active consideration by my ministry, and I will be advising the House on the action that will be taken by the government as the decisions are reached.

HOLIDAY CLOSINGS FOR RETAIL BUSINESSES

Hon. Mr. MacBeth: Mr. Speaker, I am introducing for first reading a bill entitled, An Act to Regulate Holiday Closings for Retail Businesses.

The proposed legislation is a response to the growing public concern regarding retailing on a seven-day-a-week basis. The bill is secular in nature, and it proposes to regulate retail closings on certain holidays, including Sunday.

The proposed legislation attempts to reflect the wishes of the public as assessed by the Ontario Law Reform Commission and the Provincial Secretary for Justice following public hearings and the receipt of numerous representations.

Mr. Sargent: The minister is five years late.

Hon. Mr. MacBeth: It is hoped that the establishment of certain "pause days" will slow the growing commercialism and materialism about us and result in an improvement in our quality of life and permit the encouragement of recreation and leisure on these common days of rest.

I will welcome the comments and suggestions of the members as the bill proceeds through the House.

Hon. W. Newman: Mr. Speaker, may I take this opportunity, certainly on our side, and I am sure on all sides of the House, to welcome today our friends and your friend, Bill Stewart, who is with us in the gallery today.

Mr. Nixon: Back working for a living.

Mr. Speaker: Just before I call the question period, I think I should make a few comments concerning that particular order of business. I know that those members who were in the last Legislature will agree with me that the question period was getting out of hand. I hope that the House will agree—

Interjections.

Mr. Speaker: To a point, that is.

Mr. Roy: We couldn't get any answers.

Mr. Speaker: Stricter compliance with the standing orders is desirable. Firstly, I point out that by standing order 27(d), oral questions must be confined to matters of urgency and of public importance. I suggest that the majority of the questions asked of recent years have not been urgent and in many cases cannot be considered of public importance.

An hon. member: Not all of them.

Mr. Speaker: Not all of them, I point out. Clause (h) of the same standing order provides that no argument or opinion is to be offered, nor any fact stated except so far as may be necessary to explain the question.

Mr. Martel: From both sides of the House.

[2:15]

Mr. Speaker: It has become the practice to preface these oral questions with long preambles preceded by the words: "In view of the fact that." In most cases, the alleged facts were not facts at all but expressions of opinion. In either case, they were out of order. A question should be a simple interrogative starting with an interrogative word such as "why", "how", "where" etc.

Hon. Mr. Davis: That's just in case you didn't get your three Rs.

An hon. member: What about inflection?

Mr. Speaker: That too. I must again remind the members that a question is to obtain information, not to give it.

Mr. Roy: I can't wait for your comments on the answer.

Mr. Speaker: I also direct the attention of the House to clause (f) which provides for supplementary questions arising out of the minister's reply. Many questions, of course, have been asked which, although perhaps related to the same subject matter, have not arisen out of the minister's reply. Such questions, I suggest, should be asked as original questions when the member gets the floor. I would also point out that ministers' answers have in many cases been much too long, even when given immediately.

Mr. Lewis: Vengeance is sweet.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I ask the ministers, therefore, to keep their answers as brief as possible and I direct their attention to the final phrases of clause (d) of standing order 27. I suggest that even if a minister is able to reply immediately, if he feels that the question requires a very lengthy answer

he should take it as notice and deliver his answer on a subsequent day as a statement under statements by the ministry.

Mr. Bullbrook: Did the Premier hear that? Is he listening?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Carefully.

Mr. Speaker: So we look forward to a very interesting and worthwhile question period.

Mr. Bullbrook: We will never hear from the Premier with rules like that.

Mr. Speaker: We will now call the qnestion period. The hon. Leader of the Opposition.

OIL AND GAS PRICES

Mr. Lewis: I have a question of the Minister of Energy. In his role as mascot for the oil companies—

Mr. Bullbrook: Why, where, when or how did that come about?

Mr. Speaker: I heard that as somewhat editorial.

Mr. Lewis: Mr. Speaker, that is neither argumentative nor an opinion, it is simply a description. Can he indicate to the Legislature what action he intends to take to prevent the price increase in gasoline at the pump, or a gallon of home fuel oil, to exceed the 5.4 cents a gallon which he indicated he would permit?

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: Mr. Speaker, if I may perhaps answer the first part of that question, which I noticed was placed in an interrogative tone, the hon. member wasn't too sure, I find it rather interesting, particularly after a recent address which I had intended to deliver in Calgary but which was delivered for me, that I hear from the NDP that I am the mascot of the oil companies and then I hear from the oil companies that I'm taking cheap shots. If the NDP and the oil companies are both against me then I must be right.

Mr. Singer: That answer is certainly within the rules.

Mr. Roy: The minister has never been right.

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: I have indicated, Mr. Speaker, that we are prepared: First of all, the government will monitor any complaints that may arise from the question of pricing after Nov. 15. If we find that there is a widespread lack of adherence to the government's wishes then we are prepared to come back with a piece of legislation which would extend the freeze at the higher level of 5.4 cents on gasoline and 4.8 cents on home heating oil.

Mr. Lewis: A supplementary, if I may: How does he intend to monitor, prosecute or prevent an increase in excess of the 5.4 cents, which would violate his prescription, knowing that the increase of even 0.6—six-tenths of one per cent—will cost the consumers of Ontario $25 million more than he originally undertook?

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: Mr. Speaker, I do not have the figures with me, but I have the suspicion of recent days that the hon. Leader of the Opposition is reading some of my old speeches and those of the Treasurer (Mr. McKeough) and the Premier (Mr. Davis) at the first ministers' conference. Those are exactly the arguments we put forward at the first ministers' conference in April and since, trying to stop the increases. The point is that the federal government, under the authority of the Petroleum Administration Act, did impose those increases. The point is that the Ministry of Consumer and Commercial Relations has been, during the life of this freeze, carrying out the monitoring role. We will continue to monitor prices and, as I said before, we can very quickly come to this House if necessary with further legislation.

Mr. Nixon: Supplementary: Since the government has undertaken to empower the Energy Board, not just to monitor but in fact to regulate the prices of other types of energy, then why are the ministry and this minister so unwilling to give similar powers to the Ontario Energy Board to accept applications and either reject or accept them in whole or in part, for increases at the commercial level for petroleum products sold in Ontario?

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: First of all, I want to make it abundantly clear that I'm not rejecting that. We have a royal commission still working. The commissioner will announce in a few days the series of meetings that he will be holding around this province to discuss petroleum prices and petroleum pricing. One of his terms of reference is to advise the government how best to deal with this situation in the future. As we know, it is the stated policy of the government of Canada that the prices will continue to go up towards—I believe "towards" is the word they used—world prices.

I'm not rejecting that possibility; this government does not reject the possibility. I

think we should let the commissioner finish his work. We have told him we want his final report no later than the end of February.

Mr. Nixon: In the meantime the minister should maintain regulation.

Mr. MacDonald: Supplementary: When and if the government should move on a regulatory or statutory ceiling of 5.4 cents because it has been exceeded, will the government at that point, two months, five months, six months from now, obligate them to rebate any overcharges they have made in the interval?

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: That question is based on the premise that there are going to be infractions.

Mr. MacDonald: Right.

Mr. Lewis: That's right.

Mr. Deans: The minister said there will be.

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: Given the co-operation of the companies and the retailers during the life of this freeze since July, and the very small number of complaints received, we do not anticipate great problems. I'm not thinking in terms of two months, five months or six months, I'm talking about the initial few weeks after Nov. 15 to make a decision; then we will come back if necessary with legislation.

Mr. Nixon: Supplementary: Since it is the government's wish, according to the minister, that no increases beyond 5.4 cents be permitted, then why doesn't he ask the House to support that, not just as the wish of the government but as an enactment of this Legislature as was done in the imposition of the original freeze, until such time as Mr. Isbister finishes his examination.

Mr. Bullbrook: Right.

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: Because, I suppose—and it is part of my Conservative philosophy—I don't believe in any more laws than are necessary.

Mr. Nixon: It was okay then but it isn't okay now. It was okay before the election but not after.

Mr. Speaker: Order.

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: I am confident that we will have co-operation; if we find that in any widespread way we are not, then we will come back.

Mr. Speaker: We are straying away from the sort of request which I made at the beginning. The hon. member for Sudbury East; this will be the final supplementary.

Mr. Martel: In view of the fact that northern Ontario was already paying eight or nine cents a gallon more or even higher, and in view of the fact that the second report will indicate—

Mr. Speaker: I really think that's getting a little far away from the original question. That will be a good new question for the hon. member; we'll get around to it.

PUBLIC SECTOR WAGE SETTLEMENTS

Mr. Lewis: A question of the Premier: Does the Premier intend to pass an Act of this Legislature giving to the federal anti-inflation tribunal the authority to adjudicate wage settlements in the public sector in Ontario?

Hon. Mr. Davis: The Treasurer will be making a fairly comprehensive statement as to our understanding of the federal anti-inflation policy, the legislation and our reaction to it. To try to answer that particular question as specifically as I can, our advice is that no Act is necessary.

Mr. Lewis: By way of supplementary, since negotiations in the public sector—for example, the teachers—are covered by collective bargaining legislation approved in this Legislature and paramount in Ontario, how will those groups get there, legally or constitutionally otherwise, unless there is an Act of Ontario's Parliament designating that be done?

Hon. Mr. Davis: I can't give any legal opinion, but I assume that a lot of collective agreements in this province have been signed, negotiated and signed, pursuant to the Labour Relations Act of the Province of Ontario. The UAW, to use one union as an example, is totally under the federal legislation; there is no option as far as they are concerned.

Mr. Lewis: But we have an option.

Hon. Mr. Davis: There is no option as far as we understand the law; they would have to go to the federal board. I don't think there is any contradiction or any conflict—I really can't understand the question.

Mr. Lewis: But this is the public sector.

Mr. Nixon: Supplementary: I hope this will be seen to be flowing from the Premier's comment, Mr. Speaker. Since the Minister of

Education (Mr. Wells) is reported to have said there may be an 18-month delay in getting a decision out of the control emanation in Ottawa, is it possible that the position expressed by Her Honour in the Speech from the Throne yesterday, indicating that the government intends to put full responsibility for all of these matters in the federal ambit, is it possible that as this House progresses and the matters are debated here, that the government might change to some degree its commitment to such a position, which in the view of many reasonable people—the Liberal Party is included in this area—is an abject loss or a rejection of the responsibilities which must lie in this House and surely with this government?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I don't want to be provocative or controversial—

Mr. Singer: What a change.

Hon. Mr. Davis: I think the Treasurer will have some observations to make. I would just make one preliminary observation that this government is anxious to co-operate and see the federal legislation and policy work.

Mr. Good: This government doesn't want to take any responsibility.

Hon. Mr. Davis: I think it is important for the benefit of this country that we do. I think it is also important, and I could go on at great length, for the people of all classes or groups in this province to feel that they are being treated by the same board in an equitable fashion. I think it is also relevant that the people within one province feel that they are being treated in the same fashion as people in another province. I think there is some merit, if there is some substance to that argument, and I genuinely believe there is, to have these adjudications made by a national body that is dealing with all provinces.

I am quite prepared that this House discuss this on an ongoing basis. I just suggest to the members of the House that we perhaps should all have a greater understanding of the legislation, what we are attempting to accomplish on a national basis, and not to make too many hasty prejudgments. I have already discussed it on a very informal basis in my own area with some people who are very involved in the union movement. They say to me: "We have to go to the federal board. We are citizens of this province. Why should there be exceptions made?"

I guess the feeling by certain members of the House—at least by the Liberal Party of this province—is that perhaps some greater pressure or some greater consideration or some degree of exception could be exerted by a provincial board in competition with or in opposition to or contrary to the federal policy.

Mr. Reid: That isn't so.

Hon. Mr. Davis: I think that we all have to consider this very carefully. There is very excellent rationale for this being handled on a national basis, if at all possible.

Mr. Nixon: It lets the Premier off the political hook.

Hon. Mr. Davis: No, that is not the question. I know the hon. member likes to say it lets us off the hook—fine.

Mr. Nixon: It does.

Hon. Mr. Davis: With great respect—with the most respect that I can conjure up at this moment for his observations—

Mr. R. S. Smith: The Premier doesn't conjure up very much.

Hon. Mr. Davis: —when it comes to the substance of it, then it really is limited.

If the hon. members opposite are really concerned about this issue, if they really think the federal government at last is providing some leadership in terms of inflation, in terms of some control of this economy, then for heaven's sakes let's see if we can't make it work. I think there is great merit in seeing if it can be done on a national basis.

Mr. Bullbrook: By way of supplementary.

Mr. Speaker: Yes, I do believe that question did stray from my original request to—

Mr. Nixon: How about the answer?

Mr. Bullbrook: Well, you are going to—

Mrs. Campbell: How about the answer?

Mr. Speaker: Is this a true supplementary?

Mr. Bullbrook: I trust you will permit a supplementary.

Mr. Speaker: I will hear the member for Sarnia.

Mr. Bullbrook: Recognizing my long-standing inability to understand the Premier's responses to a positive question, I would like him to clarify for me a seeming inconsistency in his approach. If these matters—being so national in scope, so consequential

in moment—should be referred to a national tribunal, why didn't the Premier do the same thing in connection with Hydro rates?

Mrs. Campbell: Yes.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, if the member for Sarnia—and I do understand his question; I regret that he doesn't always understand the answers—would just read the federal guidelines and the federal legislation, and I would recommend that he do both, the answer is right within the material from the federal government.

Mr. Bullbrook: I have read it.

Mr. Speaker: The Leader of the Opposition.

Mr. Bullbrook: Perhaps the Premier might, by way of the final supplementary, please edify me in the rationalization of his inconsistency.

Hon. Mr. Davis: With great respect, I recommend to the hon. member for Sarnia, because I sense he cannot have read those documents or he wouldn't be asking the questions—

Mr. Bullbrook: I have read them.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Then I suggest he reread them, and I would answer that question tomorrow.

Mr. Speaker: Does the Leader of the Opposition have further questions?

Hon. Mr. Davis: The answer is self-evident.

Mrs. Campbell: The Premier hasn't read them.

Mr. Bullbrook: The Premier hasn't got an answer.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Does the Leader of the Opposition have further questions?

Mr. Lewis: I hope all of us can urge an extension of the question period. Until that happens, no further questions.

[2:30 p.m.]

Mr. Speaker: The member for Brant-Oxford-Norfolk.

TORONTO TEACHERS' NEGOTIATIONS

Mr. Nixon: Brant-Oxford-Norfolk it is.

I would like to put a question to the Minister of Education. What specific action is he taking in his office as Minister of Education to bring together the two sides in the teacher-board dispute at the secondary level in Metropolitan Toronto? What action is he taking to bring them together to avert a strike that appears to be more and more likely as we see the deadline approaching at the end of this month?

Mr. Samis: Sending them to Ottawa.

Hon. Mr. Wells: The hon. member knows the steps that have been taken to avert a conflict in Metropolitan Toronto. As a matter of fact, I appointed a mediator in that particular dispute on June 1.

Mr. Nixon: We have been paying him $50 a day ever since.

Hon. Mr. Wells: That mediator has been very conscientiously working along with the two parties—the board and their teachers—each of whom tells me privately that last thing in the world they want is a strike; and yet we seem to be marching down the road to a strike given all the new economic circumstances that now present themselves.

I said yesterday and I say again today, there doesn't have to be a strike in Metropolitan Toronto. All they have to do is sit down together some time today or tomorrow and sign some kind of an agreement.

We recognize that agreement is going to have to go up to the anti-inflation board because they have waited past that date of Oct. 13; that's not our fault and that's not their fault. It is perhaps no one's fault, but it is a fact they haven't got a contract signed before Oct. 13, so someone is going to have to decide what rules are going to apply in so far as the federal programme is concerned.

That has been told to them and I think they can't avoid that responsibility. Anyone in this province who hasn't signed a contract before Oct. 13 is going to have to live with the statement that was made on that date.

Apart from that I have urged the two parties to get together; I don't think there has to be a strike. They have had the help of one of the best mediators in Canada, who has worked here, as I say, since last June. If the member can tell me what more we can do, I would be happy to hear from him.

Mr. Nixon: A supplementary in response directly to what the minister has said: Would he consider asking the Premier to meet with him, preferably in the Premier's office, together with the leading negotiators from the board and from the OSSTF in an 11th-hour, last-ditch attempt to require both sides to see reason? Because if there is a strike, I

would predict that we would be in this House a month from now debating legislation to put teachers back in the classroom. Surely this is the time to avoid that, not a month from now; after all the acrimony that has gathered in this community.

Mr. Speaker: Order please.

Hon. Mr. Wells: I would say to my friend that I would be happy to meet with both sides at any time. I have met with the leaders of both sides numerous times since June 1.

Mr. Nixon: This is the time, now.

Hon. Mr. Wells: I have talked to some of them today, as a matter of fact. The thing I hope he understands is that we cannot have a meeting where we can agree with them that we are all going to conspire together to forget about those anti-inflation guidelines that were announced on Oct. 13.

Mr. Lewis: That's not the issue, and the minister knows it; that's not the issue.

Hon. Mr. Wells: Well it is the issue.

Mr. Lewis: Not at all.

Hon. Mr. Wells: With great respect to my friend, it is the issue. Because it's being suggested that if someone would make a statement an agreement could be reached, and that agreement will be absolutely binding notwithstanding what was said on Oct. 13.

Mr. Lewis: No, not at all.

Hon. Mr. Wells: Well let the member tell me then.

Mr. Speaker: Order, order.

Mr. Lewis: I will put it in the form of a question—

Mr. Speaker: Supplementary question.

Mr. Lewis: How does the minister expect to reach an agreement when the mediator—of whom he has spoken so highly—has offered recommendations which are totally unacceptable to the board? How else will he have a settlement, given the vote this Friday and the strike vote Monday, unless he personally intervenes? Where is it going to come from?

Hon. Mr. Wells: I don't know what my friend feels I can do in intervening.

Mr. Lewis: You are the Minister of Education, my friend.

Hon. Mr. Wells: Does he suggest that I urge that the board accept the fact-finder's report?

Mr. Lewis: Sit down and work it through with them.

Hon. Mr. Wells: I am asking him: Is he suggesting that I suggest that the board accept the fact-finder's report?

Mr. Lewis: Does the minister like his mediator's report?

Mr. Speaker: Order. Order please.

Hon. Mr. Wells: I don't think I have to say whether I like that report or not.

Mr. Speaker: Order.

Mr. Lewis: Clearly he doesn't want to.

Hon. Mr. Wells: The fact-finder has brought in a report which goes well beyond what the board has offered; it goes well beyond the guidelines announced on Oct. 13.

Mr. Lewis: That's right.

Hon. Mr. Wells: I recognize it is a very difficult position.

Mr. Lewis: So the minister in fact—

Hon. Mr. Wells: I certainly had hoped, and I think my friend would have hoped, that an agreement would have been reached during the summer and we wouldn't be in this position.

Mr. Speaker: Any further questions?

Mr. Nixon: A further supplementary, with your permission: We all hope this, and we are all elected here in the legislature to do what we can to avert it. Would the minister not agree that he and the Premier have the main responsibility in this regard and would he undertake to meet with those leaders or ask somebody from Ottawa—Pepin or somebody—to come down and sit in?

Why not? This is going to be the first and most important test of the wage and price control procedures and the Minister of Education has the responsibility on his shoulders to see that we don't have a strike. Wouldn't he agree?

Hon. Mr. Wells: I will assure the House that I stand ready and will be in communication with both sides. If I can be of assistance

to them, I certainly will be of assistance to them.

Mr. Lewis: The strike is inevitable on that basis.

Hon. Mr. Wells: No, it is not inevitable.

Mr. Young: Mr. Speaker, a question of the Minister of Transportation—

Mr. Nixon: I am sorry, Mr. Speaker, I haven't completed my questions.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I thought the hon. member said it was his last question.

Mr. Nixon: I am sorry. I misunderstood. I thought there was a supplementary coming from the hon. gentleman.

GUN CONTROL

Mr. Nixon: I would like to ask the Premier if he would undertake to give some further consideration to introducing a gun law, either amendments or new legislation, to the House in the immediate future. Would he not hark back to his statement made in Windsor, I believe during the early part of August, in which it was indicated that the government had this legislation ready to introduce and that if it was put before this Legislature it could be made into law without any delay or without waiting for the federal action? It surely would be supported on all sides of this House.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I am glad to hear the latter view of the leader of the Liberal Party of this province. My speech to the police chiefs in Windsor, as I recall it, stated my own personal concern on a number of these issues.

I stated to the Police Association that the justice policy field had recommended these certain changes to the government and in terms of policy they had been accepted. I also made the point, I believe, in that speech, and I still believe it to be true that there is very great merit in having this done by way of amendments to the Criminal Code of Canada. If we are going to have permanent solutions to the extent these things can be permanent, it would be far better it be done through the Criminal Code.

The Attorney General of this province (Mr. McMurtry) met with Mr. Allmand last Thursday or Friday I believe—I can't give the hon. member the exact date—at which time he received assurances that the federal government was now prepared to act and act really very shortly, we understand, in the same general direction as the suggestions we had made with respect to what I think is a very important issue.

It was stated in the Throne speech that we were prepared and are. I would like to have some indication—and I think we can get this—as to exactly what direction these amendments are going to take and some definite timetable from the federal government. If we feel they will not meet our purposes here in this province, I can only answer very simply, because I happen to feel very strongly on this issue, that certainly we are prepared to introduce the legislation ourselves.

Mr. Nixon: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker, coming from what the Premier has said about the timetable. Has he read reports from Ottawa which indicate the officials there would expect the legislation to be dealt with in 1976—presumably early in 1976—and would he not agree that we could deal with this immediately in this House and at least give that sort of leadership to a situation which is becoming increasingly important?

Hon. Mr. Davis: I would think, and I would guess these things take on greater urgencies with the closer proximity of some of these situations to people who have responsibility, that there is every likelihood the federal government will move more rapidly. The Attorney General tells me that he has been in conversation with Mr. Basford and they are now prepared to introduce these amendments next month.

Mr. Cassidy: In view of the tragic shootings in Ottawa this week, would the Premier be willing to issue guidelines to dealers in guns, effective immediately, asking them not to allow the sale of lethal weapons over the counter, as is still taking place in Ottawa after the shootings this week?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I think that question should be properly directed to the Solicitor General (Mr. MacBeth) or the Attorney General.

Mr. Speaker: There will be opportunity for that later if so desired. The member for Ottawa East.

Mr. Roy: Mr. Speaker, following your guidelines, I will not ask that supplementary. I will ask a new question of the Solicitor General, with your permission.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you very much.

Mr. Shore: I have a supplementary.

Mr. Speaker: The member for London North, I believe.

Mr. Good: Does that riding sound familiar?

Mr. Shore: If the Premier places such a great importance on this issue and feels that it's a jurisdiction relating to the federal body, surely he must feel that the provincial body is also important dealing with provincial matters on the anti-inflationary matter; and I don't see how they contradict on these issues.

Mr. Speaker: And your question?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I recognize the member for London North perhaps couldn't follow all of your observations when you made your brief statement before the question period. I really—and it may be that I couldn't hear it—just don't quite understand the question.

Mr. Roy: No. I don't think you heard the Speaker; your answers weren't obvious either.

DUMP TRUCKS

Mr. Young: Mr. Speaker, a question of the Minister of Transportation and Communications, following up his statement regarding the implementation of that Rapoport report. I would like to question him in respect to certain aspects of that report, which is of very great concern to the dump truck industry today. What action is he considering regarding the prompt and fair payment of accounts; the joint responsibility for overloading; regulation and bonding of brokers; and the Quebec-Ontario co-operation in respect to the whole industry and the problems thereto?

Hon. Mr. Snow: Mr. Speaker, as I stated in my statement earlier this afternoon, I feel we have dealt with the most important and necessary recommendations of Mr. Rapoport's report. Other matters are under consideration, including the ones the hon. member mentions, and further action will be taken on some of them in due course.

Mr. Young: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary: Could the minister give us any time factor in respect to the due course, what it means? During this session? Before Christmas?

Hon. Mr. Snow: No, I can't give the commitment that those matters can be dealt with before Christmas.

PROVINCIAL JUDGES

Mr. Singer: Mr. Speaker, I have a qestion of the Attorney General. Could the Attorney General tell us what plans he has to alleviate the difficult conditions under which provincial judges are working, as set out by the Provincial Judges Association and as set out by the Deputy Attorney General?

Hon. Mr. McMurtry: This is a matter that has been brought to my attention during my relatively short term in this position. I do recognize that it is a problem, and I intend to meet with the chief judge of the provincial court within the next few days to discuss how we might approach this matter to resolve some of the problems.

Mr. Singer: By way of supplementary; has the Attorney General spoken to his deputy, who made some well-publicized remarks about it? Perhaps the deputy has some suggestions.

Hon. Mr. McMurtry: I speak to him on a relatively frequent basis.

Mr. Singer: Good, talk to him again.

Mr. Bullbrook: How's that for direction?

Mr. Speaker: The member for Timiskaming.

Mr. Martel: The new member for Timiskaming.

Mr. Lewis: What a pleasure this is!

Interjections.

KIRKLAND AND DISTRICT HOSPITAL

Mr. Bain: I have a question of the Minister of Health. Considering that almost a year ago the provincial government was petitioned by the community leaders to use the old Kirkland and District Hospital as a chronic and extended care hospital when the new hospital was opened, when can the people of Kirkland Lake expect the minister's decision on the utilization of the old hospital as a chronic and extended care hospital?

Hon. F. S. Miller: Mr. Speaker, I have no comment to make on that at this time. Chronic hospitals remain a priority, but I think one must realize that when one petitions for a new hospital in the community, one cannot always be sure that the old facility will carry on in use. Usually the arguments that precede something like that — and I believe they applied in Kirkland Lake — are that the present plant is worn out.

I think if one looks into the problems you'll see that there are many of those physical plant problems inherent there. A building that looks good often costs more to convert to the standards we require than it does to build totally new facilities. Having gone through that place — I believe that he'd find this was true in that case.

Mr. Bain: A supplementary?

Mr. Speaker: One supplementary here.

[2:45]

Mr. Bain: In straight terms then, the minister is telling the people of Kirkland Lake that the old hospital will not be used as a chronic and extended care hospital? Is this correct?

Hon. F. S. Miller: Not necessarily.

Mr. Lewis: That's what he is saying.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The member for Grey with a new question.

GREY COUNTY TEACHERS' SETTLEMENT

Mr. McKessock: Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the Minister of Education.

I hope you will excuse me for asking a question early. I did intend to sit back and watch for a while being a newcomer, but the people—

Mr. Speaker: We are pleased to have questions from all members.

Mr. McKessock: The people in the riding of Grey lost no time in letting me know they wanted me to act for them from day one.

Mr. Nixon: The member has done several favours for the Tories already.

Mr. McKessock: Over the weekend we have been talking about wage settlements for elementary schools. I have received 40—

Mr. Speaker: Would the hon. member please ask the question?

Mr. McKessock: I have received contact from over 40 teachers over the weekend and they are concerned that in Grey county they have not received their wage settlements although counties to the south and east of them — Bruce and Simcoe — have. I want to ask the Minister of Edcation what he is going to do to let these teachers in Grey county bring their wages up to the standards of the neighbouring counties. If this is not allowed to happen there will be disparity between these two counties which will—

Mr. Speaker: I think the hon. member has asked the question. He must not debate the matter.

Mr. McKessock: I would like to ask him if he shares my views; and if so, what he intends to do about seeing that they receive parity at this time.

Mr. Nixon: What about parity in Grey and Bruce?

Mr. Speaker: Does the hon. minister have an answer?

Hon. Mr. Snow: A typical Liberal question.

Hon. Mr. Wells: I thank my friend for his question and, of course, his concern about the people of Grey county. I think we are all concerned about those people. They were represented here in a very excellent way for a good number of years.

Interjections.

Mr. Singer: They didn't seem to think so on Sept. 18.

Hon. Mr. Wells: I find a little difficulty in knowing exactly what my friend would like me to comment upon because I think that the elementary and secondary teachers of Grey county, unlike Metropolitan Toronto and several other areas, do have a settlement. As far as I know they had that settlement before Oct. 13 and presumably that settlement is in effect until either the end of this year or next Aug. 31. That settlement must have been negotiated between those teachers and their board and it must have been agreed to and signed and ratified by their group, so I don't know exactly what he or his teacher friends are complaining about.

Mr. McKessock: A supplementary to the question: Grey county did not sign until after Oct. 14, although Bruce had, so this leaves them in a 25 per cent less—

Mr. Speaker: The question is what? Would the member ask the question please?

Mr. McKessock: What is the minister going to do about it to see they get this 25 per cent raise which Bruce county has achieved?

Hon. Mr. Wells: If Grey county did not sign the agreement or officially sign it until after Oct. 13, I guess they will have to talk

to the anti-inflation board in Ottawa about that particular problem. I will be glad to look into it and verify it. I don't have the dates of when the settlements were made. My information is that there were settlements in those particular areas.

HAMILTON SELECTIVE SERVICES

Mr. Mackenzie: Mr. Speaker, a question of the Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations.

Does the minister recall receiving a letter from me, dated Oct. 20, in which I took exception to the business operation known as Selective Services, in Hamilton, which was encouraging recipients of mothers' allowance, welfare, pensions and other government cheques, through a series of newspaper ads, to cash the cheques for a fee of 10 per cent of the value of the cheque? What action is the minister taking to stop this kind of blood-sucking and profiteering at the expense of those who need the full amount of those cheques?

Hon. Mr. Handleman: Mr. Speaker, I don't recall receiving the letter, probably because of an interruption of a certain service, but I can say we have taken action. The service has stopped. Banks are now cashing those without charge, and therefore there is no longer any incentive for anybody to try to do it the way the hon. member has described.

HOSPITAL CLOSINGS

Mr. Roy: Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the Minister of Health. In view of the statements reported in today's press, made by himself and his colleague, the Treasurer (Mr. McKeough), about the closure of hospitals across this province, can he advise the House if he has made a list of the hospitals he is going to close and in what areas? Second, does he have a plan of what to do with the hospitals which are going to be closed or is he going to do something like we have on Yonge St. where a hospital has been closed and empty for two years?

Mrs. Campbell: It's on University Ave.

Mr. Roy: On University Ave. Third, can he assure the people in the Ottawa area that the situation at the Ottawa General and their new hospital will not be delayed because of his new policy?

Hon. F. S. Miller: Mr. Speaker, the policy is not new. In fact, the hon. member's party went to great pains to say how much could be saved in that area during the election period, if I recall.

Mr. Roy: Yes, we said it. The minister didn't say it.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: What about the Liberal Party's dental plan? Tell us about the dental plan again.

Hon. F. S. Miller: Yet watch the opposition every time I try to close one. What happened when I tried to close one in Windsor? Who spoke up against it? You can't have it both ways.

Mr. Nixon: What about Durham? Who spoke up about that?

Mr. Reid: And the one in Burlington.

Mr. Speaker: Are there any further questions?

Hon. F. S. Miller: The answer to the member's specific question as to whether I have a list is "no," but I have a pretty good idea.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Sudbury East.

Mr. Roy: I have a supplementary, Mr. Speaker. If the minister has a pretty good idea, can he tell us something of his idea? Secondly, what is the alternative plan he has in mind on what to do with the closed hospitals?

Hon. F. S. Miller: Mr. Speaker, there isn't always an alternative and that is one of the things we have to realize. I think the illustration the member used of the old Mount Sinai Hospital on University Ave.—

Mr. Roy: If the minister had any policy he would.

Hon. F. S. Miller: —is a perfect example of what appears to be an almost new building costing literally millions of dollars to convert it to another use. I believe the current cost of the conversion is in excess of $4 million. That is an awful lot of money for a building that looks good.

Mr. Reid: Hydro could have been put in there.

Mr. Roy: That is what we call a lack of policy.

Hon. F. S. Miller: That's not a lack of policy.

CHILD WELFARE ADVISORY COMMITTEE

Mr. Martel: I have a question of the Minister of Community and Social Services. As the result of a commitment by his predecessor in June to consider the establishment of an advisory committee to study strategies and programmes for implementing the provisions of the Child Welfare Act, has a final decision been made to establish that committee? If so, does he intend to meet with the group who were at that meeting when that commitment was made by his predecessor?

Hon. Mr. Taylor: The answer is no.

Mr. Riddell: Not another one of those kind, surely.

Mr. Martel: I have a supplementary question. Can the minister indicate some timetabling as to when he intends to respond to this? We were supposed to have a reply in early September.

Hon. Mr. Taylor: I will review that and get back to the member.

BUDGET DEFICIT

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Speaker, this is one of those "in view of the fact" questions.

Mr. Speaker: As long as there are facts, it's okay.

Mr. Singer: Now what are you going to do?

Interjections.

Mr. Sargent: It is a question of the Treasurer, Mr. Speaker.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: The member means despite the fact.

Mr. Sargent: One year ago today, on Oct. 29, 1974, on page 4519 of Hansard, the Treasurer, Mr. White, in answer to my question: "Would he project a $2 million deficit?"; replied: "I predict a $336 million surplus." In view of this fact: Today 12 months later, the deficit is $1.9 billion.

Mr. Speaker: I think that is the basis of the member's question. Would he ask the question, please?

Mr. Sargent: Since he has taken over—this is in view of the fact—he was 1000 per cent wrong.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. That comment is out of order. Does the member have a question?

Mrs. Campbell: He is asking it.

Mr. Sargent: I ask the Treasurer to inform the House why in the Throne Speech yesterday, paragraph two of the second page, it says: "The Ontario government has led the way during the past year in restraining its own expenditures." In a speech last night the Treasurer said—

An hon. member: Question?

Mr. Sargent: I'm closing, fellows. To reduce the spending—

Mr. Speaker: Order please, the hon. member is conducting a debate. I think he placed a basis for a question, which is in order.

Mr. Sargent: Sit down, here is the question.

Mr. Speaker: Order please, we must have the question or we will go to someone else.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: Throw him out.

Mr. Speaker: If you have a question, proceed please.

Mr. Sargent: All right, I will ask the Treasurer what is his projection of the deficit in this coming budget? Don't give me one of those answers where the minister doesn't answer. I want an answer.

Interjections.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Mr. Speaker, the Minister of the Environment (Mr. Kerr) suggests that I should take that question as notice and I think perhaps I will.

Interjections.

Mr. Roy: That is an improvement; I was expecting "in the fullness of time."

PAPERWORKERS' STRIKE

Mr. Swart: Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct my question to the Minister of Labour, and it pertains to the continuing labour dispute between the Canadian Paperworkers' Union and the papermills in this province; and particularly to the request of the committee of mayors and MPPs relative to the

minister's intervention in this dispute to bring them back to the bargaining table.

I understand that Abitibi and the CPU are to meet next Tuesday. Can the minister indicate to the House whether the parties, particularly the company, which to this date has refused to have meaningful negotiations, are prepared to take part in serious negotiations? Second, is the minister taking steps to get the other paper companies back to the bargaining table with CPU and the other unions; or is she prepared to let Abitibi set the pattern?

Hon. B. Stephenson: Mr. Speaker, it gives me great pleasure to have the hon. member across the way announce the success that we've had in our minor efforts to get these two disputing factions back together. The answers to his first two questions are "yes" and to the third one "maybe."

HIGHWAY PAVING CONTRACTS

Mr. Givens: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to ask the Minister of Transportation and Communications when he intends to let tenders for the paving of the Spadina arterial road from Lawrence to Eglinton—

Mr. Cassidy: The member never stops.

Mr. Givens: —and the extension of Highway 400 from Highway 401 southerly?

An hon. member: What else is new?

Mr. Singer: Good question.

Hon. Mr. Snow: Mr. Speaker, I believe it will be the municipality of Metropolitan Toronto that will be letting the tenders for both those projects. As far as I'm concerned, the sooner the better.

Mr. Roy: You are not going to abide by that, eh?

Mr. Givens: Supplementary: Has the minister dealt with the application of the metropolitan corporation to provide the 75 per cent subsidy of the Province of Ontario toward the paving of the Spadina arterial road and the extension of Highway 400 southerly? Has the minister dealt with that yet?

Hon. Mr. Snow: Yes, Mr. Speaker, those matters are in progress and as soon as—

Mr. Riddell: He didn't deal with them though.

Hon. Mr. Snow: —the chairman of Metropolitan Toronto arrives back in this country I have a meeting arranged with him to finalize that.

VIOLENCE IN HOCKEY

Mr. Lawlor: Mr. Speaker, to the Attorney General, a two-part question re violence in hockey. Does the minister always commit the crime of splitting his infinitives?

Mr. Lewis: That does as much violence to the English language as sticks to cranium.

Mr. Lawlor: The second part of the question is, does the minister wholly disagree with his predecessor in office, a most honourable man indeed, with respect to this question, as the minister seems to run completely adverse to him?

Hon. Mr. McMurtry: The answer, Mr. Speaker, to the first part of the question would be "not always," and with respect to the position taken by my predecessor, I know of no difference of opinion. As a matter of fact, I had the opportunity of spending a few minutes with my predecessor a couple of hours ago and I was indicating my concern about the fact that charges should be laid when there is a clear breach of the Criminal Code. He certainly did not indicate to me that he disagreed in any way with the stand I am now adopting.

Mr. Good: John is on the payroll already.

Mr. Lawlor: A supplementary question, if I may: Is it the Attorney General's intention then to apply a similar ruling to all sports, on the gridiron, in the ring and in other areas of that sort of activity?

[3:00]

Hon. Mr. McMurtry: As far as I am concerned, any time there is a clear breach of the Criminal Code, the criminal law of this country, and this breach is brought to my attention, I will recommend that charges be laid.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Huron-Bruce.

Mr. Nixon: Supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. Our time is just about out. If we could get to one new question, we would finalize the question period. So it's between the two of you.

Mr. Nixon: Can I just ask the minister if he is giving special instructions to the police forces to attend these hockey games with

the indication that they will have a special responsibility to prefer charges?

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: If they do, they get Bullbrook.

Interjections.

Mr. Nixon: Perhaps it might be made clear whether the minister is not answering or does he have no answer in that regard?

Mr. Speaker: He didn't have an answer.

MINERAL RIGHTS ON AGRICULTURAL LAND

Mr. Gaunt: I have a question of the Minister of Natural Resources. Has the minister made a decision with respect to the matter of taxation on mineral rights as it applies to agricultural land?

Hon. Mr. Bernier: This was a recommendation of an inter-ministerial committee headed by the former parliamentary assistant.

Mrs. Campbell: You have got to blame it on somebody.

Mr. Roy: Does that exist?

Hon. Mr. Bernier: It's a matter that we have not come to grips with. I think I indicated publicly during a certain campaign that it's not likely we would move in this direction at this particular time.

Mr. Gaunt: That's good. When will a final announcement be made in that respect?

Hon. Mr. Bernier: There is a committee established to review both sections of the Mining Act and certainly this will be one area that they will look at. I expect within the next six months or a year we will have something definite and more positive to say.

Mr. Speaker: The oral question period has expired.

I want to ask the indulgence of the members for my slowness with the names of the ridings. It's rather difficult to put together the new faces and the new ridings, as you can understand. So a little patience on all sides, I think, would be appreciated.

Mr. Roy: As long as you remember my name.

Mr. Nixon: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, before you go forward. I believe you handled the question period rather well, sir, but for clarification I would like to bring your attention to the question addressed to the Attorney General, having to do with the role of the police in hockey violence. The question was asked by an hon. gentleman to my right and there was a supplementary from the same person. It is a matter of some concern, and I think you would find it reported in the front pages of all the dailies and at the top of the news items everywhere. If I might suggest, sir, it might have been possible to have another additional question from another party, perhaps a third party.

Mr. Speaker: I'm not sure of the member's point. It was my impression that the hon. minister did not have an answer to your supplementary at the time, so I called the next and final question.

Mr. Nixon: I don't think that is so.

Mr. Speaker: I may have misjudged. My right eye fails me sometimes.

Mr. Nixon: I think he felt he was responding to your direction.

Mr. Speaker: Petitions.

Presenting reports.

Hon. J. R. Smith presented the report of the Ministry of Correctional Services for the fiscal year 1974-1975.

Mr. Roy: I thought that was a petition from your riding.

Mr. Speaker: Motions.

Hon. Mr. McMurtry moved, pursuant to the provisions of section 16 of the Ombudsman Act, 1975, that a select committee be appointed to consider and set out general rules and guidelines for the guidance of the Ombudsman and to provide formal recommendations to the Legislature thereon on or before Dec. 1, 1975, the said committee to consist of seven members as follows: Mr. Singer, chairman, Messrs. Grossman, Hodgson, Lawlor, Norton, Reid and Renwick.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. Speaker: Introduction of bills.

HIGHWAY TRAFFIC AMENDMENT ACT

Hon. Mr. Snow moved first reading of bill intituled, An Act to amend the Highway Traffic Act.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

PUBLIC COMMERCIAL VEHICLES AMENDMENT ACT

Hon. Mr. Snow moved first reading of bill intituled, An Act to amend the Public Commercial Vehicles Act.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

ONTARIO ENERGY BOARD AMENDMENT ACT

Hon. Mr. Timbrell moved first reading of bill intituled, An Act to amend the Ontario Energy Board Act.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: On Sept. 4, 1974, the government announced the Ontario Energy Board should be authorized to supervise the orderly allocation of available supplies of natural gas among end users in the event of supply difficulties. This decision was based on our perception that available supplies from existing areas of production would fall below our requirements before a supplemental supply surce, such as the frontier areas or coal gasification, was available.

Several events since the announcement in 1974 have confirmed the need for these powers. First, the National Energy Board has held hearings and issued a report on natural gas supply and requirements which indicates that available supplies from existing areas of production will not meet the needs of users east of Alberta as early as 1977. As I stated in London, Ont., on Oct. 2 our professional adviser's view, which was presented to the National Energy Board in the public hearings, which led to the report referred to, is less optimistic than that of the NEB.

Secondly, the federal government has announced its intent to curtail exports of natural gas from Canada in order to meet approved Canadian requirements. This winter all predictions indicate that the natural gas shortage in the United States will deeply increase in its severity and its attendant hardship. Curtailment of exports by Canada must be accompanied by a commitment to the wise use of this important fuel and feedstock by Canadians.

Canadians in general and residents in Ontario can avoid any shortfalls in natural gas by some modest curtailment of exports; the commitment to energy conservation; goodwill and a determination to resolve differences between producing and consuming provinces in a manner that maximizes current supply opportunities; and by the early reality of one of the available supplemental sources of natural gas.

Before I briefly summarize the contents of the bill introduced today, let me make one point very clear: There is no natural gas shortage in Ontario at this time. This legislation is no more the sign of an emergency than the purchase of a firetruck by a municipality indicates that the town is burning down. It is a precautionary measure.

Mr. Roy: Did you think that one up yourself?

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: Furthermore, we expect all natural gas customers to receive fully their needed supplies this winter and are confident that all needs can be met next winter.

Mr. Roy: He is coming along.

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: I also would add that all existing residental users will be given the highest priority of use. We do not envisage in the foreseeable future that there will be any mandatory curtailment of natural gas to residents in Ontario who are using natural gas to heat their homes. This does not say we are letting up in any way in our advocacy of the wise use of all our energy forms by our citizens on a voluntary basis.

The legislation is to provide for the orderly allocation of natural gas among users. The natural gas utility companies that have long-term contracts for the supply of natural gas—with TransCanada PipeLines and other wholesale suppliers of natural gas—will be required to file allocation plans with the Ontario Energy Board annually on a date to be stated in regulations. The contents of such allocation plans and the criteria to be followed in their preparation will be set out in the regulations.

After the allocation plan has been filed with the Ontario Energy Board and notice of it given to users of natural gas who may be affected by the proposed allocation plan, any affected person may, within a date also to be specified in the regulations, file an objection or comment on the proposed allocation plan. The natural gas utility may then on a similar basis file its reply to any objections or comments.

The Ontario Energy Board, after consideration of the proposed allocation plan, the objections, comments and replies, may by order approve the proposed allocation plan or amend the proposed allocation plan and approve it as amended. The allocation plan will then come into force on a date some time after the plan is approved and will continue in force for a 12-month period. The process will be repeated in order to have allocation plans prepared for subsequent 12-month periods. In my statement, in the committee

stage of consideration of this bill, Mr. Speaker, it is my intent to discuss further the details of the government's plans in relation to natural gas allocation.

RETAIL BUSINESS HOLIDAYS ACT

Hon. Mr. MacBeth moved first reading of bill intituled An Act to regulate Holiday Closings for Retail Businesses.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Hon. Mr. MacBeth: Mr. Speaker, the purpose of the bill is to establish certain holidays on which retail business establishments shall be closed. The exceptions include small grocery stores, milk stores, news and tobacco stands, drug stores, antique shops, flower shops, etc. Also excepted are those things permitted by the Lord's Day Act, Canada, and the Lord's Day (Ontario) laws.

Mr. Deans: What does "etc." mean?

Hon. Mr. McBeth: Municipalities may by law make exceptions where necessary to the tourist industry.

Mr. Deans: You mean all those and all the others too?

Hon. Mr. MacBeth: There are a few others. You will see them when you see the bill, Mr. Speaker.

DEVELOPMENT CORPORATIONS ACT

Hon. Mr. Bennett moved first reading of bill intituled, An Act to amend the Development Corporations Act, 1973.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Hon. Mr. Bennett: Mr. Speaker, this bill provides the Ontario development corporations with the necessary authority to implement the Municipal Industrial Parks Programme referred to in both the 1975 budget and supplementary Acts and statements by the Treasurer (Mr. McKeough).

[3:15]

MUNICIPAL AMENDMENT ACT

Hon. Mr. McKeough moved first reading of bill intituled, An Act to amend the Municipal Act.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Mr. Martel: All this legislation is usually during the last week.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: The bill empowers a municipality that is acquiring or developing land for industrial purposes, with the aid of a loan from one of the development corporations under the Development Corporations Act, 1973, to give security to the loan by way of a mortgage or otherwise.

ASSESSMENT AMENDMENT ACT

Hon. Mr. Meen moved first reading of bill intituled, An Act to amend the Assessment Act.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Hon. Mr. Meen: Mr. Speaker, this bill amends the Assessment Act to provide that condominiums and co-operative housing will be assessed on the same basis as owner-occupied, single-family, residential dwellings. It also contains a number of other technical and rather housekeeping matters in the bill.

Mr. Roy: It's going to take more than that to get that—

BILLS OF SALE AND CHATTEL MORTGAGES AMENDMENT ACT

Hon. Mr. Handleman moved first reading of bill intituled, An Act to amend the Bills of Sale and Chattel Mortgages Act.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Mr. Lewis: This is really first rate. It is a pleasure.

Mr. Cassidy: Who gave them pep pills?

Hon. Mr. Davis: I told you.

Mr. Martel: Why didn't you do that four years ago?

ASSIGNMENT OF BOOK DEBTS AMENDMENT ACT

Hon. Mr. Handleman moved first reading of bill intituled, An Act to amend the Assignment of Book Debts Act.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Mr. Deans: Quite a switch; all the back benchers are making cabinet statements.

An hon. member: Actually, the cabinet is about all that's left.

Mr. Nixon: We're going to miss him as Housing Minister. It's not going to be any fun at all.

CONDITIONAL SALES AMENDMENT ACT

Hon. Mr. Handleman moved first reading of bill intituled, An Act to amend the Conditional Sales Act.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Hon. Mr. Handleman: Mr. Speaker, the amendments to the three Acts that I have introduced today provide for the extension of time for registration of certain legal instruments in the case of an interruption of postal service.

LABOUR OMBUDSMAN ACT, 1975

Mr. Reid moved first reading of bill intituled, the Labour Ombudsman Act, 1975.

Mr. Reid: Mr. Speaker, I am reintroducing this bill which I introduced last session. The former Minister of Labour indicated his department was giving serious consideration to introducing legislation or setting something up within the Labour department which would protect the individual worker both from the companies and, particularly, illegal practices by the union.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

CONSUMER REPORTING AMENDMENT ACT

Mr. Reid moved first reading of bill intituled, An Act to amend the Consumer Reporting Act, 1973.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Mr. Reid: Mr. Speaker, this Act provides that information in consumer reporting firms not be allowed to leave the Province of Ontario. It is particularly aimed at this information and the privacy of individuals being protected, particularly in view of the fact that much of this information seems to find its way outside not only Ontario but also Canada.

It also provides that companies holding this information must register with the Ministry of Consumer and Commercial Affairs the regulations and the way in which they are protecting the privacy of the information under their control.

GOOD SAMARITAN ACT

Mr. Haggerty moved first reading of bill intituled, An Act to relieve Persons from Liability in respect of voluntary Emergency Medical and First Aid Services.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Mr. Haggerty: Mr. Speaker, the purpose of the bill is to relieve persons from liability in respect of voluntary emergency first aid assistance or medical services rendered at or near the scene of an accident or other sudden emergency.

SAFETY COMMITTEES ACT

Mr. Haggerty moved first reading of bill intituled, An Act to provide for the Establishment of Safety Committees.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Mr. Haggerty: The purpose of the bill is to provide the employees in Ontario with a voice in safety matters. I am confident the bill will reduce the number of personal injuries in Ontario.

Mr. Speaker: Just before the orders of the day, as hon. members know, tomorrow at 11 o'clock I will, in the presence of the Lieutenant Governor, administer the oath of office to the Ombudsman designate, Mr. Arthur Maloney. All members are invited, as you know because you received the invitation on your desks or in the mail. Those wishing to attend will sit in their places as usual. I know that all hon. members will wish to join in the inauguration of this most important parliamentary office.

Orders of the day.

Clerk of the House: The second order, House in committee of supply.

Mr. Chairman: Before we get to committee of supply, I would like to take this opportunity to thank members from all sides of the House for according me the honour and privilege to serve you in the committee of the whole. I realize it is not going to be an easy task and I want to call upon members from all sides of the House to act in a reasonable and responsible manner in our deliberations.

I intend to be fair and impartial but I intend to be firm in enforcing the rules of the House. I think all members of the House should keep in mind that all of their remarks in the committee should be relevant. They

should be courteous and they should conduct themselves in a civil manner at all times.

Mr. Good: No repetition.

Mr. Chairman: I am sure the hon. member for Simcoe East (Mr. G. E. Smith), who will be joining me in these responsibilities, will assist members in every way possible and both he and I ask for your assistance and your co-operation at all times. If that is done I am sure we will look forward to some very useful and very productive sessions of this committee of the House. I want to thank you for according me this opportunity to be of service to you.

Mr. Gaunt: He deserves a raise in pay.

Hon. Mr. Welch: Mr. Chairman, it was planned to consider the remaining votes, that is 1006, 1007, 1008, and 1009 of the Ministry of Treasury, Economics and Intergovernmental Affairs.

ESTIMATES, MINISTRY OF TREASURY, ECONOMICS AND INTERGOVERNMENTAL AFFAIRS
(continued)

On vote 1006:

Mr. Chairman: Does the minister have any opening comments?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: No, just to say that we will abide by all your declarations, Mr. Chairman. As the first estimates under your benign gaze and firm hand, on behalf of all of us here I certainly welcome you to the chair.

Mr. Shore: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order please. In view of the fact that basically, this is a new Legislature with many new MPPs—both opposition critics particularly are new in this whole area—as the member for Wilson Heights (Mr. Singer) stated yesterday there is some question of whether we can pick up the areas which were left off. Perhaps out of respect and reason and maybe education we could have permission to broaden the scope with which we are dealing with the general areas. Perhaps an opportunity could be given to having an opening statement in relation to the broader aspects of this vote.

Mr. Chairman: If the hon. member for London North will refer to page G100, vote 1006, there are six items in that vote. There is a programme description at the bottom and if there is anything of a specific nature which you want to ask the minister, I am sure he would be happy to provide you with that. I would only caution you to confine your remarks to 1006, item 1, programme administration.

Mr. Shore: Then we can't discuss anything broader than the area of 1006, is that the ruling?

Mr. Chairman: That's true.

[3:30 p.m.]

Mr. Makarchuk: Mr. Chairman, first I would like to congratulate you personally on your elevation to this position. There are a few other points I would like to mention. It's nice to be back here and notice some of the changes around the place. I remember one of the remarks made by the Treasurer when I was rudely interrupted four years ago: "What is Makarchuk doing now?" I would like to inform him that Makarchuk was making sure that the Tories ran third in Brantford in the future. That's vindication of what I was doing. Now I'm going to try to find out what the minister was doing.

As I said earlier, before I was rudely interrupted four years ago, we were interested in a land-use plan for the Province of Ontario.

Mr. Nixon: What is this, a maiden speech?

Mr. Makarchuk: At that time various ministers were giving indications that this plan was in the process of development. I would like to point out that that was five years ago, and in five years many people are capable of doing a lot of great things. Perhaps the minister at this time will give some indication as to the status of the plan? When is it going to be ready if it's going to be ready? Where is it? If he is having any disagreements in the various ministries, which ministries have not given approval to the plan? Can he give some indication of the general content of the whole thing?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: No, there are no disagreements as yet. I suspect there may well be but there are not any as yet. Had we not been interrupted by the election, I think by now it probably would have gone through the various cabinet committees and our internal process to cabinet and might well have been ready for introduction about this time. We've lost two or three months in terms of the election and we're just getting back to it now.

As for timing, I doubt very much if it will be before the first of next year; I doubt it will be before the end of this year.

Mr. Makarchuk: Could the minister give me some idea of the details of the plan? Will the plan be able to provide communities some direction in terms of growth or land use? Will there be some indication as to what land is going to be preserved for agricultural use, for housing, for industrial growth and so forth? Have the various economic and environmental factors been taken into account? Are these going to be considered or included in the development of the plan?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: No, I think the member is getting much too finite. We would say most of the things that the member has just raised would be in local, regional, county or municipal official plans and not in a provincial statement of objectives. Not much of what he has asked me for will be in the provincial statement.

Mr. Chairman: Are there any other comments on item 1 of vote 1006, programme administration? Carried.

Item 2, urban and regional planning. Are there any comments?

Mr. Swart: Yes, I have a number of comments that I want to make on this item. In the total budget of TEIGA I suppose it's a very small item but I suggest it has implications far in excess of the funds involved. It relates particularly to the issue that was raised by the member for Brantford. I want to discuss that in some greater detail.

I understand from the minister that the proposed master plan, if that is what he is referring to, isn't proposed to go into any great detail in terms of planning the province either for land use or for development. If that is the case, I suggest it's a very real mistake because if we leave the situation as it has been for either regions or local municipalities to do the planning for the province on a broad scale it just won't be done.

There are three things that are needed in this province, I suggest, with regard to development and land-use planning. First, of course, is decentralization of growth, second is the preservation of the good agricultural land and, third, is the efficient provision of services. I suggest that we have had, certainly in the field of land use, a complete failure in this regard.

Last evening I took the time to use the maps provided by the federal government with regard to the soil capability for agriculture of the Canada land inventory. I also got the population of the municipalities throughout this province. We find that of the growth in this province—and I think these figures can be backed up and I can go into more detail on them—during the last 15 years, something like 82 per cent of it has been on the class 1 and class 2 agricultural land.

Even worse than that, most of that growth, about 70 per cent of it, has been in the golden horseshoe area, if we can include Kitchener-Waterloo, Oshawa and Peterborough and down through Brantford and the Niagara Peninsula. About 70 per cent of it is not only on class 1 and class 2 land, but on good agricultural land from a climatic point of view that can produce crops that can't be produced on other class 1 and class 2 agricultural lands in the province.

I would point out that if you took the city of Ottawa out of that growth—and with deference to the members from Ottawa, there is not a great amount of prime agricultural land in there—we would find that the situation is much worse because Ottawa is a municipality, on the poorer agricultural land generally, which has had a very rapid growth for obvious reasons. So the situation is that prime agricultural lands in this province, far from being preserved, are more and more becoming the lands upon which urban development is taking place.

Let me just give you some statistics from my own area, as an example. In the Niagara Peninsula, in the years 1946 to 1951, 43 per cent of the development there was on the best agricultural lands, the one quarter or the one fifth in the north part, which includes of course the fruit lands. From 1951 to 1961 that percentage went up to 46 per cent. From 1961 to 1971, it went up to 58 per cent and from 1971 to 1975, 75 per cent of all the growth in the Niagara Peninsula went on the very best lands in one quarter to one fifth of the area of the Niagara Peninsula. I suggest that drastic action is needed to change that.

The needs I suggest are becoming greater —the needs to take action, to have a master land-use plan in this province. The needs are becoming greater as time goes on because our society is changing. I was pleased to see in the speech to the Sierra Club by the minister of TEIGA that he stated he recognizes that we are in a period of transition, but I was rather sorry to see that he didn't seem to offer any solutions to the problem nor, I suggest, even properly assess those changes.

The need for this master land-use plan is becoming greater, first of all because we have a slower rate of growth generally and population growth in this province. Statistics show that in Canada as a whole our population growth is about 1.2 per cent compared to three per cent 20 years ago. It shows that in Ontario it is down to two per cent—and those are the latest figures; if we had them for 1975, it would probably be less than that—compared to 3.5 per cent 20 years ago. I am the first one to recognize that this doesn't relate directly to family formation, that we are still reuqiring the houses to put people in, because family formation of course is based on the birthrate some 20 years ago, but nevertheless it is a trend which will show up in the near future.

The second reason that we need to have a master land-use plan—because of changing conditions—relates to the higher density development that is taking place. Again, if I can refer to Niagara, I would point out that from 1973 to 1975 the statistics show that the density increase was between 40 per cent and 50 per cent in the three major cities in the Niagara Peninsula.

This has a relationship to the urban boundaries, because not so much land is needed as was formerly and not so much is going to be needed for urban development. If plans are approved allowing 2,000 or 3,000 acres of good land to be used, rather than 2,000 or 3,000 acres of the poorer land, it will mean inevitably, as it will in the Niagara Peninsula, that the growth goes down into the good land rather than in the other area and gives further need for the boundaries to be pulled in much further in the good agricultural area.

The next item I want to mention as a changing need is the coming world food shortage. Perhaps this doesn't need to be stressed, but I think we all here probably know that by the year 2000 there is going to be at least 6½ billion people in this world—up from the present 3¾ billion. I have heard people argue that birth control measures will prevent that population increase. However, all of the best assessments show that those measures will not have that effect. The very technology that produces birth control methods and provides the education for people to use them, means that people are also going to live longer. There is going to be 6½ billion people and we are just not going to have enough land on which to feed them.

Mr. Nixon: What are you going to do about that, Mr. Treasurer?

Mr. Swart: We can do something about it, of course, in this province. The Canadian Press reported on Dec. 19, 1974, that an explosive global catastrophe was in the making. This was the conclusion from a June, 1974, conference of economists and agricultural specialists dealing with relief efforts in the poor regions of the world. Their report said it will come as early as 1975 or as late as 1988. Conditions are accumulating towards an imminent tragedy of world-wide magnitude.

If we think that is an overstatement, then I will just point out that in the Oct. 15 issue of the Toronto Star there was a report from Chicago which said:

> The hand on the granary door will soon be the one to rule the world unless food production continues to stay ahead of global population. The key issue is that world food supply and population growth are headed along a collision course.

That was a statement by Robert Long, the Assistant Secretary of Agriculture in the United States, whom one can hardly accuse of being a radical.

So, I suggest that these three changes in the world and in our society are reasons why we have to demand that there be a master land-use plan within this province.

Of course, one other item that pertains to this whole changing situation is the near monopoly control and ownership of developable land. It's no longer the friendly neighbourhood real estate man who is doing the developing; it is monopoly corporations.

The need is there, and I also suggest that the farmers are for this, too. It is not good enough to say that they are opposed to it, as the minister implied in his speech at the Sierra Club about the opposition to it.

Again, I have a press clipping stating that Peter Hannam of the Ontario Federation of Agriculture, says we need to take a firm stand on use of agricultural land. He said that unless a definite land-use plan is instituted, most agricultural land will disappear within 25 to 30 years.

We know, of course, that Gordon Hill, the president of the Ontario Federation of Agriculture, has been taking a strong stand on that. The farmers are willing to see this policy which will preserve our good agricultural land. All they ask is that it be an applicable operation for them. I certainly think it was a serious omission from the Throne Speech that there was nothing about land use and, what's more, nothing about farm income maintenance. It says to you also that the public of this province is in favour of a

master land-use plan which would reserve the good agricultural land and give some direction to development.

[3:45]

I have here with me a planning report from the Niagara region, public meetings were held there, very extensively relative to the regional plan, which incidentally came out to do nothing for the preservation of agricultural land. The report from our planners on the various meetings, relative to the preservation of prime agricultural lands, says this was one of the topics of greatest concern. There was virtually unanimous support for a policy of preserving fruit lands and other prime agricultural areas. Many of the briefs also attached conditions to the support of this policy and these were almost invariably that there should be a viable agricultural industry.

I would suggest, too, that in the recent election, if you can draw one interpretation from it perhaps more than any other, it is that the public is concerned about the preservation of good agricultural land.

In my riding — I think it is perhaps not out of place here to mention it — in my own area in particular, the Conservative opponent made the issue — and the only issue — Swart. Swart was against development in that area and good assessment on the best agricultural land in the city of Thorold. Let me tell you that in Thorold, at least, I got more votes than the other two candidates combined and the Conservative was third.

Again I suggest that it is good economics. As well as the people wanting it, as well as the farmers wanting it, it is good economics for us to have our development take place on other than the good agricultural land. The Federation of Agriculture in the Niagara region reports that in the last year they produced about $60 million in farm products on the Niagara Peninsula and that is perhaps an annual average which is increasing because of the increase in prices. More than half of this is produced in one-fifth of the Peninsula —the north half of the Peninsula.

In that same speech to the Sierra Club I see the minister said that it is going to cost money if we are going to shift our growth to the poor agricultural lands. I just say two things. First, that it is costing money if we don't. Does it make any sense to destroy this type of productive land and let the poorer land remain there and many times not to be cropped?

The second thing I say to the minister: Show me proof where it is going to cost more if we develop on the non-productive land. Show me proof where it is going to cost more if we develop in Cornwall, or Barrie, or if we develop in Fort Erie, or Port Colborne in the Niagara Peninsula instead of below the Escarpment. I suggest, if he has any documents to this effect, that the House would be only too glad to see them.

So I say let's get on with the job of this master land-use plan. Let's make sure that it sets the structure for the future development of this province to incorporate the principles which I have mentioned, and to which I suppose everybody pays lip service. Let me say in no uncertain terms that it is the province that has the responsibility to do that, not the local municipalities. You know individual municipalities and regions just aren't going to, and surely Niagara is an example of this. Not one single solitary change has been made by having a regional plan there, by having the regional council, and I was working on that council for five years.

The outcome of that regional plan was the compilation of every single official plan in the region, not one solitary single change was made in the plan that was adopted by that region. I suggest too, that this has to be tied to industrial manpower policy. It can't just be land use; it has to be applied to industrial manpower policy.

I think this can be done. There are people who will say people won't go up north or won't go elsewhere. I suggest Ottawa is proof that if you have the jobs there, if those jobs are diversified and not just all in basic industry, and if there are jobs for the wives and for the women, people will move into the cooler areas of the province and into areas which some of us who live in the south may not think will be as desirable.

So I make three proposals. The first is that this province brings forth a master land-use and development plan which sets the framework — not just guidelines — in which the municipalities must work. I suggest the municipalities want it. In a report which was adopted almost unanimously at a convention 10 years ago the mayors and reeves of this province asked for this. What they asked for was a framework in which they should work and that there be a provincial land-use and development plan.

Secondly, as a temporary measure I suggest that we should establish a set of binding principles with regard to good agricultural land that must be followed and official plans amended accordingly. It must contain a whole

new category of agricultural land, not just rural land which is left as a residue for development at some future date.

Finally, if this policy is going to be effective, then it must be followed by all of the ministries and the various departmental operations and it must be co-ordinated.

Let me tell you again about the Niagara Peninsula, about the little village of Virgil, centred in the most productive land perhaps in North America, a village of about 300 homes, which the Ministry of the Environment was pushing for the installation of a sewer system which cost $2.25 million—at least that's the estimate; it will probably cost a lot more than that by the time it is finished—and which would serve a population of 15,000 people. Some of us fought that. We fought against the large urban area which the regional plan proposed for the town which would have accommodated initially something like 7,000 residents in that area in the very best prime agricultural land.

There was an Ontario Municipal Board hearing. Some of us opposed it and went before that hearing which lasted three days. The Ministry of the Environment was there to promote that development in that area. The municipality was there to promote the development in the area. When we tried to put forward our arguments to the Ontario Municipal Board against the proposal because of the destruction—some now and more in the future—of valuable agricultural land, we were ruled out of order because it was not pertinent to the issue.

I suggest the province has to take leadership in this and that local and regional plans will not work and cannot work until this provincial government has established the framework for development which will meet those three criteria which I talked about earlier. One is a decentralization of growth, the second is a preservation of good agricultural land and the third is a provision of services at a reasonable cost.

Mr. Good: Mr. Chairman, I should relate my comments to things that haven't been covered by the previous speaker. I understand we do have an agreement to finish these four votes by suppertime this evening? Or is there no such agreement?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: There may well be. Nobody has told me.

Mr. Good: Regarding the bill that was before the House in the last session with respect to northern communities—if my memory is correct I believe we had first reading of that and then it was left on the order paper. There was at the time a considerable objection to the terms of reference in the Act and I understand it was not acceptable to those people in the unorganized areas and the improvement districts of northern Ontario. Could the minister bring us up to date as to whether there is a new proposal now being considered by the ministry to bring the unorganized areas in northern Ontario under some form of municipal structure?

Mr. Haggerty: It was in the Throne Speech in 1974, or 1973.

Mr. Chairman: Would the minister care to reply?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: I don't think there will necessarily be a new proposal. We are still sorting our way through the previous proposal.

I would have to say that from my observation—and I haven't been as closely involved with this as perhaps I would like to have been or should have been—there are a great number of difficulties thrown up and which present themselves. It may be—and I certainly haven't firmed up any opinion on this—that what we are attempting is something which is too structured, and if we are going to go that far then we should go to either an improvement district or an organized municipality and be prepared to have more provincial involvement with some sort of local advisory advice.

That's a little bit off the top of my head, but that's some of the direction that I see our thinking going in. We will not have anything further this fall, I think that's fair to say. There were a number of meetings this summer in the north with various community groups, unfortunately without political involvement on my part or on the part of Mr. Beckett, for obvious reasons. So it's not something that we will be moving on very quickly.

Mr. Good: Under the same vote, item 2, regarding the proposed guidelines and legislation as it relates to mobile homes, that is something which has been discussed here for a great many years in the Legislature, something which a year or two ago we thought action was going to take place on and as yet nothing has happened at the provincial level.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: It's in the Ministry of Housing.

Mr. Good: The information fact sheet given to us when we were—

Hon. Mr. McKeough: I'm sorry, that's something—the local planning policy—that is an area which has been moved, effective Oct. 1, into the Ministry of Housing, and that's where it is now. In any case, the chairman of the task force I think was, is and has always been from the Ministry of Housing. You'll recall the previous Minister of Housing gave a report in the House on the subject of mobile homes in May or June, was it? I've just forgotten when. He may have something, I don't.

Mr. Good: All right, thank you. On the matter of the joint provincial-municipal projects dealing with the Simcoe-Georgian Bay area, I would like to ask if the minister has seen the report done by Dr. Pearson on the Georgian Bay archipelago and what his comments are on it? I understand it was commissioned by the recreational property owners in the Georgian Bay-Parry Sound area, and in it I think there was stressed the logical and natural difference that exists between the owners of recreational property and the natives living in the area.

I think both sides agree there must be something done to make it more compatible for the two to live whose objects are perhaps at variance; the local people wanting a certain type of development and recreational people wanting to retain the status quo and be more interested in the environmental aspects. Has the minister seen the report? Has the ministry studied it? What are the minister's reaction to it?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Yes, I've seen it. I think it was three, four or five months ago and we've had quite a bit of correspondence on it in the last little while. It flares up and dies down. To my knowledge, I don't think there's particularly a variance among those people, because they are nearly all recreational people in that particular—well, perhaps, proposed incorporation would be the way of putting it. I went through the report and we are answering the letters. Our view would be, of course, that Parry Sound is under examination by a task force who hope, I think, to report—if I am not mistaken—probably in the spring of 1976. That report by the consultant is an input ino the work of the task force. I wouldn't express a view on it at this moment, myself.

[4:00]

Mr. Nixon: May I ask, Mr. Chairman, is that task force the one the former member for Brantford was chairing? He is associated with some investigation like that.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Yes, I think the member referred to the Simcoe-Georgian Bay task force. What we are talking about is the Parry Sound task force, which is separate from Simcoe-Georgian Bay.

The former member for Brantford was chairman of two task forces, the Simcoe-Georgian Bay task force and the Northumberland task force, in his capacity as parliamentary assistant and then as Minister without Portfolio. Both of those political reports—as opposed to the technical reports—were just about completed, perhaps a month or two months away from winding them up. In fact, one of them had actually run out of money, I think, so that's always an inducement to wind them up rather quickly, although I think they got something more from my colleague in Management Board. I have just forgotten.

At any rate, two weeks ago I asked Mr. Beckett if he would wind up the work of those two committees. He agreed to and I would expect that we would have the final report of the political committee—well, I am guessing—in the next two or three months. In the one case, perhaps a little longer than the other.

Mr. Good: One final item, under item 2, dealing with the local government organization. The county restructuring programmes are still, I presume, going on. What about regional government reviews? Do you have any in the process at the present time, or contemplated?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: There are, I think, 12 county restructuring studies.

Mr. Good: Yes.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Twelve—off the top of my head. None of them have reported yet. It seems to me that the earliest one is about next March or April. There are three reviews under way: The Robarts review of Metropolitan Toronto; the review being done by Dr. Mayo in Ottawa-Carleton; and the one which is really just getting under way by a former alderman and controller in Metropolitan Toronto, Mr. Archer of Niagara. No others are contemplated.

Mr. Good: No others are contemplated. In that regard, I understand the minister at one time—a year or two ago—said that he thought regional governments would take 10 years before they should be reviewed, before things settled down into a proper place. In our own regional government of Waterloo, things are very dicey, to say it mildly, at the present time.

Some of the rural townships have had their tax bills go up 58 per cent in the last two years. There is a great deal of dissatisfaction among the rural people because of their increase in taxation as the transitional adjustments are taking place; and three of the five adjustments have already taken place. They find that they know now that at the end of five years things are going to be back into what they consider a disproportionate level of taxation, thrust upon them by the regional governments.

Two of the rural area governments, Mr. Chairman, have decided on their own that they want a study of some sort to see why their tax bills are going up. The regional chairman said, "We are not to blame. Don't blame us. We are only taking the same percentage of our levy from the area governments according to the formula under Bill 167. So don't blame us."

We are right back at the situation in Waterloo now where they were in Niagara before the 1971 election when St. Catharines wanted to secede from the region. The province went down very handily before the election and dumped $1 million in their laps and things simmered down and you got Bob Johnston re-elected again in 1971. Well, you didn't come with any money in Waterloo region and you didn't win any seats in Waterloo region—

Mr. Haggerty: You lost Niagara.

Mr. Good: —and you wouldn't have, anyway, as far as that goes.

The whole point is simply this. The rural people in Waterloo region are very upset. The regional chairman says there is no way the region will undertake a study on its own —with or without provincial funding—until after the five-year period, when transitional grants have all been levelled out and the adjustments have been made and they know where they are at. That isn't satisfactory to many of the people in the rural areas, because they have felt that their taxes have been going up. No one knows, but maybe the straight inflationary input would have caused the necessary rise in taxation in the rural areas. Maybe the merging of the municipalities with their different assessment structures is the thing. Maybe it's a combination of many of these things.

Maybe it's just the great, grandiose method with which regional governments were instituted by this government in past years that is causing the problem. But somewhere, somebody has got to get down to business to do the financial investigation and to do the study that was never done, and should have been done, before the implementation of the regional governments. It was always passed off and said, "Oh no, we'll let the good people in the area look after the finances." In other words, "We'll put it there and you people can worry about the financial implications."

Would the minister not agree that there must be some kind of study or some kind of review of the whole area of regional governments where there is dissatisfaction to a large degree? One theory is that the dissatisfaction will eventually drive the region into a one-tier system. Perhaps some of the larger communities want that, but certainly the small communities don't want a one-tier system. Maybe the division of powers between the upper and lower levels is causing some of the problems. I think these things should be looked at; I don't think we can wait 10 years to look at them, and I don't think we should be waiting for five years to look at them.

I wonder if the minister would re-evaluate the situation and come forth with a programme that would affirm that where there is an indication and a desire for a study, the ministry would provide funds for a study at a regional level. I don't think the area government municipalities can get to the bottom of their problems on their own. Could I have a response from the minister, please?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Subject to the mail problem these days, I don't believe I've had a request from either of the municipalities which the member mentioned.

Mr. Good: No, because an area government can't deal with the government. They've got to go through the region. The government set it up that way.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: No, they don't object to dealing directly. The former mayor of Cambridge particularly was never loath to come forward without going through the region, I recall rather vividly.

Mr. Good: Yes, but she got cut down by doing it.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: At any rate, if such a request came to me I would be glad to take a look at it.

Mr. Good: All right, you'll have one tomorrow.

Mr. Wildman: I would like to direct a question to the Treasurer in regard to the answer he gave to the previous speaker regarding the organization of unorganized terri-

tories in the north. Specifically, is there an ongoing study by the ministry of the options open to the unorganized townships of Sault North? If so, what provision is being made for local input into that study? Also, is one of the options under study incorporation into the city of Sault Ste. Marie of the townships of Sault North?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: I frankly don't know whether Sault North was one of the communities that were visited. We visited something like 25 communities, I believe, and had discussions with them. Whether that was one of them or not I simply don't know. I'll find that out for the member. But I have indicated to him that essentially it is a planning problem or a lack of planning problem, and the Minister of Housing (Mr. Rhodes) is taking that under his wing.

Mr. Shore: Mr. Chairman, could I perhaps direct a question to you and have the hon. minister reply, since it's more for information? Not to minimize the importance of the discussion, I'm just wondering if there is an opportunity to change these estimates or can we conclude basically that this is a question period?

What I'd really like to know substantially is this: There are a lot of very important items here dealing with and involved with the Province of Ontario financially; if, for example, we suggest that there should be changes in any of these areas, is the money spent or do we have the control to do any changing within these confines? Could I get an answer for my information?

Mr. Chairman: You don't have the right as an individual member to change the purpose for which this money is being voted. You don't have the right to increase it. You have the right to comment on it, to elicit information from the minister and perhaps to make some suggestions as to what he might do as an alternative. But I would like to remind members of the committee that we did spend some considerable time in the last session, and formed an all-party agreement that there would be 33½ hours in committee of supply to deal with the remaining estimates that are to be dealt with in this committee. This includes four votes in Treasury, Economics and Intergovernmental Affairs; Education; Health; Social Development Secretariat; Natural Resources; Resources Development; the Premier's Office; the Cabinet Office and the Lieutenant Governor. So you can readily understand that we don't have all that much time. The time is down now, according to our monitor, to 32 hours and 46 minutes.

Mr. Nixon: How time flies.

Mr. Chairman: You are going to have to restrain yourself, limiting the scope you engage in in the remaining time.

Hon. Mr. Henderson: You're in trouble, Marvin.

Mr. Shore: Mr. Chairman, I have no trouble restraining myself. I just want to clearly understand the purpose and the accomplishment that will develop out of spending the 33 hours. That is what I'm trying to find out.

Mr. Chairman: It is my understanding that you will try to elicit from the minister the purpose for which this money is being voted?

Mr. Good: Has been voted.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Has been voted?

Mr. Singer: Has been voted.

Mr. Nixon: You read a blanket resolution last spring.

Mr. Good: This has nothing to do with this session.

Mr. Chairman: I have on my list the hon. member for Beaches-Woodbine and then Wentworth North (Mr. Cunningham).

Mrs. Bryden: Mr. Chairman, speaking as a new member for the first time in this House, I would first like to congratulate the member for Lake Nipigon (Mr. Stokes) on his elevation to the high post of Deputy Speaker and chairman of committee of the whole. I watched him over the years in my other capacities in this legislative complex, and I think he will fill the position very ably.

I would like to say that it's a new experience to be able to put my ideas forth from the front bench instead of from the back rooms or through notes to members, as I did when I was research director. It's also a pleasure to face the provincial Treasurer across the House; I consider him a worthy opponent—

Mr. Lewis: Well—

Mrs. Bryden: —I hope that we will be able to engage in some really serious discussion of urban and regional planning in this debate.

I must say I'm nonplussed as to what our philosophy of planning is. We've had 10 economic regions, and then we had five economic regions, and we had regional ad-

visory councils, and now we have this policy planning committee that is supposed to be bringing in growth centres. But in all of it, we never seem to come up with a philosophy of planning, or with any definite idea of where we were going, and that seems to be characteristic of this government. So that in the debate we feel that we're punching at empty paper bags.

During the election, I found that there was a great deal of discussion of decentralization and its merits—because the pressures have been growing during all these years of lack of direction of policy—the pressures on our housing starts, the way housing prices have been going up; the pressures on our transportation services; the pressures on our recreation services; the pressures on our ecology. Without some sense of overall provincial planning in these fields we are not going to be able to meet those pressures, and it's going to mean a serious reduction in the quality of life for a great many people in this province.

We've also at last, become aware of a serious threat to our agricultural land—the 26 acres an hour that are going out of production; the number of farmers who are dropping out of farming.

Mr. Nixon: Can we have an argument about that figure for a while?

Mr. Lewis: We're concerned about that. We will pursue that, I promise you.

Mrs. Bryden: That I found even on the streets, the sidewalks, the asphalt of Beaches-Woodbine, the loss of our agricultural land was one of the most serious concerns of urban people, because they realize that—

Mr. Ruston: Give the farmers enough and they will produce.

[4:15]

Mrs. Bryden: —if we don't have agricultural land, we don't have food production and we don't have recreational land and we don't have green belts.

I think there are several reasons why it is very urgent that this decentralization policy that is being studied come forth with some definite direction. I sometimes wonder whether it was delayed during the election campaign because the government didn't have the courage to say, "These centres will be growth centres and the rest will not be growth centres."

I am not sure whether it is desirable to be a growth centre or whether people would rather it be a centre that is reserved for maintenance and preservation of its present size, but obviously we have to have some sort of planning and some sort of concentration in certain areas if we are going to deal with our population growth and with preservation of our agricultural land.

There are, I think, several new elements that make it more urgent to bring forth this plan. One is the Pickering Airport decision. I hope the minister is going to reassure us that regardless of what the federal government does on this matter—it seems to be waffllling back and forth as to whether it is going to proceed or not going to proceed with the Pickering Airport—he is firm in his decision not to provide any further services for the Pickering Airport.

It took the government more than two years to finally recognize that the Pickering Airport decision was a mistake and that the evidence that we needed a second airport in that area was by no means conclusive. In fact, the evidence seems to be more and more that we do not need such an airport.

During the campaign the government didn't go quite as far as to admit that it was a mistake. It tried to get the best of both worlds by suggesting it would stop services for the time being, hoping to get the votes of the people who were against and the people who were for, but suggesting that perhaps the services might go on after the election. Finally, a week after the election, the government apparently saw the light and decided that there was no case for the Pickering Airport and that the only way to stop it was to stop the services. So I hope the Treasurer will give us a pledge that that is a firm decision.

The second important element that has come up that I think requires reaction from the government is the COLUC report, the Central Ontario Lakeshore Urban Complex study of the planning for this central area. The COLUC report adopted the popoulation targets, the growth targets of the Toronto-centred region plan and yet it says that you cannot sustain a population of six to eight million people and a viable agriculture at the same time in this area.

I would like to know, in the light of that conclusion, is the government prepared to modify that population target of six to eight million for this central Ontario lakeshore area? It seems to me that we are going to lose too much valuable class 1 and class 2 agricultural land if we go ahead with that kind of a target. We are also going to lose a whole lot of other things in the way of recreation land and we are going

to need much greater transportation and hydro corridors.

The third element which requires further consideration of a definite plan is the whole energy situation. With the price of energy going up—and I hope we are going to be able to stop some of the increases but it has already gone up to a considerable extent—energy now becomes a crucial determinant in planning—not only the price but where the delivery systems are going to be located and where the production facilities are going to be located.

I don't think the ministry has been taking energy into its plans to a sufficient degree. It is a new element which has suddenly become much more important.

Finally, there are what you might call the new regional government techniques. Originally they were very much from the top down; we now have what is known as county restructuring which looks like it is from the bottom up. Is there sufficient flexibility for counties to develop their own style of regional government in this country restructing? It seems to me they are pretty well required to accept the provincial pattern of urban and rural combination units which may not be best in all cases. Perhaps in some cases you should split off the urban areas.

They also seem to be pretty well locked into two-tier systems. I think there should be more flexibility for county restructuring but again we haven't had very much reaction from the ministry on what our newest plan of regionalizing is.

I think we are in a policy planning vacuum. I think it is time we had a clear direction of policy, a clear statement from the government on what it thinks about the COLUC report, the targets therein and how we can save our agricultural land. That is the most crucial area.

I think also we need from the ministry a statement of how people are going to be involved in some of this planning. The people have to have something to look at in the way of a plan before they can discuss it and this is what we have been lacking. It means that the various ministries which are planning transportation and recreation and energy delivery have nothing to go by. I think that was what COLUC was set up for—for this particular area not for the whole province—to give those ministries some guidelines. But since it came out there has been no reaction from the government so we don't really know what guidelines those ministries are following and what they are following for the rest of the province either.

In effect we have an abdication of policy and I think we have to change that if we are going to preserve our agricultural land and have a proper land-use policy.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Just two or three comments. I suppose the first one I would like to make is that much as I regret the departure of the former member for Beaches-Woodbine, I would have to say that both my staff and I feel much happier now we can see the enemy rather than have her lurking in the back of Stephen's offices. She is here in front of us and we will conquer her in due course. We are glad to have you here because you have been a worthy opponent for a long time—I will put it that way—and it is good to be able to see you in front and centre.

Mr. Lewis: I understand.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Yes, but the quality of your speeches is going to suffer—

Mr. Lewis: Of course it is.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: —without that kind of research. We are all dreading horribly the errors you are going to fall into because she won't be checking over your thoughts.

Mr. Lewis: No, she is vetting everything I say.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: That's good. Two or three responses to my friend, not necessarily in the order raised.

I think your point about energy costs—transportation costs really—is well taken. In terms of our thinking, and I don't say this is necessarily true of the people who do the actual planning studies or planning work, I think over the years we have all been lulled into the belief that transportation is a relatively cheap commodity. Undoubtedly it is not going to be as cheap and it is not as cheap. We are going to have to take the problems of transportation and distance much more into account than perhaps we have in the past. That isn't going to make life any simpler certainly. It means that if it is difficult now to encourage the location of an industry outside the golden horseshoe it is just going to be that much more difficult to locate that industry outside the golden horseshoe, let alone in northern Ontario, because if transportation costs were a problem before, relatively speaking, they are probably going to be an even greater problem and difficulty in the future. But the point is well taken.

It must become a greater part of our thinking than perhaps it has been in the past.

As for Pickering airport, I think the member has the assurance of the government that we aren't about to change our mind in any way and service that site. The COLUC report, as you will recall, suggested certain kinds of growth and which levels were most appropriate. We haven't taken a position nor will we take a position until we have the views of the affected municipalities, both regional and local, and for that matter people as well.

Those responses are coming into the advisory committee on urban an regional development which is a group of deputy ministers. In due course they will have the benefit of the advice which they receive from the local municipalities and the regional municipalities and people. Then we will be formulating recommendations to the government and the government then will make up its mind at that point in time, but I think not before and until we have had the maximum public input and municipal input.

How are people involved in provincial planning? One of the dangers, of course, is that if provincial planning becomes too finite or too detailed then it is going to be more and more difficult to have people involved. Theoretically, I think the province in terms of its planning should be dealing with local government; local government in turn should be dealing with its own people in terms of the specifics of the plan.

Now life isn't that simple, obviously. If somebody wants to talk about development in North Pickering—that is not a very good example—if somebody wants to talk about development within Markham to the Minister of Housing or to the Minister of the Environment, we don't say he can only talk to the Markham council, who can only talk to York region, and only York region can talk to us.

I think if the system really is going to work that the people participation should be coming through local and regional government Sometimes that is difficult and sometimes our perceptions of what the local people want—and my friend from Welland perhaps hit on this—are not necessarily the perceptions held by their local governments. Presumably both of us can't be right, but the perceptions aren't always the same locally as they are from the provincial level. One argues about things like assessment. That is perhaps much more important to the local politician, and properly so, than it is to us at the provincial level.

I am very loath in any way to bypass that sort of system. I would not as easily as my friend from Welland dismiss—perhaps that is too strong a word—the input of the region into a regional plan or the decision-making power of the region re a regional plan. I don't think we have had enough experience yet to make that determination. Niagara or Ottawa-Carleton are the first regional plans to come in to us. They come in now to the Minister of Housing and not to me. I really shouldn't comment on whether they are good plans or so-so plans or overly parochial plans. [4:30]

I think we are going to have to let the system as it is constituted work a little bit longer before we make the decision that the province has to weigh in with a much heavier hand than it has in the past. I would be the first to say and admit that we will have to develop—and that is the purpose of the provincial planning concept—perhaps stronger guidelines and stronger planning principles for the province than we perhaps have in the past. We should lay those out so that regional, and to some extent local, planning takes place within those guidelines. But we are going to have to be very careful that we don't become too detailed in our thinking.

Just because somebody in this Legislature thinks—I don't say this critically—that Wallaceburg in my riding should grow and Chatham shouldn't, or Blenheim shouldn't or something, it's not nearly as important as what the Kent county council feels, provided that the guidelines are the same, or that the broad principles that are being followed or perhaps laid down by the province are the same. So let's not get too detailed in our thinking or our planning.

Finally, on techniques regarding restructured governments, the member said there seems to be some propensity towards two tiers. There really isn't. I'm not a professional, but at the professional level, at the staff level, we would be delighted to see some one-tier governments come forward. They haven't yet.

Interjection.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: There are two, Thunder Bay and Timmins, and my observation would be that they are both working very well. I would be delighted to see more, but we will have to see what percolates up through the restructuring studies. We certainly have no aversion to them.

Mr. Cunningham: As the new member for Wentworth North I am privileged to add my congratulations on your election. I should maybe at this time offer my congratulations

to the minister from Chatham-Kent on his re-election. I would be inclined to say that had he the misfortune of running in my particular area, I would not have the privilege of offering my congratulations to him. As the author of regional government, I think it is an appropriate time—

Interjections.

Mr. Cunningham: I think it is a highly appropriate time at this time to bring to mind—

Interjections.

Mr. Cunningham: —to the hon. minister what in my opinion, and in the opinions of my constituents, is a long overdue re-examination of regional government as it affects my constituents.

Perhaps if there is one thing of which the ministry and the government could not be accused it is of too detailed thinking, especially as it would relate to regional government in my area. It is my understanding that there is going to be a re-examination in three particular areas. It would be my hope, as the member for my particular area, that in the light of the extreme duplication of services in my area, the tremendous increase in cost as related to that duplication, the severe disaffection as it would relate to the individuals of that area, and of course a letter from the city of Hamilton to the government that I am sure they got before the postal strike, that such a re-examination would be appropriate in my area at this time. I would like to go on the record as saying that I am not in favour of a one-tier system as it would apply to my area and neither are the people of my area.

Interjections.

Mr. Cunningham: And I would think that had the Minister of Revenue (Mr. Meen), who was charged prior to being Minister of Revenue with the onerous, and I say onerous, task of presenting this rather ill-conceived form of government to my area, had this individual been inclined to report in great detail the feelings of my community, we should not have seen regional government as it exists today.

The point I would like to make before I conclude is that certainly inflation is with us here in Ontario. The one thing I would hate to see continue to be perpetrated on the people of my area is the excess cost of municipal government. As the province reduces its impost on a 20 per cent per year basis to this area, this hardship is going to be felt in even more detail than they feel it now. I would urge the minister to certainly add my area to one of those many areas fed up with regional government; one which would like to see a complete re-evaluation of it as it exists today. Thank you very much.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: I met with the Hamilton-Wentworth council. I also met with the Waterloo regional council. The Waterloo regional council, to my recollection, didn't ask for a review. The city of Hamilton has asked for a review since the day before the bill came into being. We are not contemplating a review in Hamilton-Wentworth which I guess has had two full years and a bit under its belt.

The member talks about the problems of duplication. I would be glad to hear his suggestions as to how you could eliminate the duplication. I am sure the regional council would as well. The one obvious way to eliminate duplication, of course, is a one-tier government. It's very obvious. That's what the city of Hamilton wants. That's what I think Kitchener, for example, would like to see. But with the greatest respect, from what I know of your area, I don't think that that's a very viable alternative at this moment in time. If he really wants to get rid of duplication, that's the way to do it.

Mr. Cunningham: Supplementary to that, if I may, I would say at this time that the minister and the government seem to be harbouring the illusion that this particular area is solely the city of Hamilton. There are a number of areas—and I am sure the House leader of the New Democratic Party would care to state this too—there are a number of areas that are very severely disaffected that fall outside the area of Hamilton. Specifically in my area there are Dundas, Ancaster, Strabane, Westover, Carluke, Lynden—places that I am sure many of these people have never been to.

I don't have all the answers. In fact, I have very few answers as they relate to this very ill-conceived structure of local government. I think the time has come, it is long overdue, for re-evaluation to determine now how it's going to work; and if it's not going to work, that it be scrapped.

Mr. Makarchuk: I think one of the reasons the minister has so many problems is that there are people who actually are in favour of one-tier government. I can assure him that the council of Brantford is actually in favour and would like to see a one-tier government imposed in that area.

Mr. Nixon: Cities always favour it. They want to take it over. The Treasurer favours it because it would be easier to run from Queen's Park.

Mr. Makarchuk: Naturally there are other people in the county who are objecting to the idea of one-tier government. I agree with the minister's statements that if he interposed—

Mr. Nixon: Darn right.

Mr. Makarchuk: It is difficult enough now at the municipal council level for John Q. Citizen to try to get his problem resolved. He has to go to council and then the council will have to go to the provincial government. If another tier is stuck in there, all that happens is the individual gets himself bounced back and forth. The first tier says: "It's not our problem, it's the second tier's problem." The second tier says: "It is not ours. We have got to check with the first tier." Then, of course, he comes back rather confused and certainly annoyed.

I think one of the problems, particularly in Brant—and the realization that has to filter down to some people in Ontario—is the fact that more and more people are living in urban areas and they are paying the taxes. The population is there and in a democratic sense it would be their proper right to have the chance to call the shots or to have some say in the functioning of the government.

The urban-rural split is developing. I think it's prevalent in numerous areas of Ontario; it is certainly prevalent in our area. I am bringing to the minister's attention the fact —and I think he is aware of it—that there is work going on at the local level to try to come up with some kind of a compromise, some type of restructuring that would perhaps provide solutions to some of the problems that are faced by the city of Brantford. But I would like to caution the minister at this time about the problem that may develop. I am not too sure that we are going to reach that compromise.

I think the problem in Brantford right now, of course, is that the city is surrounded on all sides by a township. It needs land to grow; it needs land to plan, to develop and so on. However, there is no way they can do it; they do not own and possess the land. There are certainly areas of the township that could be incorporated in some type of restructuring. However, if they are not incorporated in the restructuring, if there is no restructured government, if no compromise can be developed between the officials, I think the minister should realize that the city of Brantford cannot afford to wait until somebody, somewhere at some time eventually agrees to agree with everybody else. I don't think that will happen.

The minister also should be prepared to allow the city of Brantford to annex areas of the township in order to provide that kind of community growth that the city requires. I would like at this time to hear what the minister's views are on that particular matter. I should point out to him that Brantford city council at one time received verbal assurance that they would be permitted to annex portions of the townships. As a result of those assurances, council went ahead and started building a sewer to service a major area of 1,000 acres. I'm sure you know the 1,000 acres I'm talking about—800 is owned by the Ontario Housing Corp. and 200 is owned by the city. It's not even grade one or two agricultural land. It's ideal land for development for housing, industrial use and so on—and it sits there stuck in a jurisdictional dispute.

We have part of the sewer in the ground and it just lies there and doesn't collect any revenue because we were told later on: "We are not going to permit any annexation in your area." And the reason for that is because of the influence of some of the Tory reeves in the area who kept running down here all the time. I have a feeling that the minister agreed to everything that one reeve wanted just to get him out of his office. I would like some of the minister's views on the prospects of the city of Brantford having to go into annexation in terms of trying to resolve its own problems.

Mr. Nixon: Mr. Chairman, I would just like to comment on that before the minister replies, since he doesn't know quite what to say. It was interesting when the former Minister of Housing—I don't know what he is now, but the member for Carleton-Grenville (Mr. Irvine) is the one to whom I am referring.

Mr. Roy: Provincial Secretary for Resources Development.

Mr. Nixon: Ah yes, Provincial Secretary for Resources Development. He was in Brantford and Brant county talking about the possibilities of a restructuring there when we were talking about the very matter of the utilization of that 1,000 acres owned by Ontario Housing. He said: "Well, of course, if you go

for regional government we would have a ready answer."

I suppose there is a legitimate aspect to that response, and yet in my opinion it almost falls into the category of blackmail—certainly it puts unsupportable pressures on local councils and developers and people who are looking for housing, as well as the farmers.

The minister, the Treasurer and others, have always said the restructuring of counties is going to come at the behest of those people at the local level. And yet there are always those feelings that if you go for some sort of regionalization or restructuring—to use the words that the minister likes to use—that you will get more grants, that you will readily get approvals for the developments that you are seeking; rather than any attempt to make the system, as it is presently constituted, function with any effectiveness.

After all, it is now almost eight years since the government of Ontario went into the area and purchased 1,000 acres needed for housing development in the area. I don't see why they couldn't be developed as a part of Brantford township. The sewer development is right there. Why couldn't the development go on into the township and a suitable agreement be worked out so that those houses could be built in that area without an unnecessary and an unnatural pressure to go to restructuring or annexation?

I'm concerned about this and I would like to know the minister's views. So that I won't get up too often, I would like to put another question, which has already been referred to by the member for Brantford. It has to do with the general provincial land use plan, and the member for Welland referred to it as well.

It was just a year ago now that the Treasurer's predecessor, Mr. White, announced there would be a land use plan for the whole of the province made public before the end of that year, 1974. It was postponed and carried over into 1975, and now I sense we are even further from it than we were then.

The idea that Mr. White put forward was that, unfortunately, the plan would not be complete in every detail—and no plan ever is nor ever will be—but that he believed enough in the concept to put together the ideas that were presently in the collective planning brain of the government and others participating. He was going to put it before the Legislature at least for debate and as being acceptable as a basis of government policy.

I have the feeling that the present Treasurer, having gone through the Design for Development phases in his earlier career with John Robarts, and having gone through those 10 regional development councils referred to by the member for Beaches-Woodbine (Mrs. Bryden) and having gone through the Toronto-centred region plan, and having had his own probably idealistic concepts of planning dashed somewhat when he found that they were not workable, or as effectively workable as he had hoped, that he is sort of jaded in his job as chief planner for the province; that he doesn't believe that any of these things can work anymore. He is very hesitant to bring forward something that might be called a land use plan, even in general terms, for the whole of the Province of Ontario; or at least for the southern peninsula while we are waiting for some further initiatives in the north.

[4:45]

If in fact he doesn't believe in it perhaps he should tell us this so that our argument will take a different basis, because he knows, on the basis of statements made by his predecessors, which have to be accepted in this House, that we have a plan that is in formulation. It was promised to us a year ago now and as a matter of fact before that. I don't believe we are going to get it as long as Darcy McKeough is Treasurer. I don't believe we are going to get it as long as we have a Conservative government.

Mr. Makarchuk: Before the minister replies, on the same point, I think the member for Brant-Oxford-Norfolk—and I am not sure of the sequence.

Mr. Nixon: All of Brant except Brantford.

Mr. Makarchuk: All of Brant except Brantford and areas adjacent thereto. Anyway, it seems to me that part of the problem with the member for those areas when he is advocating that Brantford township should develop 1,000 acres is that he has been away for too long from the area.

One of the concerns the city of Brantford has about Brantford township developing the area is the fact that the city of Brantford has to provide services. They provide the sewage, they provide the hospitals, they provide the libraries, the recreational facilities, the transportation facilities; and the people of Brantford pay for those services.

Mr. Nixon: That is wrong. Who paid for your centennial arena? The people of Brantford only? What are you talking about? Who paid for the sewage disposal? Only the people of Brantford? That is wrong.

Mr. Makarchuk: As a matter of fact, I would suggest that the member—

Mr. Nixon: Most of the money came from the provincial level.

Mr. Makarchuk: I suggest the member read the Brantford urban growth study, it is available and it gives a breakdown in detail the per capita amount of money that the people in Brantford contribute to the various services in relation to the per capita amount that is contributed from Brantford township.

Mr. Ruston: Put a wall around that.

Mr. Makarchuk: What he is advocating, it appears, is a form of what one would call municipal welfare-bumism. This is what it really is, where you have one municipality sitting on the fringes of another municipality, enjoying the services provided by the municipality in the core and at the same time not carrying its share of the load, and I think this is a matter that has to be considered.

Mr. Lewis: Finally we are getting a balance here—

Mr. Chairman: The member for Hamilton West.

Mr. S. Smith: Perhaps the minister might be given the opportunity to answer the question first of all.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Mr. Chairman, I hesitate to get involved in this very interesting discussion between the urbanite and the farmer, having some sympathy for both points of view, and frankly not being as familiar with the 1,000 acres which the two members seem to be familiar with; it is not something that I am involved in.

Mr. Nixon: I don't consider that an insult; maybe he does.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: I would wonder why Brant and Brantford township couldn't get together and agree on something. Obviously they can't; obviously that's what leads into restructuring, obviously; or the alternative, into annexation.

We are not happy with lengthy, nasty, bitter, expensive annexation disputes. However, I suppose that if—

Mr. Nixon: How about those nice easy area regionalizations? Do you like those?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: —after eight years agreement isn't reached, then perhaps we do have to think about allowing annexations to proceed. I simply don't know. I don't really think I am jaded.

Mr. Nixon: Why don't you go for a plan then?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: I add that to the member for BON. Is that right, BON? Is that where you are a member?

Mr. Nixon: I like that. That is good, Brant-Oxford-Norfolk.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: I really don't feel I'm jaded. Gun shy perhaps, but not jaded.

Mr. Roy: You are too modest.

Mr. Nixon: Too nice a guy.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Hamilton West.

Mr. S. Smith: Thank you for recognizing me at this time. I wanted to enter this discussion on regional government in Hamilton-Wentworth because I was very disappointed in the answer the hon. minister gave to this committee. It seems only symptomatic of his general attitude toward regional government that somehow it is something which is imposed when needed. It is one tier or two tier; either way somebody is going to complain; so what the heck, we might as well put it in.

The fact that the city of Hamilton objected to it very early on is viewed almost with glee by the minister. As he said: "Well, they opposed it from before day one. What do you expect from them; it is only Hamilton, after all." This, I propose to show, is only symtomatic of the way Hamilton has been treated by a succession of Tory governments. Hamilton had some good reasons for oppsing regional government when it was imposed upon them because of the way it was imposed upon them. The minister is very well aware of the integration, in terms of working, between the residents of Burlington and the citizens of Hamilton; he is well aware that there was deep feeling expressed by a colleague in his cabinet at the time that regional government was introduced. A more prudent person, a more prudent government, might have imposed instead the suggestion for regional planning rather than the necessity for a whole structure of government. Now he sits back and he says: "Well, you know, those guys were opposed to it right from the beginning."

Let me tell you what has happened in the area of Hamilton-Wentworth. We now have, with the taxpayers money, two departments of planning, two legal departments, two de-

partments of personnel. We have two departments of accounting. We have people coming for jobs who work in the city or in the region who have to apply in both places.

We have the spectacle of a sidewalk falling into a street in the middle of Hamilton and nothing being done about it because the sidewalk had been declared municipal and the street had been declared regional. We have lawyers who find it necessary to enter two actions on behalf of any client who happens to trip in the city of Hamilton because there is the possibility that it may be the region which is responsible as opposed to the municipality.

The fact is it is not simply a matter of the hon. Treasurer sitting there with a grin on his face and saying: "Well, it has to be one-tier or two-tier, and you know if you guys like one tier, the guys outside are going to want two-tier." That kind of simplistic thinking should have gone out of this government long ago and it should have been beaten out of this government by the last election results.

I actually thank the out-going cabinet of the previous government for having assured my election and it is very kind of them. That was a big issue in Hamilton West and I appreciate it very much. But right now, the time has come to deal with this intelligently. We must deal with this as follows and I have made this proposal and I make this proposal again to the hon. minister, and I hope he sees fit to accept it.

Knowing that hardened positions have been taken by the government of the city of Hamilton and by the government of the region of Hamilton-Wentworth, the sensible thing to do at this time is to appoint an arbitrator, an intelligent arbitrator, to sit down with a few represenatives of the city government and the regional government to eliminate all forms of duplication. This can be done; various forms of duplication can be looked at each in its own right. These duplications can be eliminated, possibly continuing a two-tier structure of some kind as long as there is recognition given to the individual identities of the surrounding municipalities. With an arbitrator and a time limit this could be done. I propose to the Treasurer that rather than sit back and simply say: "We have no plans for re-examining Hamilton-Wentworth at this time, let them eat cake." Rather than saying that, I propose that the Treasurer appoint an arbitrator to sit down with the representatives of both sides, who have taken admittedly hardened positions and perhaps immature positions, to eliminate all forms of duplication within one year. Failing that, the entire matter should be put to a plebiscite.

That is a sensible suggestion; it was accepted by the residents of Hamilton West, and I hope that the Treasurer will see fit to consider that suggestion and not dismiss it out of hand. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Nixon: There is some common sense. Let's see you accept it.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: I really don't think that we are going to solve problems between parts of a region or between a municipality or between two municipalities by appointing an arbitrator. I think the hon. member should really think that one through.

Mr. Breaugh: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I would like to discuss in the course of these estimates some things that have already happened and perhaps take a slightly different tack than some of the other members have taken.

As one who has just come from eight years of work in regional government and having been faced with some of the myriad of planning devices that go on in the Province of Ontario, I would like to put some questions to the minister in terms of this amount of money being spent and propose that while it's generally conceded there isn't any overall land-use planning that anybody will acknowledge in the Province of Ontario, there is a considerable amount of land-use planning. In fact, there is a considerable amount of planning going on in the Province of Ontario that is being accepted by the government on a certain level, not necessarily publicly, but if you take a look at the money that is being spent here, there is certainly a lot of planning going on or something going on.

If you are out working in a regional government trying to make the thing work, you will certainly find some experiences there that say there is all kinds of planning going on. The problem is to identify who is doing it and what status does it have. Whatever did happen to the Toronto-centered region plan in all its phases? Whatever did happen to the COLUC report, where did it come from; who did it and what's the government's position and where is it now?

It has been my experience, and I think that of a great many municipal people who work in the planning area, that what you have is a provincial government that likes to kite things. It likes to spend $1 million. It likes to do a lot of planning. It likes to put out great volumes at $4 or $5 a whack, and that's at the selling end—sailing end is probably the best term—because then no one can

accuse the government of not doing good things, of not doing the planning. Certainly they are. You can find volumes all over the Province of Ontario of plans that have been done on transportation, on land use, on facilities. They are all over the place. No one wants to acknowledge them.

Perhaps the Treasurer might remember in February this year that when the Premier brought the cabinet to the Oshawa area he met a few delegations that day, not the least of which was one from the municipalities. One of the things that we presented to the ministers on that given day was that we had identified at that particular time some 28 planning projects that were going on in that area. We asked them to respond, to identify which ones actually were happening and what was going on with them. We really did not get very much.

The one thing that was assured is that of those 28 projects, and there are more now, the bulk of them were being financed by this government. Very often they were in conflict and very often they put us in a position where we had to spend even more public funds to try to counteract them. It seems to me to be a ridiculous situation.

Let me quote you one classic. In the years prior to 1971, there was an Oshawa area planning and development study done in that region. The cost of that was roughly $1 million. It recommended a specific area for regional government, a study area. It is true that at the end of that there was considerable disagreement. What there wasn't was any arbitrator in sight and nobody to touch it. In fact, the recommendations of that particular study and the consensus that was there was nowhere near anything that looked at all like the region of Durham. Where that monstrosity came from, no one knows. At no time could we ever identify any planning staff from any department which recommended anything in that shape or size.

That happened because of an uproar in Cobourg and supposedly because it was not politically acceptable. We don't know whether it was politically acceptable or not to the people of that area because they never got a chance to say that. There was a bit of sham, a little bit of a parade of Mr. Irvine at that time going around to those municipalities, but certainly that's not consultation; certainly that's not involving those municipalities; certainly that's not involving the people of those areas. In fact, some of those sessions were held in private with the public excluded.

What it boils down to is essentially some very basic questions. Who is doing the planning in this province? In a public sense, in what the government is prepared to admit, nobody. There aren't any. In a private sense and on a ministerial basis, there is all kinds of planning going on. Ontario Hydro has now got a rather classic programme to warm up Lake Ontario so that you can swim in there. That's a form of planning. On top of that, having said they are going to do that, they are now prepared to offer the town and the townships in that area some money to pay for the cost of planning that thing that they are already going to do.

The North Pickering project is there in the region of Durham. What's its status? Where is it going? Is it gone because the airport has gone? Are you going to listen to representatives of those municipalities who say that it ought to go? Where is that consultation going to come in?

[5:00]

Could we get the government at some point in time to admit to what plans it is using? Could we get the government at some time to take some of the conflict out from one ministry to another?

In the city of Oshawa we are looking at seven different versions of where a parkway belt ought to be somewhere through the city—from seven different ministers. Could we get somebody to admit publicly to one of them as being not a bad idea? Could we find out in a public way from those ministers involved exactly what those plans are, instead of having to scout around and try to find some wayward planner and pin him down?

Could we get some admissions about what is actually going on: Could we, in effect, take some of the confrontation out of the planning process? Could we get the government to show that initiative, to admit what it is doing, to stop financing each separate ministry to fight one another and, in total, to fight the municipalities? Could we cease that kind of warfare you have going on between urban and rural areas, between local municipalities and regions, and between all of those people and the Province of Ontario? Could we, for example, decide that somebody is going to plan—pick anybody for that matter—let them do the plan and let them take some initiative?

Let me put to you what may happen in my area. I think you are going to be faced in short order with an official plan put together by the region of Durham. It is going to have some very interesting things because one of the options you are going to be faced

with is no North Pickering project. It would be my guess that that is going to be the consensus from the municipalities. It certainly is the consensus of the people in that area. When you see that one what is going to happen to that particular project?

After all that money being spent; after all those little study teams out in North Pickering; after all the little delegations to the region of Durham and everybody else in that area for that matter, what is going to happen to it? Having spent a couple of million dollars in planning are you going to blow it out the window? There is that interesting proposition, because you may recall—some of you were there when members of that regional council came down to meet with the Premier—we got a slight concession out of him, a back-room concession I admit, when he said that particular project, as an example, will go as any other form of development will go, through a development corporation; and he put that nice tag on the end "as long as you do the right thing."

Now we are having the public hearings. Now that part of a planning process is occurring. It is obviously in conflict with a great many things you have here in these estimates. Those people are going to take that initiative; they are going to present to you a plan for that area because, frankly, you have abdicated your responsibility, if you like, in this one subtle way: You are not prepared to say publicly what you are prepared to do in a million and one other ways.

It will be interesting to see the reaction of this government when that plan rolls in. After that public hearing process, after that consultation with their own local municipalities, it will be interesting to see whether they are prepared to accept that. If that is the case, let's make that the rule for the game.

Let's say that all these planning estimates get taken out of the provincial estimates. Let's give the money to those areas. Let's say to those people: "All right, you plan the province," because it seems eminently clear to all of us that somebody has to and it isn't happening, at least not in a way that anybody on the government side is prepared to admit.

Mr. Riddell: Mr. Chairman, after listening to the debate all afternoon I have come to the conclusion that the most harmonious living available to the people of Ontario is in southwestern Ontario where we don't have regional government and where the people have some say about the imposition of regional government through the political arena.

Mr. Lewis: Too many Liberals, though.

Mr. Nixon: That's why we haven't got regional government.

Mr. Bullbrook: What do you want us to do; hold hands?

Mr. Riddell: I would like to indicate that Huron county, on its own, underwent a restructuring study and at the end of that study it voted against a restructured system. Unfortunately the hands of the area municipalities and county councils are being forced because of the particular grant structure of this goverment.

Let me give you one example. Because the health unit of Huron county did not amalgamate with another area, they receive a 50 per cent grant, compared to other areas where the health units did amalgamate and in turn received a 75 per cent grant.

Mr. Nixon: That's regional government planning for you.

Mr. Riddell: If this isn't forcing the hands of the municipalities in an underhanded way, I would like to know what it is. I think this has to stop and I intend to pursue this matter of the particular grant structure to those areas which feel they have got a good system working now and do not want to become involved in regional government or even a restructured system.

Another point I would like to bring up is preservation of agricultural land, which does not seem to be a priority item of this government, and never has been. I suppose the reason is that most of the members on the government side are urban-oriented and there are not too many of them who have made their livelihoods at farming or really know why we should endeavour to preserve agricultural land.

There is rumour again in the county of Huron that Ontario Hydro is going to establish a generating station somewhere in the Bayfield-Goderich area. I think we all know that Ontario Hydro is probably one of the biggest culprits in the wasteful use of prime agricultural land and in the disruption of agricultural production. They establish their power corridors wherever they feel it is going to cost the least amount of money and be the easiest method of establishing their towers and the easiest access for the power corridor.

I would like the minister to indicate whether this government is going to permit

Ontario Hydro to continue to surge ahead with its plans for a grid system, or whether this government is going to direct the efforts of Ontario Hydro to establish future generating plants in northern Ontario, where we should be encouraging industry and where there isn't the prime agricultural land available that we do have, particularly in Huron and Middlesex counties which I represent and which could be considered the richest agricultural area in Ontario. Could he look into whether Ontario Hydro is still considering establishing a generating plant in Huron county, which, as I indicate, would spell doom to the white bean crop and other agricultural crops in the area and which invites other industry to come in? It is not so much the pollution on the part of the generating plant itself but the very fact that other industries come in, and people come in, and the first thing you know we have lost our good agricultural land and our good agricultural production.

I would just like assurance from this minister that he is going to be keeping a watchful eye over the Minister of Energy and Ontario Hydro to see that no further development takes place on Hydro's part either by generating plants or power corridors on prime agricultural land, and in areas where other industries are going to have an effect on the production of agricultural products.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: I think this is something which you might want to discuss during the estimates of the Minister of Energy (Mr. Timbrell) or perhaps of the Provincial Secretary for Resources Development (Mr. Irvine), the matter of whether there will be a Hydro plant at Bayfield or wherever. As far as I know I think that is still one of some 20 proposed sites, including one or two in my own county, all of which are being put forth to the Porter royal commission. The Porter royal commission began yesterday or today with preliminary public hearings. I think those hearings will go on for a year or two years. There will be an exhaustive study of the power needs of the province and locations. Until such time as those hearings are completed, I don't think anyone can say in any certainty that there shall or shall not be a power plant in one location or another. That is what the Porter royal commission is all about. But I think that's something that you might well want to explore with the provincial secretary who is still carrying that responsibility.

Mr. Deans: My day wouldn't be complete unless I raised the matter of regional government with you. I listened to my friend from Hamilton West. I am not at all sure that an arbitrator is the answer. In fact I suspect it probably is not the answer.

It would be better if we could find some common ground between the city of Hamilton and the surrounding municipalities, without imposing upon them anything more than has already been imposed by the government. I think it would make more sense, rather than to appoint someone to go in and to tell them what ought to go where, if we were to try to encourage them to find the way to resolve the petty differences that appear to exist between them.

But far greater than that is the problem that the people of the surrounding area—and I think it's fair to say the people of the city themselves—feel about the mounting costs of regionalization. I think that a great number of people in the total area are frightened half to death about the prospects of the increasing cost on residential taxes.

I don't think there are many people, including many of the regional councillors, who fully understand what the total cost of regionalization is now and what the total cost of regionalization is going to be at the end of the transitional grant period. It worries me when I look at people whose taxes continue to rise and who get no more, and in many instances less, in the way of services than they were getting prior to the implementation of regional government.

I can remember telling this Treasurer, I think—certainly his predecessor—that I was worried that we were going to see a transferral of cost to people who not in their lifetime were ever going to derive one single bit of benefit; and I think that is happening. I think when you take a look around the far reaches of the region you can see, as I can see—even a blind man could see—that the majority of the people who live in those areas pay more and get less. That is just not an acceptable way to govern. That is not an acceptable way to establish any form of government—provincial, federal or municipal.

The people of the area of Glanbrook, whom I represent, they don't think very much of regional government. They think a lot about it and not much of it, because since the implementation they have had nothing in the way of service, but by God they certainly have looming over them the prospect of a major garbage dump stuck in the far corner of their municipality to service the needs of the region. If that's the kind of planning that is going to be done by regional

government in the Hamilton area then no; thank you very much, we don't need it.

Or I see the people in that same municipality who are faced with the very grave prospect of a greatly enlarged airport facility being developed in their municipality. They say to me: "Would you tell the government we don't really want that. That is not what we had hoped to see accomplished with the implementation of regional government."

So I'm telling you that it doesn't make sense. You can't take everything that is undesirable to the large municipality of the city of Hamilton, and simply by regionalizing move all of those things out into the county. You can't do that. I am frankly worried that is what is going to happen. I am frankly worried about that.

[5:15 p.m.]

Now I think there is a responsibility on the provincial government, and the Treasury and Economics ministry in particular, to sit down and to level with the citizens of the Hamilton-Wentworth region. I think you have to begin by explaining very carefully through the members here perhaps or through some form of campaign, exactly what it is going to cost them to have what they are currently getting by way of services, if and when the grants that are available through the provincial government are no longer available.

Beyond that I think you are going to have to take a look at what appears to be a fact — I can't really claim it is a fact because I can't get at the actual statistics — that the same level or a lower level of service for the majority of the people outside of the municipality is costing them more money, If this continues, as sure as I stand here there will be people who won't be able to afford to continue to own the houses they currently live in, because a great many people who live outside of the municipality are not young in new accommodations but are rather older and have been there for many years and find the tax burden extremely high.

I wrote to the Treasurer and I have written to other people and I raised it in the last Legislature. I frankly think that some form of cost benefit study is required. It is not a political study, and it is not for the purposes of deciding whether it should be one-tier or two-tier, but rather for the purposes of deciding what it is actually costing and what, if any, the benefits are that are being derived by the citizens.

I would like to ask also, from the political point of view, that the minister not turn his back on the city of Hamilton's request for a review, but rather encourage them to involve the other municipalities in any review that is undertaken so that we can begin a long tough road of bringing about some reconciliation.

It may be impossible. It may be that the mayor of the city of Hamilton is so dogmatic that it would be virtually impossible to bring about this reconciliation, it may be that the mayors of other municipalities may feel like wise; but I do think there are a sufficient number of interested and concerned people in those municipalities, including Hamilton, who would be prepared to take part in such a study, were the Ministry prepared to initiate it, or at least prepared to nod in assent that it makes some sense.

You don't have to do it out of Queen's Park. If you don't want to get involved in a study there for reasons that I don't understand, then that is your prerogative. But for heaven's sake, at least recognize the concerns being expressed by the citizens. If you don't believe the politicians, listen to the people on the streets. At least believe that the citizens of the area are expressing concerns that are real to them. If the premises upon which their concerns are based are wrong, then it makes some sense for you to tell them where they are wrong and not leave it up to the local municipal councils, which frankly are neither sufficiently well versed nor have enough knowledge of the way in which the region is developing at this point in time.

We can't afford to experiment with the money of the local taxpayer. The local tax base is sufficiently strained as it is. We can't afford to have the municipalities experimenting now in new and different forms of regionalism. Surely to heaven we can understand that we can't ask the municipal taxpayer to continue to carry burdens which he may not necessarily have to carry.

I am asking you to go to the city of Hamilton — not physically but by telephone, if you will, since you don't have any mail service — and suggest to them that you do understand that their concerns may well be legitimate. If you are going to have a study, then include the others in it too. Let's make it a study that will bring about a result that may bring about a better municipal government for the area. Don't shun them; don't laugh at them; don't pass them off on the way by.

I think if you did that, you would find there are areas where there is duplication, and there are areas where the costs are ex-

tremely high and the benefits minimal. Maybe you could make recommendations to them for their consideration on how these things could be changed, given they should have the ultimate choice of what form of government they have in their own local area. I think you can do that and I think you can do it without destroying whatever is good about it, while at the same time shoring up the things that may benefit them over the years.

I want to say something else about it briefly —I have to go to a meeting. I don't think anyone denies there's a need for overall planning. I don't think anyone denies that as it's established, give or take a mile or two at one of the corners, it would make sense to plan for that region as it would make sense to plan for any other regional municipality in terms of growth and development patterns. I think we all appreciate that.

I think some of us have looked at some of the small municipalities and the people who live in them, frankly, are expressing concerns that they're not getting anything out of it. They're not likely to get anything out of it and they doubt very much if their children or, for that matter, their children's children will get anything out of it but they're going to have to pay substantially just to maintain it. I think it's a criticism that may well be valid and it deserves a look at by this government to determine its validity and to make some recommendations on how it might change.

Mr. Bullbrook: Mr. Chairman, may I rise on a point of order so that you can help me? I appreciate the opportunity of listening to the hon. members and their contribution under urban and regional affairs programmes.

I want to ask you this. I think one of the most important statements made in the province in probably a decade was made by the Treasurer of Ontario on Oct. 22 when he said, "The province is prepared to opt into the total federal programme [that is, the federal attack on inflation] for a period of two years after which time we shall reassume responsibility for those sectors which come under provincial jurisdiction."

Yesterday we exercised our right to govern ourselves and became involved in a legislative set of gymnastics which in effect said the 30th Parliament couldn't start anew. I would like to know through you, perhaps with the help of the Treasurer, is there anywhere under these estimates where we can debate the position of the provincial Treasury and the provincial government in connection with the inflationary attack the federal government is attempting to undertake? Or have we passed it by in the first five votes and now don't have an opportunity of dealing with something of significance and moment which happened between the two Parliaments?

Mr. Chairman: In this particular vote, 1006, there isn't; perhaps the provincial Treasurer might like to comment on that.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: No, I really think it would be in one of the earlier votes, Mr. Chairman, but I have no doubt opportunities will present themselves to the Legislature to discuss these matters. I am thinking particularly of the Throne Speech debate for example.

Mr. Bullbrook: I guess I would like to record it for myself. It seemed rather facetious for the member for Wilson Heights to get involved in this yesterday. I must say, frankly, I wondered whether it was the appropriate time but I'd like my colleagues to recognize what the intention of those comments was now when you see the response from the Treasurer. Nowhere in his estimates now can we deal with probably the single most important thing that the government of Ontario is doing today. That is opting out of the federal programme for its own benefit. I appreciate your giving me this time but that's what I was waiting for, to find out whether we could discuss this matter.

Mr. Chairman: The Chair has noted your point of order.

Mr. Haggerty: I want to follow on the same train of thought the previous member spoke on and that is the matter of dealing with the costs involved in vote 1006. I noticed the government has stated it's going to have a programme of restraint. I notice in the estimates it goes from $30 million to $77 million, well over a 100 per cent increase.

I could perhaps deal with some of the matters concerning acquisition and construction of physical assets. May I have a breakdown of that $13 million and some costs involved in this? What does it involve? What are the acquisitions? What are you buying? What is the construction? What are you building? What are you going to accumulate in physical assets?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Have you got another question while we look this up? Those would be DREE grants. That's the DREE programme, I think, isn't it?

Mr. Haggerty: May I have a breakdown please?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Have you got another question while we look this up, please?

Mr. Haggerty: I suppose I can continue on the theme of regional government. I'm delighted to see the change in the NDP on its philosophy of regional government.

Mr. Martel: Not for real.

Mr. Riddell: The party of change

Mr. Haggerty: I was interested in the comments about conserving farmland—the 26 acres an hour that are going out—and the member for Brantford (Mr. Makarchuk) who rose in the House this afternoon and suggested that the city of Brantford go out and add some 1,000 acres of township land which, I presume, would be farmland. It's rather confusing to see what type of a programme they do have. One says we want to preserve it—

Mr. Martel: Are you that far away that you can't hear right?

Mr. Haggerty: In my county council days, back in 1964 in Welland county, we had a similar problem of annexation throughout the county. It involved almost every municipality that wanted to go out and annex certain parts of rural lands. It came about through regional government. We incorporated larger municipalities. We made cities out of townships and I believe out of 13 municipalities that are there now, there are two townships.

Mr. Swart: I believe 12.

Mr. Haggerty: Is it 12? Thanks for the correction. But two townships now exist in the regional government.

The minute you get into removing the rural atmosphere—and this is what has happened in the Niagara region—the towns and cities now take the view and say: "There is no need for rural land in the area."

We talk about official plans. I can think of the one in the Niagara region where I questioned some of their philosophy in planning. I can think of one municipality right now where they have gone out and taken over the rural municipality, the former township of Humberstone. They automatically came in with their official plan and said: "You can no longer keep animals in the rural area of the township." They're even restricting animals on farmlands. When you look back and think about the newspaper articles where you read of the land division committees in the regional municipality of Niagara, I would have to question the appointment of such officials. I think they should be elected and be responsible to the people in the region.

It was brought to my attention where they have allowed severances in perhaps 136 acres of farmland. They have allowed two and three severances. If you're going to conserve farmland, you don't allow severances of 100 acres of farmland. I don't think that should be permitted. When it comes to 10 acres or 20 acres of farmland, that may be a different story.

I understand that the ministry has already made an announcement that there are further considerations of allowing the development of a 10-acre site in a municipality. I hope this comes about, because the delay in planning which happened in the Niagara region has held up home construction in certain municipalities. It put a squeeze on land and it adds further to the cost of land purchased for the home buyer today.

The minister asked me if I had another question. I do have another question and that deals with the select committee report dealing with the Ontario Municipal Board, of which I was a member. I believe we brought the report back in 1972 or 1973. I know it was brought in within about a three- or four-month period. To this day I can't recall if the minister, through his ministry, has accepted any of the recommendations of that report. There were some good suggestions there, particularly as it relates to planning. One of the suggestions of that report was that there was a need for a new planning study in the Province of Ontario.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: I would just interrupt and point out that the Ontario Municipal Board—and, therefore, that report—the Ministry of the Attorney General. The planning sections of that report, which I think you are going to refer to, are really the purview of the Ministry of Housing rather than myself.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Cochrane South (Mr. Ferrier).

[5:30]

Mr. Haggerty: I have some questions I would like the minister to answer.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Do you want me to go back to the DREE?

Mr. Haggerty: Yes.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: It is DREE. I haven't got a precise breakdown of how the $13 million would be made up. If you recall the supplementary budget, I think we reduced this total of $56 million by about $11 million and the $13 million, I think, fell to about $10 million.

It would be made up of highway and resource road construction; purchase of the sites in Cobalt; construction of buildings to house detachments as part of the programme to improve police services in remote communities. They would be construction items as opposed to transfer payments, which would cover Cornwall and the sewers in Thunder Bay and Dryden, where the municipality itself is doing the work. I would suspect the difference between the two items is that the first one, for the most part, is in unorganized territory—or where there isn't a county at any rate—and the province is doing it directly with the federal government under DREE. The transfer payments would be organized, in municipalities like Cornwall and Thunder Bay—that is the big chunk.

Mr. Haggerty: I presume there couldn't be much money available for the unorganized municipalities in northern Ontario?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: The unorganized areas?

Mr. Haggerty: That's right—for water services and sewage.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: No, there couldn't.

Mr. Haggerty: There couldn't be.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: There would be a highway going through or something. I think there is an airport in Geraldton.

Mr. Ferrier; I am glad that the minister did bring up the item of DREE grants in the speech he has just given.

We are concerned in northeastern Ontario, and particularly in the Timmins area, as to where we stand as far as the DREE and TEIGA grants are concerned. Andy Morpurgo came up, to the Northern Ontario Municipal Association I believe it was, and announced there were going to be millions of dollars available to us in the not too distant future to provide services for the expansion and development of Timmins.

Timmins, as the minister well knows, is experiencing a good deal of growth now. In the next two or three years, as Texasgulf goes ahead with their expansion, the demand for homes will be greatly accelerating. To be able to accommodate all these homes and to provide the services and the necessary infrastructure, we are going to have to get a considerable amount of money from DREE.

The Premier (Mr. Davis) was up there prior to the election campaign and during the election campaign and more or less stated that the money was just about to come, but we have not got anything further than that. The municipal council is very concerned that a commitment be made and that the kind of money be spent in the Timmins area to help the council provide the services for the expanded home growth that is so greatly needed.

Another thing that is of concern that goes along with it is the stage of your development plan for northeastern Ontario. About five years ago you announced the Design for Development programme for the northeast—and there were announcements in Sudbury and in Timmins at the same time. The people were invited to send back their ideas and we were promised there would be the second Design for Development report submitted to the region and the municipalities in the not too distant future.

The member for Nipissing (Mr. R. S. Smith) in the last House raised the question as to what had happened to Design for Development for the northeast. The minister replied rather facetiously that the plan had reached a certain stage when he was minister, but that after he had taken a little time off and then was reappointed as Treasurer, that nothing seemed to have happened in the interval.

Mr. Martel: The world stopped while he was gone.

Mr. Ferrier: A number of us asked John White what was going on and he would respond by letter saying they were working on it and things were developing and that kind of thing. I think he was giving us a snow job.

Hon. F. S. Miller: In Timmins?

Mr. Ferrier: All through the northeast.

You can't fault this minister for lack of action. He is prepared to get things done. That is why I am surprised that he has not reported his second Design for Development and has not got a plan of development for the northeast ready to go. I think that's holding up some of the DREE money for the northeast. I don't know whether you've got any that you are spending in the northeast.

We are glad you are doing something for Cornwall; certainly they need it. We are glad you are doing something for the northwest; they've got their Design for Development: Phase 3, I think, already accepted and you are mentioning the number of jobs you are going to create in the next 20-year period and

how they are falling into place. That's very good but what about the northeast?

We need this plan to be implemented, to know where we are to go in the next few years and the development that is to take place. We need to be assured there will be federal money there. I don't know whether the federal government is reneging or whether it is you but I would like to have some assurance that the DREE money we are looking for is actually going to come. Could you tell us approximately when it will come?

The second thing is on the Design for Development, the whole regional plan for the northeast, when are you going to be able to come back to us with Phase 2 so we can have accepted the plans for development for our region of the province?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Answering the questions in reverse order, the northeastern plan, as I think I said earlier, is really wrapped up in planning strategy for the province and the two things will probably come simultaneously. I would expect it sometime after the first of the year; that's just a guess at this moment, though. I couldn't be more precise.

On the Timmins DREE agreement I had a report yesterday which I'm sorry I didn't bring with me. We are negotiating feverishly with DREE. We are getting closer and I would hope that before too long we would have an agreement with them on infrastructure. That's going to be very much subject to the availability of funds at this end.

Mr. Ferrier: To pursue it a little bit, what would you do if you are not going to make enough funds available?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Join the queue.

Mr. Ferrier: Join the queue? You are taking a lot of money out of us with Texasgulf there now—not as much as you might but you are taking a lot out. That development is going to mean a stable economic situation, I would suspect, for the whole region—not just my area but that of the member for Cochrane North (Mr. Brunelle); Smooth Rock Falls, Cochrane and Iroquois Falls—the whole area is going to benefit significantly. I don't think, with the kind of demand there is going to be for homes and services throughout the whole region that you can say we are going to have to sit back and wait.

There is a crisis situation there now. When the construction workers come in and there are 1,500 to 2,000 more workers in that area there will be chaos if there is not the money for the servicing and the infrastructure to provide homes for those workers. We are going to be in a terrible state if you can't get us that money.

Mr. Martel: Mr. Chairman, I want to talk about regional government for a few moments and the Sudbury situation. It was about nine months ago when my colleagues and I approached the minister to investigate what was going on in the Sudbury region. I'm not sure the minister believed my colleagues and me that there was a crisis developing there. Ultimately, I met three times with his then parliamentary assistant, the former member for Brantford, to see if we could get something moving in the Sudbury area, some type of quiet investigation to head off the impending disaster. To my knowledge nothing, but nothing, occurred. Ultimately, one day after the last general election—the very next day to be precise—the chairman of the regional municipality of Sudbury resigned and we are now confronted with the prospect of a chairman who ran third in Sudbury. That doesn't augur well with the people of the Sudbury area since in the riding of Sudbury East the Conservatives got 12 per cent of the vote, in the riding of Nickel Belt they got about 21 per cent of the vote, and in the Sudbury riding they got about 30 per cent of the vote. Now we are going to have foisted on us as regional chairman one of those candidates who ran third. We will be in great shape.

Mr. Nixon: Maybe one of the ones who ran second is available.

Mr. Martel: No, he has got his reward. The intriguing thing about the last election is that they get their rewards very quickly. He is now a commentator for one of the local television or radio stations.

Mr. Nixon: He would be good too—Elmer.

Mr. Singer: Everybody listens to him up there; they don't vote for him.

Mr. Martel: I find it distasteful, needless to say, and so do many of the people in the Sudbury region, from a second point of view too. We are the only area, I believe, who have two government appointees. We have the chief executive officer and the chief administrative officer who are appointed by the province.

If that isn't enough, there is tremendous resentment with respect to regional government. As one of those who supported regional government in the Sudbury area, I well recall in 1971 that the government's own sitting member wouldn't support that

concept, but we encouraged it to be moved ahead because of the promise of the government or the carrot which the Treasurer held out—he was Treasurer then too, I guess; he was Minister of Municipal Affairs for a while. The carrot that was held out, of course, was a fair assessment of the mining corporations in the Sudbury area.

Last week I went over to the assessment office and did a little digging to see why it is that we in Sudbury see our taxes going up by 12 to 15 per cent each year. Their assessment of the total holdings of the International Nickel Company is—can you guess?—$95 million. That's for the whole of the area—not just Copper Cliff. Nickel Centre has a total assessed value of $635,000; Onaping Falls, $2,043,000; Valley East, $294,000; the city of Sudbury, which includes the former town of Copper Cliff, $75 million; and Waldon, $16,969,000; for a total assessed value for realty assessment and business assessment of $95 million. It is crazy; it is mad.

A fellow built a new motel there called the New Trade Winds Motel. He pays more taxes than does the International Nickel Co. for its new iron ore recovery plant. It is mad because that new plant is worth over $100 million. All we assess, I guess, is the foundation and the walls. We don't assess anything else; we don't assess anything underground—and there are virtually cities underground. Yet we see the taxes going up at a rate of 10, 12 or 14 per cent. In fact, I am told that these figures were ordered by order in council, that they were much less than those produced by Pat Gillis, I believe it was, who did the original assessment of the two companies.

If you think Inco is bad, Falconbridge isn't any better. The assessed value of little old Falconbridge is $21 million. In Nickel Centre it is $4,127,000; Valley East, $30,000; the town of Waldon, $172,000; Onaping Falls, $17 million. It is mad.

I am saying to the councillors when I meet them now, "For God's sake, whatever you do don't raise the tax to the local residents one more cent. Let your town go into receivership first. Make this government do what it promised to do in the Sudbury area when they held the carrot out for regional government, and that is to give us a fair assessment base to work from." That is what had to be done; that is what hasn't been done. What in God's name is going to happen when the startup grants are completed—next year, I guess it is? We are in trouble, Mr. Treasurer, if you don't do something soon.

[5:45]

You can do several things. I understand there are committees across Canada now considering the assessment of the equipment. You could look at the machinery. You could look at the underground operations. Surely they shouldn't be exempt. You just can't allow this. I live in a small municipality of 4,500 where taxes are $800, $900 and $1,000 and they continue to rise. You look in Valley East, where taxes—without sewer and water, which the province is going to own—have now reached $500, $600 and $700 for little homes, before the extra $240 that is going to be charged for the sewer and water facilities which are just being completed in that municipality. If you can imagine though in 1975, in the richest area in Canada and in Ontario, we are starting to install sewer and water facilities. You wonder why you lose in the Sudbury basin? It's pretty obvious. We get the odd Tory safari in there around election time. We've had more politicians in the Sudbury basin in the last seven months. We won't see them again for the next three years, providing there is no election before then.

An hon. member: Oh yes you will.

Mr. Martel: It's crazy, Mr. Minister, and you are responsible. There is money there and you can't tell me that $21 million is the market value of Falconbridge. Surely you can't attempt to tell me that? You were in Sudbury this summer and you gave them a song and dance again. They put the same proposition to you: "You got us into regional government by saying we would be able to tax fairly." A lot of the municipalities didn't want to go with it, a lot of the politicians didn't, but they could see it as the salvation of that area. As I say, I supported it when your own colleague wouldn't. You remember the former member for Nickel Belt? He opposed it. Yet you leave us there in limbo and the resentment continues to escalate. The taxes continue to escalate. The problems are ever greater. We get platitudes. I would like the minister to tell me categorically if the type of assessment that we have was done by order in council. Were Gillis's figures in fact used?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: I am afraid you are going to have to ask the Minister of Revenue (Mr. Meen).

Mr. Martel: It is too easy to pass off. You are the boy with the bucks. You are the man who dispenses the money. You are the

man who comes to Sudbury and tells the people—

Hon. Mr. McKeough: With the greatest respect, the assessment programme, as the member knows, is with the Minister of Revenue, not me.

Mr. Martel: I am aware that he collects them for you, yes.

Interjection.

Mr. Martel: Right, and he assesses them for you, but you set the policies.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: He does not assess them for me. He assesses them for the local municipality.

Mr. Martel: Right.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: It has nothing to do with me.

Mr. Martel: I am sure the minister pays the bills. When the money returns from the consolidated revenue fund and it's filtered back to Sudbury, where does it come from? Any money?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: No money comes from the assessment—

Mr. Martel: No, no.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: —by the province of Falconbridge or Inco or anybody else. That's how the municipal taxes are collected.

Mr. Martel: I am well aware that the municipal taxes are collected locally. I am well aware of that. I'm saying that the policies which were held out to create that regional municipality, the thing that did it was a fair assessment of Inco. That was the prime factor behind it. That led to the creation of that regional municipality.

There is insufficient money. Despite the tremendous wealth in that area, the richest in the province, it's going down the pike. Municipalities are being forced to increase their taxes ever so much per year more and this government sits in a state of inertia. You can pretend that it belongs to your friend across the way, but you were in Sudbury this summer. You came into Sudbury from Timmins, in fact, and spent a day with council I believe—part of the clambake, of course—to assure us that it was going to work.

I say to you you have to do something, as a government, to salvage something from what is going to happen in that area. For you simply stand on your feet, because you do pay the bills, and give us that type of response—I would like to know again, because you were in cabinet, was it by order in council that the figures Gillis prepared were rejected? I am told they were much higher but it's like trying to get papers out of the Kremlin, trying to get information with respect to what's transpired in the Sudbury area.

Surely, you have to be in a position to tell us because you are responsible, if it goes down the drain, for picking up the tab. As I say, I have suggested to the people that they simply don't increase taxes any longer, that they simply let it got to pot. If you have to take over, that's fine, but they should not increase taxes to the local residents; we should be getting more for the whole area from the wealth that's there. Surely the Treasurer understands that?

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Martel: He doesn't understand it.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Mr. Chairman, if there is something wrong with the assessment of the mine properties in Sudbury, presumably that would come up in the Legislature in the estimates of the Minister of Revenue and not in these estimates.

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Chairman, if I am in order—I don't know if you are taking the whole vote—can I speak on the Niagara escarpment?

Mr. Chairman: No, we are dealing with item 2 of vote 1006, urban and regional planning.

Mr. Sargent: This is planning we are talking about, I guess. I am talking about—

Hon. Mr. McKeough: You can talk about it under the fifth item.

Mr. Chairman: That would come under the fifth item, Niagara Escarpment Commission.

Mr. Sargent: I am talking about regional planning. Okay?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Are you planning to be away?

Mr. Sargent: You will recall, Mr. Premier, some time ago your cohort on your left and Mr. MacNaughton came up to our area and tried to tell us we were going to have regional government. There were about 300 people there and they put on a big show which they were going to do all over Ontario. They were going to regionalize our area. I told them to

stay the hell out of our area and they did. Grey and Bruce counties are free people up there. We are not paying double for government; we are running our own show in that area in contrast to the centralized control you have down here. I want you to know you are going to stay out of there.

I want to say this while I am speaking, with regard to the Niagara Escarpment, Mr. Minister. When the vote comes up I want you to know you are going to have to disband that area because you are going to be in deep trouble if you don't. That's all I can say right now but I am waiting for a chance to get a shot at you on the Niagara Escarpment.

Mr. Reid: Since you are tied up in your new duties, Mr. Chairman, I thought I would make the northern speech for you, as far as regional planning goes. I want to make two remarks to the Treasurer if I may. They are simply, in regard to these regional planning programmes and the money that goes with them from DREE, it has been my experience in the last few years that the people who are making these decisions on behalf of the people in the region are the civil servants. The municipal councils and the elected representatives are not asked about it at all.

I draw your attention particularly—we heard Mr. Morpurgo's name being used earlier but I would like to know what the process is for these federal-provincial agreements and how the programme is arrived at. We are trying to get the road between Atikokan and Ignace, which may sound familiar to some of us, and we are trying to get it under the DREE plan. But apparently if Mr. Morpurgo or some other manifestation of the government in some office somewhere doesn't feel this is important to our region, we don't get it. The local elected council seems to have no input into this kind of decision.

The current Treasurer has to take the responsibility for having done away with the Northern Ontario Development Corp. He promised us at that time that we would still have input made into these decisions, and yet this is not so at all. I don't want to go on at great length, but I wonder if the minister can indicate what input the local officials, and even the MPPs and the federal members, have in the decisions that are made in regard to these federal-provincial agreements?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Since I have been the minister, there just hasn't been that much new in northwestern Ontario. I think it's fair to say that the decisions have been taken. The great chunks of money are being used up in one place, for the most part, which is Thunder Bay. I am told, and certainly I have had—not in your part of Ontario as much, but northeastern—representations made to me. I think it is a little unrealistic to suggest that you are going to get Kenora and Rainy River to sit down in a room and decide how they are going to split the pie, or which comes first. Ultimately, somebody has to make a decision; that's my responsibility.

Mr. Sargent: That's not helping them any.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: It is not Morpurgo's; it is my ultimate responsibility so far as the province is concerned. Of course, part of the decision-making is 50-50; it is federal decision-making as well. Certainly Mr. Morpurgo's advice is important, but it is not the ultimate determination. The ultimate determination is political at our end; I can't speak for Ottawa.

Mr. Reid: If I may ask one brief question. How do the local municipalities that are in dire needs of funds—such as Ignace, a growing community—get to the minister?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: They write letters, and they send applications in the same way that they do for a whole host of other things.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Renfrew North.

Mr. Martel: Do they get a reply?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: When the mails work.

Mr. Conway: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. A question for the minister that relates in part to my predecessor's comment. It is one of urgent and public concern for those of us in Renfrew county. It is the question of the general development agreement for that county.

We have had, over the past number of months a number of assurances from the Ontario government that the final commitment from the Ontario government with respect to that particular general development agreement would be forthcoming. It has been 13 months since the federal government and the various municipalities in that county have made their submissions and have firmed up their commitments. It is a matter, as I said earlier, of urgent and public concern to those of us whose responsibility it is to ensure the economic growth and development of that part of eastern Ontario—a part, I might add, that I think has been historically and tragically ignored by 32 years of a certain party's government.

So I ask the minister, to take it into immediate consideration, and to supply me and my county with an answer at our earliest and certainly at his earliest convenience. What, if anything, is this government prepared to do about the general development agreement for Renfrew county? Thank you.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: It is being pursued, and we just particularly—the other day if I recall, several weeks ago—appointed consultants and asked for tenders. We appointed consultants on the Timbertown proposal; that was just a few days ago.

Mr. Conway: But as the hon. minister realizes, the general development agreement has about it certain general directions. It concerns me, for example, that three or four days before a certain event on Sept. 18 certain representatives of the ministry opposite appeared in the city of Pembroke to tell us, for whatever political reason, that tenders will be let on the Timbertown study. In the Speech from the Throne yesterday I read on page three how there is a commitment to furthering industrial parkland, particularly in eastern Ontario. These developments are part of that general development agreement as we understand it.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Not necessarily, I wish they were.

[6:00]

Mr. Conway: Now I want to see, I would like to see and I know the people in my riding involved would like to see, some commitment on the general planning level first. This is what concerns us.

Are we going to get it piecemeal? We'll take it piecemeal; we'll take anything we can get. We were told earlier that the carrot has been held before certain areas of Ontario. In Renfrew county, as far as I can see, we haven't even got a carrot.

I want some assurance from you, before the federal designation runs out at the end of this year, that this ministry is serious in its commitment. Can you tell me now, or at the very earliest convenience, what your plans are for that general development agreement? What are you going to do about industrial parkland in the city of Pembroke? What are you going to do about Timbertown?

We've been told about studies before. A few years ago we were presented with two very extensive and expensive studies with respect to Mount Madawaska, which is something in the line of Timbertown for the other part of the county. Those studies have been classically ignored. Unfortunately, today in that particular development we have very serious financial difficulties. I don't want that to happen with Timbertown. I think that project, like Mount Madawaska in my county—and pardon me for being somewhat parochial—deserve better fates.

Mr. Chairman: I might remind the hon. member that it is 6 o'clock, the time we usually rise. Is there going to be any further discussion on item 2, vote 1006?

Hon. Mr. Welch moved that the committee rise and report.

Motion agreed to.

The House resumed; Mr. Speaker in the chair.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Speaker, the committee of supply begs to report progress and asks for leave to sit again.

Report agreed to.

Hon. Mr. Welch: Mr. Speaker, before moving the adjournment of the House, we might remind ourselves that tomorrow morning at 11 o'clock in this chamber we have the special ceremonies involving the Ombudsman. Tomorrow afternoon we will have the mover to the address in reply to the Lieutenant Governor, following which we will go into the committee of supply and carry on with these estimates.

Hon. Mr. Welch moved the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to.

The House adjourned at 6:05 p.m.

CONTENTS

Wednesday, October 29, 1975

Rent review, statement by Mr. Rhodes 15

Dump trucks, statement by Mr. Snow 16

Holiday closings for retail businesses, statement by Mr. MacBeth 17

Oil and gas prices, questions of Mr. Timbrell: Mr. Lewis, Mr. MacDonald, Mr. Nixon 18

Public sector wage settlements, questions of Mr. Davis: Mr. Lewis, Mr. Nixon, Mr. Bullbrook 19

Toronto teachers' negotiations, questions of Mr. Wells: Mr. Nixon 21

Gun control, questions of Mr. Davis: Mr. Nixon, Mr. Cassidy 23

Dump trucks, questions of Mr. Snow: Mr. Young 24

Provincial judges, questions of Mr. McMurtry: Mr. Singer 24

Kirkland and district hospital, questions of Mr. Miller: Mr. Bain 24

Grey county teachers' settlement, questions of Mr. Wells: Mr. McKessock 25

Hamilton selective services, question of Mr. Handleman: Mr. Mackenzie 26

Hospital closing, questions of Mr. Miller: Mr. Roy 26

Child welfare advisory committee, questions of Mr. Taylor: Mr. Martel 27

Budget deficit, question of Mr. McKeough: Mr. Sargent 27

Paperworkers' strike, question of Hon. B. Stephenson: Mr. Swart 27

Highway paving contracts, questions of Mr. Snow: Mr. Givens 28

Violence in hockey, questions of Mr. McMurtry: Mr. Lawlor 28

Mineral rights on agricultural land, question of Mr. Bernier: Mr. Gaunt 29

Report, Ministry of Correctional Services, Mr. J. R. Smith 29

Motion regarding guidelines for the Ombudsman, Mr. McMurtry, agreed to 29

Highway Traffic Amendment Act, Mr. Snow, first reading 29

Public Commercial Vehicles Amendment Act, Mr. Snow, first reading 30

Ontario Energy Board Amendment Act, Mr. Timbrell, first reading 30

Retail Business Holidays Act, Mr. MacBeth, first reading 31

Development Corporations Act, Mr. Bennett, first reading 31

Municipal Amendment Act, Mr. McKeough, first reading 31

Assessment Amendment Act, Mr. Meen, first reading 31

Bills of Sale and Chattel Mortgages Amendment Act, Mr. Handleman, first reading 31

Assignment of Book Debts Amendment Act, Mr. Handleman, first reading 31

Conditional Sales Amendment Act, Mr. Handleman, first reading 32

Labour Ombudsman Act, 1975, Mr. Reid, first reading 32

Consumer Reporting Amendment Act, Mr. Reid, first reading 32

Good Samaritan Act, Mr. Haggerty, first reading 32

Safety Committees Act, Mr. Haggerty, first reading 32

Estimates, Ministry of Treasury, Economics and Intergovernmental Affairs, Mr. McKeough, continued 33

Motion to adjourn, Mr. Welch, agreed to 60

SPEAKERS IN THIS ISSUE

Bain, R. (Timiskaming NDP)
Bennett, Hon. C. Industry and Tourism (Ottawa South PC)
Bernier, Hon. L. Natural Resources (Kenora PC)
Breaugh, M. (Oshawa NDP)
Bullbrook, J. E. (Sarnia L)
Bryden, M. (Beaches-Woodbine NDP)
Campbell, M. (St. George L)
Cassidy, M. (Ottawa Centre NDP)
Conway, S. (Renfrew North L)
Cunningham, E. (Wentworth North L)
Davis, Hon. W. G. Premier (Brampton PC)
Deans, I. (Wentworth NDP)
Ferrier, W. (Cochrane South NDP)
Gaunt, M. (Huron-Bruce L)
Givens, P. G. (Armourdale L)
Good, E. R. (Waterloo North L)
Haggerty, R. (Erie L)
Handleman, Hon. S. B. Consumer and Commercial Relations (Carleton PC)
Henderson, Hon. L. C. Minister without Portfolio (Lambton PC)
Lawlor, P. D. (Lakeshore NDP)
Lewis, S. Leader of the Opposition (Scarborough West NDP)
MacBeth, Hon. J. P. Provincial Secretary for Justice and Solicitor General (Humber PC)
MacDonald, D. C. (York South NDP)
Mackenzie, R. (Hamilton East NDP)
Makarchuk, M. (Brantford NDP)
Martel, E. W. (Sudbury East NDP)
McKeough, Hon. W. D. Treasurer, Minister of Economics and Intergovernmental Affairs (Chatham-Kent PC)
McKessock, R. (Grey L)
McMurtry, Hon. R. Attorney General (Eglinton PC)
Meen, Hon. A. K. Revenue (York East PC)
Miller, Hon. F. S. Health (Muskoka PC)
Newman, Hon. W. Agriculture and Food (Durham North PC)
Nixon, R. F. (Brant-Oxford-Norfolk L)
Reid, T. P. (Rainy River L)
Rhodes, Hon. J. R. Housing (Sault Ste. Marie PC)
Riddell, J. (Huron-Middlesex L)
Roy, A. J. (Ottawa East L)
Ruston, R. F. (Essex North L)
Samis, G. (Cornwall NDP)
Sandeman, G. (Peterborough NDP)
Sargent, E. (Grey-Bruce L)
Shore, M. (London North L)
Singer, V. M. (Wilson Heights L)
Smith, R. S. (Nipissing L)
Smith, S. (Hamilton West L)
Snow, Hon. J. W. Transportation and Communications (Oakville PC)
Stephenson, Hon. B. Labour (York Mills PC)
Swart, M. (Welland NDP)
Taylor, Hon. J. A. Community and Social Services (Prince Edward-Lennox PC)
Timbrell, Hon. D. R. Energy (Don Mills PC)
Welch, Hon. R. Culture and Recreation (Brock PC)
Wells, Hon. T. L. Education (Scarborough North PC)
Wildman, B. (Algoma NDP)
Young, F. (Yorkview NDP)

No. 3



Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT — DAILY EDITION

First Session of the Thirtieth Legislature

Thursday, October 30, 1975

Speaker: Honourable Russell Daniel Rowe
Clerk: Roderick Lewis, QC

THE QUEEN'S PRINTER
PARLIAMENT BUILDINGS, TORONTO
1975



A list of the speakers taking part in the debates in this issue of Hansard appears, in alphabetical order, at the back of this issue.

Daily contents of proceedings also appears at the back of this issue. Reference to a cumulative index of previous issues can be obtained by calling the Hansard Reporting Service indexing staff. Phone 965-2159.

Hansard subscription price is $15.00 per session, from: Sessional Subscription Service, MGS, 9th Floor, Ferguson Block, Parliament Bldgs., Toronto, M7A 1N3. Phone 965-2238.

LEGISLATURE OF ONTARIO

THURSDAY, OCTOBER 30, 1975

The House met at 2 p.m.

Prayers.

Mr. Speaker: As hon. members know, this morning I had the honour to administer the oath of office to the first Ombudsman for the Province of Ontario. The proceedings have been recorded and if it is agreeable to hon. members, they will be printed as an appendix to Hansard today. Is this agreed?

Agreed.

Mr. Evans: Mr. Speaker, I would like to introduce to you and members of the Legislature, 49 students from St. Monica's School in the city of Barrie, accompanied by their teachers. Would you help me give them a warm welcome?

Mr. Breaugh: Mr. Speaker, I would like to introduce, in the east gallery, the students from Donevan Collegiate in the fine riding of Oshawa, some of whom are actually responsible for this member being in this House.

Mr. Leluk: I would also like to welcome to the Legislature this afternoon, 54 grade 7 and 8 students from St. Elizabeth Separate School in York West riding.

Mr. Conway: Mr. Speaker, on a point of privilege, I would ask if we could have some explanation of who it was who was seated this morning in the legislative seat held by the member for Carleton East (Mrs. Gigantes). I was under the impression that it may not have been the duly elected member for Carleton East.

Mr. Lewis: Is this a personal vendetta of yours?

Mr. Speaker: I am not aware of the situation. The member for Carleton East is in her seat now and I think she was there.

Mr. Conway: Mr. Speaker, part of the problem is that yesterday we were treated to certain business about the nomenclature to be used in the Legislature. I thought that was a good point made by a certain member of a certain party, and I thought today that perhaps I would add my little contribution—

Interjections.

Mr. Speaker: I am not sure there is a point of privilege. Everyone I noticed, I thought, was in his or her seat, but it is a little difficult to know at this point in time.

Statements by the ministry.

Mr. Mancini: You never answered the question.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Let's get down to some serious work.

ANTI-INFLATION PROGRAMME

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Mr. Speaker, you are aware of the major conclusions of last week's meeting of the ministers in Ottawa concerning a national anti-inflation programme and of the general support for the programme which this government has expressed. I rise now to make a full report to the members on our plan of action to control inflation in Ontario.

In this statement I will outline the scope of the inflation problem in Ontario and emphasize the seriousness of the current economic situation. I will briefly review the federal programme and indicate how we intend to enter and support that programme. I will outline the specific actions which we are taking in this province, both on our own and in coordination with the federal government. In addition, I will detail our suggestions for improvement which I made in Ottawa last week.

The current problems of both inflation and unemployment in Canada stem primarily from unprecedented pressures which built up in the international economy in 1972 and 1973. At that time, a simultaneous industrial boom in major trading countries created strong demand pressures for goods which resulted in shortages and rising prices. Poor harvests in 1973 pushed up food prices in almost all countries. Removal of price controls in the United States unleashed pent-up inflationary pressures and European and Japanese currencies were appreciated vis-à-vis the US and Canadian dollars.

This produced strong demands for Canadian exports and increased the costs of im-

ported goods. During the latter part of 1973 and early 1974 the world economy suffered a major shock as oil-producing nations dramatically increased the price of their crude oil.

The resulting balance of payments and inflation crisis of our trading partners forced them to adopt policies which led to deep and prolonged recessions. Primarily because of our modest degree of oil self-sufficiency, the recession has been relatively less severe in Canada. However, while we have avoided the very high and prolonged unemployment suffered by our trading partners, the rate of unemployment here certainly has risen to unacceptable levels. In addition, our consumers have been hit with one price increase after another in areas such as food, housing and fuel. These have reflected both international and domestic pressures.

Having been spared somewhat the bitter medicine of a deep recession, we are now faced with a unique challenge. Three years of strong inflation have shaken the confidence of many Canadians that there will be a return to a situation of moderate price increases. It is very tempting, almost compelling, for any group in our society to hedge against the future by attempting to extract high wage and price increases from our economy.

If this wage-price spiral is to be broken, it must be through effective leadership and a broad understanding that our demands on the economy must be limited to its capacity for growth. Failure to learn this lesson will make the economic medicine we have been forced to take during this year's pause in economic growth appear mild compared to what will become necessary in the future.

Prices have been rising faster in Canada than they are in the United States and wage settlements in manufacturing have been significantly outstripping the US levels. These factors augur a dark portent for our economic future and are the warning signals of a continuing deterioration of Canada's trading position. Unless action is taken, major damage will be done to our prospects both for short-term recovery and for long-term economic growth.

The longer-run impact of these trends on government at all levels is potentially devastating. Diminished Canadian competitiveness will reduce economic growth and public revenues, while on the other hand skyrocketing salary expectations put strong pressures on public spending. The inevitable result will be higher taxes or deficits, or both, and their impact simply furthers the inflationary spiral.

For these reasons, Ontario has been calling for a plan of national action to confront the economic challenge. On Thanksgiving Day, the Prime Minister of Canada outlined the steps which the federal government is now prepared to take.

I would like to spend just a few minutes outlining the major elements of the federal government's plan. It consists of income guidelines, price guidelines, a new administrative structure and a programme to restrain government expenditure. Large firms, construction companies, most unions, federal agencies and participating provinces will be subject to legal enforcement of the the guidelines.

Income guidelines will be established for the next three years. They will provide a basic standard for all wage and salary increases, taking into account both cost of living and productivity. Settlements may be adjusted, either above or below the basic standard, to account for previous wage settlements. It is proposed to regulate professional incomes, using the salary guidelines with adjustments for cost and workload changes.

On the price side, the federal government proposes that after Oct. 13 price increases should only reflect cost increases. If a firm cannot allocate costs to individual products, its pre-tax profit margin should be no more than 95 per cent of average profit for the past five fiscal years.

Mr. Lewis: It will be pretty tough on them.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Prices paid to food producers will be exempt from the guidelines, but the federal government has expressed an interest in developing marketing board policies consistent with the overall guidelines strategy. Additional guidelines are laid out for construction firms, financial institutions, export industries and retail and wholesale firms.

The programme will be administered by the anti-inflation board and enforced by the administrator. The board will monitor price and income changes and identify actions which may be in contravention of the guidelines. In such cases, the board will use moral suasion to bring the parties within the spirit of the guidelines. If this fails, the case will be referred to the administrator, who may order rollbacks and levy penalties. Cases may be appealed to the anti-inflation tribunal and from there to the federal Court of Appeal.

The legislation proposed by the federal government allows for two methods of pro-

vincial participation. Under one clause, section 4(3), a federal-provincial agreement can be signed, which brings provincial institutions directly under the administrative control of the anti-inflation board and subject to federal guidelines. Under an alternative section, 4(4), the province would undertake enforcement of the Act and could negotiate some modifications in the application of the guidelines as they apply to particular classes and groups of provincial employees.

Two additional and important aspects of the plan are, first, that the provinces are asked to undertake a rent control programme consistent with national standards and, second, the provinces may enter into an agreement with the federal government regarding the regulation of professional incomes. I will come back to these two items later in this statement.

Last week in Ottawa we heard a fair amount of discussion and debate about many aspects of this programme. Indeed, it is easy to find flaws in the broad elements of the programme. For my part, I must admit that I do have some reservations. Perhaps the programme could have been announced sooner. Perhaps a total wage and price freeze would have been the best way to start out. In this way, inflationary expectations could have been immediately cooled down and a breathing space provided to work out administrative problems.

At this point, I might comment on the plan of the Province of British Columbia to impose a temporary freeze on selected prices. First of all, it seems to me that if a freeze is to be effective it must apply to wages as well as prices. Second, it apparently ignores the problem of the rising cost of—

Mr. Martel: That's been successfully done, hasn't it?

Mr. Lewis: Anything that requires provincial initiative, the government draws back from.

[2.15]

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Second, it apparently ignores the problem of the rising cost of imported food and, for that matter, all goods coming from other provinces. Third, it will favour large, Canada-wide corporations—

Mr. Lewis: Instead of multi-national ones.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: —and possibly create financial hardships for small businessmen and farmers. Big corporations will be able to absorb the temporary inconveniences of the mini-freeze and may even pass on costs to other provinces.

Mr. Renwick: You ought to know about that.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: This underlines the importance of approaching such programmes on a national level.

We place highest priority on co-ordinated national action to meet a national problem. Therefore, we have withheld any substantive reservations and will co-operate fully with the federal government. Our co-operative attitude will also apply to the constitutional issue.

Mr. Foulds: Are they your federal cousins?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Bill C-73 involves a declaration by the federal government of a national emergency in peacetime on the basis of the peace, order and good government clause.

Mr. Renwick: There is no such power and you know it. You are wrong. That is constitutional nonsense.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: While the bill recognizes provincial jurisdiction in the case of rents, professions and provincial institutions, it gives the federal government power to directly control prices and income in private enterprises. Ontario is willing to accept this situation. We indicated earlier that we would not place constitutional impediments in the path of a national policy to regulate prices and incomes.

Mr. Renwick: Speak to your Attorney General (Mr. McMurtry) about it.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Mr. Speaker, I have reviewed the history of inflation in Canada and Ontario and emphasized the gravity of the existing situation. I have stressed the need for immediate action and stated that Ontario will fully co-operate with and support the federal programme.

Mr. Lewis: It requires nothing from you.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: I will now turn to an outline of the more specific actions this province is taking. I will also point out areas where I think the federal programme can be further improved.

First, it is our intention to enter into an agreement with the federal government under section 4(3) of Bill C-73 for a period of two years. I might say here that at the conference

last week Mr. Macdonald and other federal spokesmen indicated that they hoped, in the interests of as universal a programme as possible, that provinces would opt in under this section of the bill, and we understand that nearly all intend to do so.

In this regard, I would like to comment on a question yesterday by the leader of the Liberal Party. He asserted that we would be rejecting our responsibilities if we opted into a national anti-inflation plan in line with the expressed desire of the federal goverment. I wonder if the hon. member fully appreciates the magnitude and seriousness of the problem this nation is facing. Our major responsibility is to fight inflation in the best possible way, not to quibble over the constitution.

Mr. Singer: Oh, come on! What about the speeches in June? Tell us about those great Liberals in June and their constitutional responsibility.

Mr. Speaker: Order.

Interjections.

Mr. Renwick: You leave the constitution to the Attorney General and don't give us your interpretation of it.

Mr. Speaker: Order.

Interjections.

Mr. Bullbrook: Why do you let him be inflammatory? Why do you do that? What do you expect?

Mr. Singer: Next time the Treasurer will be gone too.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. We must get on with the business of the House.

Mr. Renwick: You leave the constitution alone and speak to the Attorney General.

Interjections.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The hon. Treasurer will continue.

Mr. Bullbrook: Choose section 4(4) not 4(3). You shake your head. You don't know what you are all about.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Mr. Speaker, picture what would happen if all provinces set up separate review and enforcement bodies. Each would make an unconnected string of decisions concerning exemptions and apply different standards of enforcement. This could only lead to a tangled web of disarray, a serious erosion of the national effort and, as a consequence, a higher rate of inflation in this country. This goverment does not endorse that kind of approach.

Mr. Renwick: That is just balderdash.

Mr. Lewis: You forgot how to govern. That is what you are saying.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Nor do we agree with the idea that special provincial relationships with some groups, such as teachers and civil servants, require that we establish a separate review board. In one way or another, the government has a special relationship with virtually every member of the work force in Ontario—trade unions, small incorporated businesses—

Mr. Lewis: Oh, come on!

Mr. Renwick: Your relationship is the boss man.

Mr. Lewis: You are not the employer in the private sector.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Nor are we of teachers, nor are we of firemen.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. We should get on with the business of the House. The hon. Leader of the Opposition should set the example, I believe, here.

Mr. Bullbrook: I guess so.

Mr. Speaker: Let the hon. Treasurer continue.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: In one way or another the government has a special relationship with virtually every member of the work force in this province—trade unions, small incorporated businesses, businesses requiring licences, tradesmen, small construction companies, real estate brokers, credit unions and other provincially-incorporated bodies. These and many others are covered under a variety of provincial statutes. Public servants are by no means the only groups who have a special provincial relationship. These relationships will continue and, as such, the anti-inflation programme involves no surrender of provincial jurisdiction in the regulation of professional, commercial or trade practices.

It is our intention to make this programme work in Ontario with only a small dose of bureaucracy but with a large dose of effectiveness. The Premier (Mr. Davis) has established a special cabinet committee, chaired by myself, with the ministers of Education (Mr. Wells), Health (Mr. F. S. Miller), Labour (B. Stephenson), Housing (Mr. Rhodes), and

Energy (Mr. Timbrell), the Attorney General (Mr. McMurtry) and the Chairman of Management Board (Mr. Auld). This committee will monitor the progress of the programme and make recommendations to the cabinet. As its chairman, I expect to be reporting to the members from time to time concerning the results of our work.

Under the cabinet committee, a position of provincial co-ordinator for Ontario's anti-inflation programme has been created. The responsibilities of the provincial co-ordinator will be to:

Monitor the overall anti-inflation programme with regard to how it is operating in Ontario;

Be the main contact for all Ontario government ministries concerning the application of guidelines in their specific areas of responsibilities;

Be the chief liaison officer between the province and the federal government; and

Offer liaison between Ontario and the private sector with respect to the operation of the programme.

All Ontario government ministries, agencies and boards have been instructed by cabinet to provide the fullest co-operation in support of the provincial co-ordinator. The members will recall that last week Dr. James Fleck was appointed to this position.

As you know, Mr. Speaker, the government is committed to establishing a rent control system in this province. We want to ensure that our plan is fully compatible with the overall federal anti-inflation programme. Soon after the meeting of federal and provincial ministers of housing, full details of our plan will be announced.

The issue of professional incomes presents one of the most difficult challenges for the anti-inflation programme. We think it is essential to reinforce the guidelines. One method would be to establish a formal fee schedule for the various professions not now covered by one. We think this method would be impractical because of the tremendous differentials in the price for any given service and the non-income mechanisms available to professionals for securing reimbursement.

In addition, we think the programme should be primarily concerned with the control of professional incomes. It should not interfere with provincial jurisdiction over the governing of professions or with client relationships. Accordingly, the most feasible method appears to be a tax-back route on a national basis. This would involve an additional and incremental tax on income in excess of the guidelines. We are studying the implications of such a tax as a possible method of ensuring that the guidelines will apply equally to self-employed and salaried professionals.

Turning now to the public sector in Ontario we will ensure that all ministries, agencies, local governments, commissions and Crown corporations will be brought within the guidelines. In particular, we shall be discussing with the federal government the development of more precise instructions and workable guidelines for application to the Ontario Energy Board concerning gas utilities and Ontario Hydro rates, Ontario Hydro concerning local hydro utilities' rates, and the Ontario Telephone Commission.

As the federal guidelines are clarified, instructions and guidelines will be made available through the office of the provincial co-ordinator. We have already met with the provincial-municipal liaison committee and indicated our basic support for the anti-inflation programme. As soon as possible, members of the special cabinet committee and the provincial co-ordinator will be meeting with all affected groups in the public sector —including school boards, hospitals and universities—to discuss the application of the guidelines.

As the programme develops, I am confident that all responsible individuals, whatever their particular economic interest, will work for the success of the programme and not for its erosion. For this reason, we accept the intent of the federal legislation for full inclusion of the province and its emanations. At this critical stage of development of what must admittedly be a very complex and yet often arbitrary programme, we cannot afford to behave in an obstructive manner. It is the national interest we are all involved in now and not the limited interests of any one level of government or its agencies.

Interjections.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: It is in this spirit that the government will opt into the federal programme—

Mr. Foulds: That didn't change a thing.

Mr. Singer: How thoughtful we are today. Our halo is glistening.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: —but I should emphasize that we are making constructive suggestions about the implementation process which we have conveyed to the federal government—

Mr. Singer: Polish the halo.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: —and which we will be discussing further with them.

The development of an improved programme will only emerge from a combination of experience and intergovernmental negotiation, conducted in an atmosphere of concern for the national interest.

I am frankly somewhat dismayed by the number of groups which have already rushed forward with demands for exemptions. A year from now, these same groups will be arguing for cost-of-living increases and will probably not admit to any connection between their earlier income demands and the rise in living costs for the general public. This, in my view, is a distressing form of economic isolationism.

Our specific suggestions for strengthening the federal programme are as follows:

First, a lot has been said about prices by those who oppose the programme and who have apparently not read or understood the proposals for limiting the price increases and net profit margins of large corporations. Our concern is that these proposals should be reinforced if necessary by a corporate surtax. Such a tax would be levied against corporate profits in excess of the guidelines where these profits are not reinvested. We cannot agree with the federal position that surtaxes—

Mr. Cassidy: That's useless.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: —on excessive income increases are too complicated to administer. Use of the tax route in support of price guidelines may help to control firms which might otherwise escape the guidelines and could reduce price administration costs.

Second, I have mentioned the wage and salary exceptions permitted under the proposed guidelines. This programme has been implemented at a time when oil and gas prices and high interest rates are pushing up the basic cost structure of our economy. To add to this pressure the large-scale wage and salary exceptions possible under the present guidelines, is to run the risk that the programme will apply only to the weakest members of society and will never really get started.

I said in Ottawa last week that we must be prepared to live for a time with inequities and draw the line now. I do not believe that there is any other way of proceeding if we mean this programme to work.

Mr. Foulds: We have lived with inequities for centuries.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: It is a tough decision but the times demand it.

There has been some discussion of annual or so-called merit increases applying to groups such as teachers and civil servants. It is not clear whether such increases will be excluded from the guidelines, but we expect this will be clarified shortly.

Our third suggestion was that the $600 annual maximum allowable pay increase for low wage groups be raised. The provision is, in our view, unrealistic and could create undue hardship for many low wage earners.

I would now like to turn to the area of government spending control. What we do not need at this point in time is a resumption of new federal spending initiatives such as we have witnessed in the past couple of years. This has put pressure on provincial and local spending, not to mention the Canadian taxpayer. If there are any major new federal expenditures in housing, then I will serve notice now that we expect the federal government to adopt the same budgetary self-discipline that we and local governments, universities and hospitals are now exercising and to find the money in existing low-priority programmes.

Mr. Sargent: You are losing $6 million a day. How can you say that?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: In this regard, it is instructive to compare the records of the federal and provincial levels of government in meeting targets of expenditure restraint and control. It is commonly believed by many that the provincial-municipal sector of government has accounted for the bulk of increased government spending.

In the case of Ontario, while this was true in the late 1960s it is simply not true today, nor has it been for the last four years.

Over the period 1971 to 1974, Ontario actually reduced its share of gross provincial product, dropping from 11.3 per cent to 10.7 per cent. Similarly, the share taken up by local government went down.

Mr. Singer: That's how you got to $11 billion.

Mr. Yakabuski: The member is going to have to return the retainer.

Interjection.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: On the other hand, the federal government increased its relative share to the gross national product from 12.5 per cent to 14.1 per cent in Ontario.

Mr. Singer: It didn't work before and it isn't going to work now. You have got to do something better than that.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: In the rest of Canada, its share of gross national product is even higher and has risen since 1971 by a larger amount.

Government spending control is an area where the federal government must show leadership rather than attempting to explain the difficulties of cutting back. This week in Ottawa I made a number of specific proposals for federal spending rollbacks and we hope they have listened.

[2:30]

This government has instituted a number of tough measures in the current fiscal year to cut back our spending growth. A progress report on these measures which were announced in July will be provided tomorrow to the members by my colleague, the Chairman of Management Board (Mr. Auld).

Mr. Roy: Yes, you have reason to choke on that.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: I might also mention that the special programme review committee established earlier this year by the government is in the process of completing an exhaustive review of expenditures and its report is expected soon. We will be studying its recommendations very seriously.

It is vitally important that the thrust of this expenditure restraint programme be expanded and carried forward into next year. Accordingly, I would like to announce new initiatives this government will undertake to further cut back public spending.

First, Ontario Hydro's target level of borrowing for the next year will be reduced.

Mr. Lewis: Oh, boy.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: The 1975 level is estimated to be $1.5 billion and the currently planned level for next year is $1.9 billion.

Mr. Deans: But that is what we were going to review in committee.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Hydro and the ministries of Energy and Treasury are now studying ways to effect this reduction and the legislative committee will certainly have an input into that as well.

Mr. Deans: Certainly nice to know that.

Mr. Lewis: So you have accepted the argument.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Second, the existing complement freeze—

Hon. Mr. Davis: Don't think it is going to be so simple.

Mr. Deans: But we're going to do it.

Interjections.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The hon. Treasurer will continue.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Second, the existing complement freeze will be extended to another full fiscal year and Management Board has been instructed to find further complement cuts.

Third, with minor exceptions for salary adjustments at the lower end of the scale, salaries of all senior civil servants will be frozen through calendar year 1976.

Fourth, provincial assistance to local governments next year will be limited to the Edmonton commitment.

Fifth, I expect to introduce my budget early in the new year and we have adopted a provincial expenditure growth target for next year of 10 per cent.

I would like to elaborate on the importance of this target. It will be significantly below our average expenditure growth rate for the past several years. Also, I expect it will be well below the federal white paper target which is that government spending be held to the growth rate in gross national product. Forecasters are now suggesting that next year's GNP growth will be in the neighbourhood of 14 per cent. Moreover, since our revenue growth for next year is currently estimated to be in the 12 to 13 per cent range, the achievement of our expenditure target will result in a reduction of net cash requirements.

It is going to be very tough to achieve this target but we are determined to do it without any loss of efficiency or decline in the level of essential services.

In concluding this statement, I would like to leave these thoughts with the members. Ontario has acted decisively in support of a national programme. It will be a complex and difficult programme to implement and will require the support of all members of society. It will require a sense of urgency and a determination to act in the national interest and not in the narrow interest of any single group or individual.

There will be inequities but many of them will be ironed out as the programme proceeds. But for those who are complaining

loudly of apparent injustice, let it be clear that no one is being asked to sacrifice his job or his economic future. No one is being asked to lower significantly his current standard of living. In fact for the vast majority, standards of living will continue to rise. The only demand placed on all of us by the programme is to exercise restraint.

It should have been apparent to many that with the sudden and brutal imposition of higher oil prices in world markets, the prospects for growth and the ambitions for rising levels of personal consumption would sooner or later have to be modified in Canada as they have been throughout the industrialized world. If we are to avoid an economic slowdown and maintain economic and social stability, restraint is not a luxury. It is a prerequisite to survival.

We cannot avoid the personal and social adjustments that the new economic realities are demanding of us. Excessive personal income gains can only be made at the expense of other Canadians and our economic future and that is what the government of Ontario is determined to prevent.

Mr. Lewis: On a point of order, if I may.

Mr. Speaker: Point of order.

Mr. Lewis: Recognizing the difficulty of coming to grips with this kind of statement in a question period, would the government either put the statement on the order paper as an item for full debate in the assembly; or, indeed, table the federal-provincial agreement, which you intend to sign, as an item for full debate in the assembly? Obviously, this grab-bag approach to it isn't going to be satisfactory.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Mr. Speaker, I think we will take the very excellent suggestion of the Leader of the Opposition under consideration. My guess would be that the agreement —not being a lawyer, let alone a constitutional lawyer like the member on your left—our expectation would be that the agreement may take some time to work out and cross the "t"s and dot the "i"s. I would think the suggestion made by the member to put this statement on the order paper as a matter of debate, perhaps, would be better than waiting for the agreement. But the House leader would undoubtedly discuss this with the leaders of the two parties to sort something out.

Mr. Speaker: Oral questions:

ANTI-INFLATION PROGRAMME

Mr. Lewis: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. A question of the Treasurer: Since the hon. minister is reinforcing, with some ferocity, the pressures on wages in Ontario, why is there absolutely no provincial intervention anywhere in this statement on the question of prices?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: I think that's not correct at all, Mr. Speaker, with respect.

Mr. Lewis: Of who? Of housing?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: We have suggested to the government that they should look at, and I think they are looking at the possibility of an excess profits tax, which, of course, is getting at exactly what you're saying.

Mr. Lewis: By way of supplementary, those are vague federal initiatives. Why is the government not prepared to do in the Province of Ontario, beyond the marginal qualifications the Treasurer stated, what has been done in the Province of British Columbia, in order to protect wage earners from excessive price increases or payments? Why does the government move on wages, but never on prices provincially?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Mr. Speaker, I might be flip and say because we're not going into an election, which the leader of my friend's party in British Columbia seems to be getting ready to do.

Interjections.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. We're awaiting the answer.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Mr. Speaker, I detailed in the statement three reasons which I think, if my friend reflects on them, he will come to agree with. I would also say we don't really think an action by an individual province such as that is going to be effective. I wish them well. We don't think it's going to be effective. Moreover, I would have to say—and I have asked my colleagues—that since Oct. 13 we have not had any evidence of price increases other than what has normally been going on. There has been no evidence to us, nor have we heard of any.

Mr. Singer: You have to stop now.

Mrs. Campbell: Stop while you're ahead.

Interjections.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: No, I would think something less.

An hon. member: Where have you been?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: I think the Ontario people, and I'm sure the people of Canada, have accepted the Prime Minister's words of Oct. 13 with some spirit.

Interjection.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: There are disagreements, obviously, as to details. We've seen no evidence of excessive price increases or abnormal price changes since Oct. 13.

Mr. Nixon: Supplementary, Mr. Speaker: I wonder why the Treasurer would indicate to the House, and specifically in reference to a question I put to him yesterday, that the net effect of a price and wage control initiative from Ottawa would in any way be depreciated if in fact this province had implementation procedures such as the Province of Quebec has or will have, and by way of a special initiative as the Province of British Columbia has taken, which is really in line with reinforcing this initiative and in no way diluting it. Would the Treasurer say to this House that he would be opposed to an implementation procedure in this province, which would in no way weaken this but which would give our teachers and our civil servants and our professional people—who are directly, under the provisions of the federal statute, available for supervision at the provincial level—ready access to those people who would, in fact, administer the wage and price controls which we all support?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Mr. Speaker, I think that the very fact that there are two boards in existence undoubtedly is going to lead to differences of interpretation and to different decisions given by those boards, and, therefore, in the minds of the people in either one situation or the other, the feeling that there is some degree of unfairness. If there is one national board administering this programme, then I think our people generally across the country are going to feel more confident that an equitable and fair solution is being arrived at for all of us, without putting public servants or teachers into some sort of special compartment and saying they are more important and they deserve the provincial ear—

Mr. Bullbrook: You had the alternative, didn't you?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: —where people who work for a small construction firm don't, or people who work in a retail business under a certain size in this province don't deserve our ear and our consideration. Think about that for a while.

Mr. Yakabuski: What do you think about the little man?

Mr. Nixon: A further supplementary along those lines: Surely the Treasurer must take into consideration that his colleague, the Minister of Education (Mr. Wells), has predicted an 18-month delay under these circumstances. We could assist in these matters without in any way weakening the input and the thrust and the effect of the federal wage and price guideline law.

Mr. Bullbrook: Because they anticipated it that way.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Mr. Speaker, if there is a delay of 18 months—and I doubt that, and I would hope that there wouldn't be—then I don't think an Ontario teacher or an Ontario public servant deserves to go to the head of some queue any more than anybody else in our society here in Ontario. We are all in this together and there are not going to be special rules for some.

Mr. Nixon: What's the sense of having a provincial government if you won't accept the responsibility? We could improve it here.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: There are not going to be special rules for some group whose favour you are trying to curry today.

Interjections.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Mr. Bullbrook: You have your alternative; it is in the legislation.

Mr. Nixon: The people can do without the Treasurer entirely.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. This is a very big topic. There are many people who want to ask separate questions which are not related to the first answer, as we tried to impress on you yesterday. I think the hon. Leader of the Opposition should proceed with a new question and these other points will be covered sooner or later. Please.

Mr. Lewis: I will create an avenue to open it up again.

A further question, then, of the Treasurer: If this was a uniform application of the law federally, I can understand the argument. Since the anti-inflation tribunal obviously has flexibility to vary up and down from the guidelines, as it is now doing in the postal dispute, why does the minister not provide within the public sector in Ontario, where the government is directly or indirectly the

employer, the same possibility as is going to be exercised federally?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Mr. Speaker, I am not aware that the anti-inflation board has had anything to do with the postal strike as yet.

Mr. Lewis: But surely the Treasurer can see that if the agreement is, as Mr. Mackasey pursues it, at a level above the guidelines, it will have to go to the anti-inflation board and then be approved up or down?

Mr. Bullbrook: The Treasurer doesn't know what they will do with it.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Exactly.

An hon. member: That's the point.

Mr. Lewis: But the Treasurer is assuming in advance that they will not approve it?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: I am not assuming anything. I am not assuming whether they would approve it, roll it back, increase it, lower it or anything else. It will go—as I understand it, if there is ultimately a settlement—it will go to the anti-inflation board. Similarly, if there was an agreement at Metropolitan Toronto tomorrow, then that agreement would go to the anti-inflation board.

Mr. Renwick: But it can't. The minister doesn't understand.

Mr. Lewis: Then let me ask the minister, as a separate question but in a sense a supplementary just to clarify something I have not fully understood: He says in his statement, "I said in Ottawa last week that we must be prepared to live for a time with inequities and to draw the line now." Is the Treasurer saying it is the opinion of this government that in the case of, let us say, the teacher negotiations—for lack of a better example at the moment—they should confine themselves to a settlement at the level of the guidelines in order to, as you say, draw the line now?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: I am saying no such thing, Mr. Speaker. What I am saying, in answer to the member's question, is that I think it would be very difficult for us in this province to decide—and we perhaps are capable of deciding—what might be appropriate changes in the guidelines in this province for a certain group—the member has used teachers—and then have that interpreted in nine different ways across the country by others. I can't think of anything which would bring the programme tumbling down faster than that.

[2:45]

Mr. Nixon: Supplementary, Mr. Speaker: How would the Treasurer respond under those circumstances, if the situation developed as predicted by his colleague, the Minister of Education (Mr. Wells), who indicated that since there may be substantial delays at the federal level under these circumstances, an agreement could be reached on the basis of our Bill 100 which might, in fact, in the future be changed and even rolled back as far as teachers' incomes are concerned by decision of that board?

Would, then, this province require our teachers, after possibly 18 months, to make restitution to the boards, or would the taxpayers in the community concerned—as was suggested by the chairman of the school board for Metropolitan Toronto—have to make additional payments to the Treasury of the government of Ottawa? Might I ask the Treasurer, would it not be better if we had the implementation procedures here which in no way would bring anybody unfairly to the head of the line, but in fact would do away with the problems that we believe can be solved better here than in Ottawa?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Mr. Speaker, the former leader of the opposition was always a great exponent of riding off in three directions at once. Now he wants to go in 11 directions at once. We're not going to do it if we're going to lick this problem.

Mr. Nixon: Is that your best answer? Can't you give a better answer than that? You, with responsibility as the Treasurer of this province—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. You're debating now.

Mr. Nixon: You are prepared to abdicate this responsibility—

Hon. Mr. McKeough. Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for Brant-Oxford-Norfolk is addressing himself to one group—the teachers.

Mr. Nixon: The group was selected by the Treasurer and the Leader of the Opposition.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: No, no, that's your problem.

Mr. Foulds: Supplementary to the Treasurer on the original question: One of the inequities that he feels the people of Ontario should live with is the inequity in prices between northern and southern Ontario. What

steps is his government willing to take to equalize prices between northern and southern Ontario, particularly in the crucial areas of food, clothing, heating and gasoline?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Mr. Speaker, there are inequities in our society. This government over the years has done much to try to remove those inequities—not only just between northern and southern Ontario—in terms of redistribution of income generally. But those programmes are not part and cannot be part of the battle against inflation. Those things must go ahead. Those things have to be considered, but let's not confuse them with an anti-inflation programme.

Mr. Bullbrook: May I have a supplementary? One supplementary?

Mr. Speaker: Final supplementary.

Mr. Bullbrook: Am I correct, in connection with the Treasurer's intemperate response to the leader of our party, that he regards the alternative under Section 4(4) of the federal legislation—the alternative available to him—as "riding off in 11 directions"? Is that correct? Yes? Has he brought that to the attention of the federal Minister of Finance?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: What I indicated to the member, if he had listened to my statement instead of babbling so much—

Mr. Bullbrook: I listened very much. It is very difficult to understand it—the convolution to go ahead—

Hon. Mr. McKeough: —he would have heard that the federal minister urged provinces to come in under 4(3).

Mr. Bullbrook: Final supplementary: Does the Treasurer not agree with me that the federal government has rendered to each province an alternative to accept its concurrent responsibility with the federal administration and not opt out in such a chicken-like fashion?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. A new question.

BELL CANADA INVESTIGATION

Mr. Lewis: One question, just to shift the ground slightly to the Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations. What happened to the investigation which, during the course of the campaign, he had launched into Bell Canada and its practices in Ontario? And further to that, what intervention is Ontario making in the Bell Canada rate application, to make sure that those rates are kept well within the guidelines

Hon. Mr. Handleman: Mr. Speaker, the first part of the question is well within the periphery of my ministry to respond to; the other I think should be re-addressed to the Minister of Transportation and Communications (Mr. Snow).

Our investigation into Bell Canada was simply to ascertain whether or not there had been any violations of the Business Practices Act—whether there had been representations made which had induced people to enter into consumer contracts, and then those representations were not carried through. We found very few instances of violations of the Business Practices Act. Where we did, Bell Canada complied with our request to comply with the representations it had made to the consumers.

Mr. Nixon: On that question, has the hon. minister been approached by those residents of Ontario who have applied for service from Bell Canada and been denied that service with the reason being given by the corporation that they do not have a profit level rich enough to permit them to provide service, as has been the custom up until the present time? Has he had complaints along those lines and has he responded to them?

Hon. Mr. Handleman: Mr. Speaker, certainly I receive complaints along those lines and the response is that we have no legislative jurisdiction to interfere in those particular instances. We have responded to those complaints which came under the Business Practices Act.

ANTI-INFLATION PROGRAMME

Mr. Nixon: I'd like to return to the Treasurer just for a moment on the basis of his statement. Being aware of the way the provincial responses across Canada have been occurring, with Quebec, probably as expected, accepting an individual provincial responsibility for implementation and enforcement, how can the minister indicate that in fact it is some sort of a constitutional shallow argument to indicate, as we have indicated from our party, that we believe it is the responsibility of this government to accept a similar responsibility—that in fact it is not divisive, but in fact it does provide the kind of service and implementation—

Mr. Roy: It is complementary.

Mr. Nixon: —and enforcement that our people require, and in fact expect, because

we are a confederation and because we have the power, and in my view the responsibility, to do so from here?

Mr. Bullbrook: That is exactly right.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Mr. Speaker, I suppose one looks for far-out examples. I think if the member would reflect on the seriousness of the situation and appreciate the gravity of the economic problems facing this country, as recognized by the Prime Minister in his Thanksgiving Day speech and recognized by the Premiers of all the provinces, he would recognize that as in the case of real national emergency or a war, we would not raise 11 armies across this country; we would raise one. It is as simple as that.

Interjections.

Mr. Shore: Mr. Speaker, I think this subject is a massive subject. The hon. minister has said it is profound. I agree with him. I think it is not unreasonable to request time to debate this particular subject. There are two aspects of this, and I think it should be done.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The hon. member is supposed to be asking a supplementary question. The statement will be placed on the order paper—or at least it is highly likely that it will be—for debate. This is just a question period for information, not debate. Information, please.

Interjections.

Mr. Shore: I ask when we could debate this subject matter.

Mr. Speaker: I do not know. That is anticipating what the House leader will agree to have on the order paper and we cannot answer that at the present time.

Mr. Roy: In view of the Treasurer's great concern about making exceptions—and that seems to be the basis of his answers here; that the Treasurer is afraid to make exceptions, let us say, for the teachers, the doctors, and so on—how can he justify having, in fact, made an exception with Hydro by referring its price increase to a legislative committee and not directly to the board in Ottawa?

Mr. Speaker: A supplementary question is supposed to be based on the original question.

Mr. Roy: I am right on.

Mr. Speaker: The question had to do with each province treating the subject differently. Hydro seems to be specific. Unless the hon. member can amend the question to the original question, we will rule it out of order.

Mr. Bullbrook: Show me in there. It is not a regulatory body and you know it. You show me. There is the document.

Mr. Nixon: If you are not permitting that question to be answered, Mr. Speaker—does the hon. member want to pursue that?

Interjections.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The so-called supplementary had to do with Hydro and the hon. member's original question, as I understood it, had to do with the divisive nature of the policy across Canada. Would the hon. member continue with further questions?

Mr. Roy: No, we are talking about—

Mrs. Campbell: He was right on. Dead on.

TEACHER-SCHOOL BOARD NEGOTIATIONS

Mr. Nixon: On a similar subject I would like to direct a question to the Minister of Education. Will he explain to the House his comments, which have been referred to in the last two question periods, when he indicated that there could be an 18-month delay in dealing with the situation having to do with the teachers. The hon. minister knows how important this is. We face a strike across Metropolitan Toronto within the next two weeks. Would he further explain how it might possibly be that an agreement under Bill 100 could be carried out between teachers and the board and the salaries paid on that basis, pending the decision of the federal board, and whether, if the decision went against the teachers, would the teachers then make restitution to the board? How is that going to work, one more time?

Hon. Mr. Wells: First of all, Mr. Speaker, my friend has said there is going to be a teachers' strike. We don't know there is going to be a teachers' strike.

Mr. Nixon: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, just so there will be no misunderstanding—

Hon. Mr. Wells: I just want to say this—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The hon. minister.

Mr. Roy: Order. That means sit down.

Mr. Speaker: I did not get that inflection in the question. Am I right?

Mr. Nixon: On the point of order which I raised—

Mr. Speaker: Would the member repeat his question?

Mr. Nixon: I appreciate the Speaker's perception of the inflection. Nobody wants a strike. Would the minister please not draw that red herring across his answer?

Mr. Bullbrook: Just answer the question.

Hon. Mr. Wells: Mr. Speaker, the answer to that question in full detail will have to come when the anti-inflation board in Ottawa issues some of its rules, regulations and guidelines. It's almost an impossible question to answer at the present time.

If the employer and the employee—in this case the board and the teachers—reach an agreement they will, through their own legal counsel, have to interpret what they feel might or might not be a variation of the guidelines. Then they will have to pay accordingly knowing that if a decision is made to roll back at some particular time there is going to have to be restitution made, if that is the penalty imposed.

Mr. Lewis: That is a shambles.

Hon. Mr. Wells: The point I want to make—and I think it has to be made because I've been looking over some other situations like this because I think, as my friend the Treasurer (Mr. McKeough) has said, one can't isolate particular groups in this particular argument.

Mr. Roy: The minister has already.

Hon. Mr. Wells: Take the case of Falconbridge Nickel Mines. They're on strike at the present time. There have been industry settlements above the guidelines. The people at Falconbridge Nickel Mines are going to have to go to Ottawa and find out what the anti-inflation board says, if and when they reach an agreement. They should be treated no differently from the teachers of Metropolitan Toronto. There must be uniformity.

Mr. Nixon: Right; I have a supplementary. I didn't ask about Falconbridge.

Mr. Foulds: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, please.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. We will allow the original questioner to ask his supplementary and then the member for Port Arthur.

Mr. Foulds: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, I thought we rotated supplementaries?

Mr. Speaker: When the leaders are asking the question they have their opportunities for supplementaries first and then we rotate. The member for Brant-Oxford-Norfolk.

Mr. Nixon: Would the minister further clarify—we're interested in the Falconbridge thing but I'm asking about the teachers' situation—is it possible the taxpayers might be required to make restitution on behalf of the teachers as indicated by the chairman of the Metropolitan Toronto Board of Education when he was asked about the implications of the statement made by the Minister of Education?

Hon. Mr. Wells: No, I can't believe that the taxpayers would be asked to make restitution in that particular case.

Mr. Foulds: Mr. Speaker, does the minister feel that if the anti-inflation board rolls back an award given or an agreement arrived at between the board and the teachers, that constitutes a nullification of the settlement and it can be reopened? How else is the minister going to maintain the integrity of the government's legislation, Bill 100?

Hon. Mr. Wells: Mr. Speaker, I do not feel it would nullify the legislation or nullify the settlement any more than a rolling back in the Falconbridge situation would nullify the Ontario Labour Relations Act in the way it operates in this province.

Mr. Lewis: Does the minister really feel comfortable with all this, having pointed out that he knows nothing about the regulations, nothing about the rules, not at all how they will apply? He has no information whatsoever and yet blindly is prepared to surrender himself to the federal government with all of the implications which flow from his own remarks? What's wrong with the minister? He bought it, supposedly, in the national interest.

Hon. Mr. Wells: Mr. Speaker, I don't feel comfortable with it.

Mr. Mackenzie: Stand up and be counted.

Hon. Mr. Wells: I think, as the Hon. Robert Stanfield has said, it's rough justice.

Mr. Roy: Boy, oh boy, it's rough justice.

Hon. Mr. Wells: I want to say that I feel a lot more uncomfortable with the kinds of things which my friend, the Treasurer, said in the conclusion of his speech and the kinds of consequences which are going to arise if we don't all get together.

Mr. Lewis: Tough on wages, nothing on prices.

Hon. Mr. Wells: If I were at the federal level I'd be just as tough on prices and I hope they are as tough on prices.

Mr. Speaker: Is this a supplementary question on the original teacher question?

Mr. Sargent: A new question.

Mr. Speaker: We're not ready for new questions. The member for Brant-Oxford-Norfolk.

Mr. Nixon: No more questions, Mr. Speaker.

TELEVISION RECEPTION IN METROPOLITAN TORONTO

Mr. Williams: Mr. Speaker, a question of the Minister of Transportation and Communications: Could the minister advise this House as to what action could be undertaken by this government to ensure to the citizens of Ontario living within the Metropolitan Toronto area the continuing availability of a reasonable choice of television viewing within the metropolitan core, the likelihood of which is now in question as a result of recent action taken by the Canadian Radio-Television Commission and the proposed counteraction by major television stations within the Metropolitan Toronto area of influence.

Mr. Singer: Are you going to overrule the CRTC?

Mr. Roy: Did that take you by surprise?

Mr. Singer: You don't have the power to do that.

Hon. Mr. Snow: This is a matter certainly that is of concern to me and to the communications section of my ministry. It is a proposal put forward by the CRTC that these commercials of the foreign stations would be blacked out by the cable companies. I don't particularly agree with it, although I don't have any jurisdiction over it.

Mr. Singer: Absolutely right.

Hon. Mr. Snow: I don't disagree with the policy or the philosophy of the federal government or the CRTC in trying to preserve the revenues of Canadian advertisers for the Canadian television industry in order to have the revenues to improve programming within Ontario. I personally think the income tax provisions that the federal government has proposed but, as I understand, have not been passed yet, would have a more beneficial effect and perhaps work better as a deterrent against Canadian advertisers spending their advertising dollars in the United States than the blacking-out proposal that the CRTC has come up with.

Mr. Williams: Are there no representations that could be made by this government to the Canadian Radio-Television Commission to reassess the recent actions taken by it that are apparently going to have some adverse effect on the television viewing rights of the 3,000,000-odd people who live within the Metropolitan Toronto area?

Mr. Singer: Are you going to repeal the BNA Act?

Mr. Conway: On the bandwagon now.

Hon. Mr. Snow. Mr. Speaker, we are certainly observing what is going on at this level. I am not concerned at this moment that this so-called threatened action will take place.

Mr. Singer: If you solve it, tell Judy how you did it.

Mr. Martel: I thought that never happened to Canadians.

Hon. Mr. Snow: I think there are a great many complications involved before they would be allowed to do this. The broadcasting industry is a very highly regulated industry, I believe, in the United States as it is here. I'm sure the stations will have to make application for approval to do such things as this. I just don't think we are going to wake up tomorrow morning and have no television from Buffalo. We'll make our presentations when we feel the time is appropriate.

Mr. Deans: You might miss Howdy Doody or something.

CANADIAN WESTINGHOUSE

Mr. Deans: Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the Minister of Industry and Tourism. Is the minister aware of the controversy which has developed in Ottawa and in Hamilton as a result of the application of a Foreign Investment Review Act inquiry into the possible sale of Canadian Westinghouse Ltd.,

in the first place to White Industries and secondly to General Steel Wares? Is he also aware of the implications on the economy of Ontario and the economy of the 2,500 Westinghouse employees if that were to be enforced? Has the minister made any representation to Ottawa with regard to the effects of this action on the economy and on the people of this province?

Hon. Mr. Bennett: Mr. Speaker, my ministry answers to the federal government in respect of the Foreign Investment Review Act. We have been very close to the discussions relating to the takeover of Canadian Westinghouse assets in Canada, first of all by White Corp. of the United States, and more specifically two years ago when GSW of London, Ont., made an offer to Westinghouse Canada to buy its assets and to keep the greatest production within this province. We made our representation to Mr. Gillespie, the Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce for Canada at the time, clearly indicating how we observed the situation of the sale to the White Corp. and its effect on the economy of Ontario and the prospects of the industry, if sold to White, leaving this province.

Interjection.

Mr. Deans: Supplementary question: Since that particular sale appears to have gone by the boards, and since White is using its patent holdings to prevent a reasonable sale to General Steel Wares, is the government now making representation to the government of Canada in an attempt to preserve for those employees their jobs, and in an attempt to preserve for the economy of Ontario the employment opportunities that may well be lost some time in the next two or three weeks as a result of the government's actions?

Hon. Mr. Bennett: It's a federal matter, as the member will recognize, and I know very well that the federal government has given to the Westinghouse Corp. of the United States until Oct. 31, to come to an agreement on the patent rights and the use of the name for the goods they manufacture in this country. That relates to a deal or to an arrangement for the selling of the assets to GSW. We have made our position very clear to the federal government on how we believe it should be handled.

Mr. Deans: What is it? What is the ministry's position?

GREENHOUSE INDUSTRY

Mr. Mancini: I have a question for the Minister of Agriculture and Food. I would like to know if he is prepared to take any steps to assist the greenhouse industry, which is going to be seriously affected by the increases for heating oil and gasoline?

An hon. member: He knows all about greenhouses.

Hon. W. Newman: I have no plans at this point of time.

Mr. Laughren: Same old attitude.

Mr. Mancini: Supplementary: Would the minister be prepared to meet a delegation?

Hon. W. Newman: Yes. With the constraints of the time in the House, if we can work it in, we will be only too glad to meet a delegation.

Mr. Breithaupt: That's a change.

Mr. Singer: That's good.

An hon. member: Might even serve them coffee.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Mr. Martel: There's a whole lot of questions there.

Mr. Nixon: Let the record show the minister is smiling.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The member for Hamilton Centre wishes to ask a question.

RENT CONTROLS

Mr. Davison: A question of the Minister of Housing. Does the proposed rent review legislation apply to all rental premises—specifically small businesses, commercial and industrial premises—and if not, why not?

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: I believe the hon. member should wait until the legislation is introduced in the House next week, at which time we can have a full and proper debate on the legislation and on the bill.

Mr. MacDonald: Another area where you haven't been able to make up your mind yet.

Mr. Lewis: I thought we would get a statement on that, too.

PICKERING AIRPORT

Mr. Givens: I have a question of the Minister of Transportation and Communications. I would like to ask the minister what is the post-Pickering posture of this particular government with respect to the matter of a second airport in this area? Are we to understand that the matter of a second airport in this area has been completely abandoned by this government? Or are we to understand that the matter of a second airport has merely been left in abeyance and that the minister will revive the matter pending a more propitious economic climate? Or are we to understand that he will be pursuing the matter of a new site for a second airport at a different place? Please spare us the lecture of the fact that this is a matter for the federal government. I want to know what this government's posture is?

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: Which of the three does the member suggest?

An hon. member: Where does the member stand?

Hon. Mr. Snow: As a matter of fact I had a long telegram from Mr. Lang this morning.

Mr. Roy: Could the minister read it?

Hon. Mr. Snow: Obviously he couldn't send me a letter; but I do plan to have a meeting with my federal counterpart in the very near future. I have no plans of trying to suggest or seek an alternative site for another airport. I think there are a great many reasons for the action that has been taken to date in stopping the construction of the Pickering airport. I'll report further to the House after I have met with Mr. Lang.

Mr. Givens: A supplementary then: What the minister is saying, if I am to understand him clearly, is that the matter of a second airport for this area is still very much alive in the minds of members of this government.

Hon. Mr. Snow: I didn't say that at all.

Mr. Speaker: Order please. The member for Cornwall.

Mr. Samis: A supplementary to the minister.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Mr. Lewis: What did Mr. Lang's night letter say?

Mr. Singer: "Let's have a meeting."

Mr. Lewis: What does he ask the minister?

Hon. Mr. Snow: I have just received this letter—this morning as I was walking over here—and I would not—

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: It starts out "Dear Jim."

Hon. Mr. Snow: —I have not had an opportunity really to read it properly.

Mr. Gaunt: It just caught the minister in transit.

Mr. Lewis: No one offered to read it to you again.

Mr. Speaker: Order please. We are just about out of time. There are a lot of people who wish to ask questions, so we will keep the supplementaries to a bare minimum. The member for Rainy River; this will be the final one.

Mr. Reid: Yes. Has the minister got officials in his department who can tell us categorically whether or not we, in this area of Ontario, are going to need either an expansion of Malton or a second airport? Is the minister satisfied? Has he been told that by those people in his ministry?

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: Did the hon. member and his brother John flip a coin on that question?

Hon. Mr. Snow: I am sure the hon. member knows the policy of this government as far as expansion in Malton—

Mrs. Campbell: No we don't That is why we are asking. We haven't a clue.

Hon. Mr. Snow: Also, he should be aware of the stated policy of his federal cousins regarding Malton. Both governments have stated there will not be expansion of runway facilities at Malton airport.

Mr. Reid: What is the government's position? What is the guarantee?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Guaranteed.

VIOLENCE IN HOCKEY

Mr. Samis: A question of the Attorney General: Could he tell the House to what extent he outlined his views and discussed the whole question of violence in hockey with the officials of the NHL, WHA and OHA prior to his announcement on Tuesday?

Hon. Mr. McMurtry: I did not discuss my views with respect to my announcement with either the officials of the WHA or the NHL.

Interjection.

Hon. Mr. McMurtry: Their attitude towards this matter seems to me to be firmly on the record. Any consultation with those bodies would, in my view, be futile.

Mr. Reid: John Bassett is voting NDP.

Mr. Lewis: I hope not.

Hon. Mr. McMurtry: I am satisfied that the OHA is making serious efforts to control the problem of hockey violence and that they will continue to do so. I have had informal discussions with members related to the OHA and I intend to have continuing discussions.

Mr. Samis: A supplementary.

Mr. Speaker: Order please; a brief supplementary.

Mr. Samis: In view of an altercation that took place last night, could the minister tell the House if he has any intentions of pressing charges—such as creating a public disturbance or assault—against one Dave Williams and one Danny Gare?

Mr. Good: He means between Bassett and the Attorney General.

Mr. Sargent: He is going to put policemen on skates; that will fix that.

Mr. Samis: Is there no answer?

RENT REVIEW

Mrs. Campbell: My question is to the Minister of Housing. Following his announcement of his new bill and notwithstanding the answer made earlier today, would the minister tell me whether I am correct in assuming that the bill, when introduced, will be introduced by his ministry; that it will be administered by his ministry; and that it will cover both the public and private sectors in the housing field?

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: The answer to the first two parts of the question is yes; and the answer to the third part, I will have to find out for sure and let the member know.

Mr. Bullbrook: Sidney Handleman strikes again.

Mrs. Campbell: In view of the problems with the private sector and the public sector, would the minister now undertake to introduce into this House the books and records of Ontario Housing Corp. so that we may be in a position to assess their position with reference to rent review?

Mr. Singer: That is a good question.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: The answer is no.

Mr. Good: Let's have a vote on that.

[3:15]

WATER POLLUTION

Mr. Angus: Mr. Speaker, I will address my question to the Minister of the Environment. Approximately three weeks ago I talked to him on the phone on the day that he was reappointed to this position and asked if he would investigate the possibility of examining the waters downstream from all the pulp and paper mills that are shut down in this province. I would like to know today what his answer is on that.

Hon. Mr. Kerr: Mr. Speaker, I have had a report as a result of that testing. I must say that the testing in the particular rivers mentioned by the hon. member in the Thunder Bay area goes on, on a continuous basis pretty well, but I do have results from five stations in that particular area dealing with five different plants, with rather detailed information; and I would be happy to give that to the hon. member.

Mr. Singer: Supplementary, Mr. Speaker: Could I ask the minister, in view of his great interest in pollution in the north, about the success or the further achievement of the action against Dow Chemical, where its mercury is getting out into the water?

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: Right after the Sargent v. Singer case on the list. Right there.

Mr. Speaker: Order. That is not a supplementary.

ONTARIO NET CASH REQUIREMENTS

Mr. Sargent: A question to the Treasurer—

An hon. member: That's three days in a row.

Interjections.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. Let's hear the question.

Mr. Sargent: In reference to his statement today, the Moody's Investors and Standard and Poor in New York advised me today that they have devalued the credit of the Prov-

ince of Ontario in view of the fact that it has borrowings pending at $300 million on the New York market now, and they say that—

Mr. Speaker: Your question please?

An hon. member: Give him a chance.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. We are just about out of time. Will the member ask his question?

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Speaker, this is a very important matter for the people of Ontario.

Interjections.

Mr. MacDonald: What is the question?

Mr. Speaker: This is a question period and we wish the question.

Mr. Sargent: Can the Treasurer tell us how he is going to finance two consecutive deficits in excess of $2 billion this year, in view of the fact he has been spending $6 million a day plus interest—$8 million a day he has been losing? How is he going to correct this before—

Mr. Speaker: Will the hon. member ask his question?

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: I don't know why you tolerate that.

Mr. Sargent: In this document he gave us today, does it tell us how he is going to correct the current deficit position in Ontario?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Mr. Speaker, if the member reads it he will find that we expect the forecast now—and I think it is really a little on the early side—however the forecast now would indicate a growth in gross national product and a growth in our revenues in fiscal 1976-1977 of somewhere in the neighbourhood of 12 to 13 per cent. That's a very preliminary estimate. Obviously if we hold our expenditure growth to 10 per cent, as we have set our target, then our net cash requirements will diminish from what they are this year.

Mr. Shore: On that point, I would just like to ask how the minister, with a 22 per cent expenditure growth in the 1975 fiscal year, expects to have it down to 10 per cent next year?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: I don't see that we have a 22 per cent expenditure increase. I would be glad to discuss that figure with—

Mr. Shore: That's a point in the minister's documents.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: I would be glad to discuss that with the member.

Mr. Shore: The minister doesn't want that to be public.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: The point is, and I make no bones about it, our expenditures have been growing over the last five years at the rate of about 14.5 per cent per year. It is going to be very difficult to hold our expenditure growth to only 10 per cent, very difficult indeed.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. We just have a moment left, time for another question. The member for Hamilton East.

USE OF HAZARDOUS CHEMICALS

Mr. Mackenzie: Is the minister aware that a dangerous chemical called Kepone, used in pesticides, is being used in the FMC Corp. plant in Burlington, Ont.? This pesticide has caused hospitalization of workers and their families in the United States and has been banned from use in the United States by the US Environmental Protection Agency. Would the minister check to see if adequate safeguards exist for the workers and report back to us?

Hon. F. S. Miller: I will.

ONTARIO SALES TAX

Mr. Haggerty: I would like to direct a question to the Treasurer. I listened with great interest to the Treasurer's statement this afternoon, as it relates to the economic conditions and inflation, and in particular, his comments to the member for Grey-Bruce Is the government's intention or policy to allow the reinstatement of the provincial sales tax from the present five per cent to seven per cent after Jan. 1, 1976? Will this increase not add further to the present situation of unemployment and hardship to the lower income persons in Ontario?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Mr. Speaker, I have no intention of bringing in amendments to the Retail Sales Tax Act.

Mr. Roy: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Doesn't the minister feel that when the government increases taxes in the province it should at least be debated in this House?

If the Treasurer is going to let the tax go to seven per cent again we debate it here.

Hon. Mr. Handleman: We debated the budget.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Mr. Speaker, you will recall that a bill was introduced here —and passed by this Legislature— which called for the termination of that tax reduction on Dec. 31. As I recall, the member was most vocal in discussing that bill, as he is on a number of other things.

Mr. Roy: That's right, I like to be.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes. He is.

Mr. Good: The Treasurer said it was done as an economic measure.

Mr. Speaker: The oral question period has expired.

Petitions.

Interjection.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Motions.

Hon. Mr. Welch moved, seconded by Mr. Deans, that a select committee of this House be appointed to study reports 4 and 5 of the Ontario Commission on the Legislature, to report to the Legislature on the advisability of implementing the recommendations of the reports or any part or parts thereof; and, if deemed advisable, the method and timing of implementation.

The said committee to consist of the following seven members: Messrs. Morrow, chairman; Cassidy, Gaunt, Good, Gregory, Martel and McNeil.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. Deans: It will be called the Martel report.

Hon. Mr. Timbrell moved, seconded by Mr. Deans, that a select committee of this House be appointed to review Ontario Hydro's proposals to increase bulk power rates for 1976, together with the report of the Ontario Energy Board to the Minister of Energy thereon under section 37a of the Ontario Energy Board Act, dated Oct. 10, 1975, and such other information as the committee may consider relevant for its purpose in light of the anti-inflation programme of the government of Canada and the Ontario commitment to that programme; and to prepare and submit a report before the end of December, 1975, advising the Legislature whether, in the opinion of the committee, such rate increase proposals are in keeping with or supportive of the anti-inflation programme of the government of Canada and the Ontario commitment to that programme and consistent with Ontario Hydro's obligation to provide power at cost; and if not, to report to the Legislature with its recommendations.

In carrying out its terms of reference the committee shall have regard to the following factors: Current economic conditions; recovery of additional operating costs; dependence upon adequate electricity supply for Ontario's future economic well-being; maintenance of Hydro's financial integrity; any provisions of the said programme respecting increasing energy prices.

And that the select committee have authority to sit during the interval between sessions and have full power and authority to employ counsel and such other personnel as may be deemed advisable and to call for persons, papers and things, and to examine witnesses under oath; and the assembly doth command and compel attendance before the said select committee of such persons and the production of such papers and things as the committee may deem necesssary for any of its proceedings and deliberations for which the hon. Speaker may issue his warrant or warrants; the said committee to be composed of the following 12 members: Messrs. MacDonald, chairman; Bullbrook, Deans, Drea, Gigantes, Grossman, Haggerty, Maeck, Peterson, Renwick, Williams and Wiseman.

The said committee may request such coverage of its proceedings by Hansard and the printing of such papers as the committee deems appropriate.

Mr. Deans: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a matter of procedure. I want to make it clear that we would give unanimous consent for that committee to begin sitting immediately if that were asked for.

Mr. Bullbrook: I don't think it is needed.

Mr. Deans: I think it is in fact. I think it has to stand for notice.

Mr. Bullbrook: Why?

Mr. Deans: I think it requires notice.

Mr. Speaker: I think it could meet at the call of the chairman.

Mr. Bullbrook: I think you are right—at the call of the chairman.

Mr. Roy: Mr. Speaker, I would like to make a couple of comments on the motion. We are in agreement, of course, with the setup of the committee and the participation of this party in the committee proceedings, but the point I must emphasize relates to the answers given by the Treasurer (Mr. McKeough) all this afternoon about making exceptions. There is an exception being made to the rule right now about a group or a company; we have got a situation regarding Hydro where we now set up a legislative committee to study the effects of the increases vis-à-vis the anti-inflationary measures of the federal government. I suggest to the Premier (Mr. Davis) and to the Treasurer that that clearly is an exception in this case and it reinforces the point my leader was making here about the teachers or other professionals, that our programme would be complementary to and not in competition with the federal measures.

I put the point to you, Mr. Speaker, and to the Premier, that in fact while the province talks about not making any except, it has made one now.

Mr. Cassidy: Is the member running for some kind of office or something?

Mr. Roy: I have always been this way. What is the member talking about?

Mr. Lewis: Mr. Speaker, I would just like to make a quick reflection on this motion, expressing obvious approval of the intent to proceed.

I think it is pretty clear that the opposition parties have joined in this intent to proceed in a way which should cause no illusion to the government. It is our determination to have that rate increase reduced, period. That is what this committee is all about. I assume it will be evaluated in the best sense but the motivation is to get that rate down.

I am fascinated in that context to note the Treasurer's statement today, which clearly indicates that the government also wants to bring Hydro's rates down; it clearly indicates it on page 12 and in the reference to capital borrowing somewhat later in the statement. It is worth noting in that context that the government itself didn't have the courage to face it, so it is appointing a committee to do it. In fact, I suspect the committee will do it for the government, but I must say that the committee surely should receive encouragement from the clear and explicit intent in the statement that Hydro is one corporation that is out of control and needs to have its rates reduced.

Mr. Bullbrook: If we are going to join in somewhat of a debate on this—I hadn't intended to make any remarks—I want to first express appreciation to the Premier and his colleague for having the opportunity to digest the terms of reference. I want the Leader of the Opposition to know that I don't regard our responsibility in connection with this as a predisposition towards lowering the rates; that isn't why I sit there. I hope that will be the outcome, but as I understand the responsibility that we are undertaking it is basically to review the proposal for a rate increase, to review the report of the Ontario Energy Board in connection with their recommendations—and now the operative and important words—in the light of the federal guidelines and Ontario's commitment to those guidelines.

Mr. Deans: There is more.

Mr. Lewis: Much more than that.

Mr. Bullbrook: Does the member want me to read them? If I am given a copy I will read them if I have left something out.

[3:30]

Mr. Deans: The member probably left them at home.

Mr. Bullbrook: I read them about 10:30 this morning. Does the member think I am a walking thesaurus or encyclopedia or something?

Mr. Deans: The member is telling us he knows what was said. He obviously doesn't.

Mr. Bullbrook: I'll reiterate for the sake of clarity—and I invite my friends to correct me—what I understand the basic terms of reference to be. They are for us to review the Hydro rate increase proposals—correct? The report of the Ontario Energy Board in connection with those rate increases—

Mr. Deans: And any other matters.

Mr. Bullbrook: Then the NDP wants the addition of their words—help me, if you would. Then we include those additional words—

Mr. Lewis: It is already there.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member is correct. Would you proceed.

Mr. Bullbrook: —in the light of the federal guidelines and in the light of Ontario's commitment to that. I want to say this to you, and I don't mean to be argumentative—

Mr. Deans: Hydro's provision of power and cost.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The hon. member for Sarnia has the floor.

Mr. Bullbrook: If the member wants to speak—and he had his moment—go ahead. I just want to give the House my point of view, for what it's worth.

Mr. Speaker: Would the hon. member for Sarnia continue addressing the chair?

Mr. Bullbrook: May I say to you what I feel the anomaly here is? Honestly I must say this to the Premier since we are called upon now to do this. First of all, I must agree with the Leader of the Opposition. I say basically—and notwithstanding what we are doing—eventually it's the government's responsibility to come to grips with this. But it is very difficult for us to sit in a temperate and quiet fashion when the Treasurer says that if he opted under section 4(4) of the federal legislation we would be 11 horses going in different directions. As the Leader of the Opposition says, when you talk about the government's responsibility now and when it undertakes here to control to some extent the capital borrowing of Ontario Hydro, it's very difficult to understand on our part your integrity of purpose.

I want to say this to you, Mr. Speaker, how can we accept and how can we understand a government that is prepared to abdicate regarding the people whom it pays, the teachers under its direct jurisdiction, and other matters of contention to the federal anti-inflationary board and which says at the same time it is prepared to accept the responsibility in connection with Hydro rates. The fact is that I invited the Premier to respond and I hope he will please rise in connection with this debate, because he responded to me yesterday. He said, "Do you know, my friend, that Hydro has accepted?" Surely I know it has accepted; absolutely it has accepted.

All you had was an invitation here, in connection with provincially regulated utilities, to deal with them in the context of the federal guidelines. Ontario Hydro isn't even a provincially regulated utility. So we know it has accepted. What we are saying is that if the government is sincere in regarding this as a national emergency that can only be dealt with by a national body, then surely the impact on every consumer in the Province of Ontario by a proposed increase in Hydro rates must in effect be one that is national in scope.

Frankly, it's ridiculous to say all these other matters, including the people whom we pay, including the public service of this province, must be subject to the definition of their position in this province by Jean-Luc Pepin. We don't agree with that. It is the responsibility of the government of Ontario to come to grips with this matter; it's not his responsibility.

Mr. Lewis: No, and when things go wrong, it will be the Ontario government's fault.

Mr. Bullbrook: We say the government is right in accepting this. We applaud the invitation on its part to participate in seeing whether these increases are appropriate—from the words of the New Democratic Party in their amendment, and I didn't understand what they meant before by those additional words—in the light of the federal guidelines and Ontario's commitment to those guidelines. We accept that.

We say to the Premier that frankly we want to join him in accepting the other responsibility towards his public servants and towards those in other provincial institutions about which, under section 4(4), the federal government has said to you that if you feel it is in the best interests of your people, because of your knowledge of their peculiar needs, you should maintain the control. Frankly, with the public servants, in the context of the minister's direct responsibility to them, he should opt in that fashion.

I appreciate the opportunity of making mention of these thoughts. Frankly, I feel the attitude of this party will be, as I understand it, without reservation and without equivocation, one of co-operation with the federal guidelines; but one of a realization that, with respect to those constitutional jurisdictions that we have, it's better done by us. Nay, more than that, that we have a responsibility to do it.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, just to reply very briefly and not to be controversial, I think really there are two distinct matters being discussed. I think the question of the wording of the resolution, what is to be discussed by the committee, I hope is clearly understood. I was encouraged by the member for Sarnia as it related to his, or hopefully his party's, approach to the activities of that committee.

I say with respect to the member for Sarnia that I think there is a very distinct difference as it relates to a rate increase of Ontario Hydro—which is totally a non-profit organization, totally in the public sector—and

the question of the guidelines applying or not applying. I hope this is understood. I think, with respect, there is a very distinct difference between that and other aspects of the federal programme.

Now, it's great for the member for Sarnia to say constitutionally—and that's why it's in the federal bill, the 4(4)—that the provinces can go their own way. I'm not arguing that. I'm not arguing the constitution. I think it is also fair to state that the Minister of Finance—and probably one might also say the Prime Minister of Canada—was particularly anxious that we move into this programme on the basis of 4(3).

I think it's an area that, yes, the House should discuss, but I would just have to take issue with the suggestion that we are not prepared in this province to discharge our responsibilities. I could tell the hon. member, I think one could guess, that if we had gone the route of 4(4), there would be some who might say that we do not want to co-operate in the national interest.

Mr. Nixon: Who would say that?

Hon. Mr. Davis: I say that is a possibility. It might even have emerged from the Liberal Party of Ontario—who knows.

Mr. Roy: No, we have been consistent; the government has not.

Hon. Mr. Davis: I think it is a fair statement, though, that that argument might have emerged.

Mr. Bullbrook: It is an imputation without foundation; but go ahead.

Hon. Mr. Davis: All right, but I mean that we all live with that sort of thing—and the member for Sarnia understands that. I just want to make it clear what the Treasurer said today, and what I have said, that I think it is a difficult situation for Canada.

I think there is merit, substantial merit, in approaching it on a national basis. And with great respect, really, we are debating something that isn't part of this resolution.

I want to assure the member for Sarnia and any other members of this House that this decision has not been taken lightly. We are anxious to see the programme work. It might have been very simple for us, in political terms, to have said: "We told you so; why not a year ago." We haven't. We've said: "We're going to try and help." I think that is important for the people of this province, because they too are citizens of this country and it is a matter of national concern.

I say once again that I really haven't any observations. I think that I'm totally out of order in making these observations; but I would say I'm only following the lead of the member for Sarnia when he got into that aspect in his discussion of the resolution.

Mr. Lewis: It is nice to have the Premier participate in this way. It is one of the pleasures of minority governments.

Hon. Mr. Davis: The Leader of the Opposition doesn't know how much more fun this is than some of the other things we do.

Mr. Lewis: I suspect it is. The Premier will probably enjoy it.

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: I wonder if I might just make a few comments that would perhaps close this brief debate. I first of all want to thank the representatives of the two opposition parties for the way in which they carried themselves in the discussions that led up to this resolution. I'm particularly pleased that the member for York South (Mr. MacDonald) has agreed to chair this committee. Having served with that gentleman on the select committee some three years ago, I know of his fairness. I know of his devotion to his responsibilities and his determination to carry out his responsibilities to the limits that are set out for him. I have every faith in that man.

I want to suggest too, particularly in reply to the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Lewis), that we look back, as I have in recent days, over the chain of events in the last few months. Look at such things as my reference to the Energy Board on April 28. Look at the supplementary action demanded of Hydro in July. Look at the fact that we are, as we do regularly, reviewing again their capital programme of borrowing and making every possible effort to ensure that the borrowing programme is only what is needed—and that, of course, relates to the capital programme therefore. In fact it is the government's desire, and always has been, that the Hydro rates be the lowest possible, bearing in mind such factors as the financial integrity of Hydro and a reasonable supply of electricity to the province and a number of other factors all of which, I'm sure, will be discussed in the committee.

We've discussed this on a number of occasions since I became Minister of Energy. I recall many more discussions when by predecessor, the hon. Treasurer (Mr. McKeough), filled this portfolio. I would hope that the deliberations of this committee will be frank and full and that, in fact, the oppo-

sition parties will put forward their proposals in as clear a way as possible so that the people of Ontario can have a clear picture of what Ontario Hydro is today; what is the proposed future and what are the alternatives.

As the Minister of Energy, I look forward to assisting this committee in any way I can and assisting the members to bring about the best possible results of their work.

Mr. Speaker: Is it the pleasure of the House that this motion carry?

Motion agreed to.

Mr. Speaker: Motions.

Introduction of bills. The member for Ottawa East.

HIGHWAY TRAFFIC AMENDMENT ACT

Mr. Roy moved first reading of bill intituled An Act to amend the Highway Traffic Act.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Mr. Roy: Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this bill is to lower the speed limit on Ontario highways to 55 miles per hour. The result of this, Mr. Speaker, is dual. Not only do we save energy but we reduce the accident and injury rate and we have statistics to prove that. When we consider the cost to the health care system for motor vehicle accidents in this province is $1 million a day, I think it is an important piece of legislation. It was introduced in the last session and I am doing so again.

Mr. Speaker: Orders of the day.

[3:45]

Clerk of the House: The first order; consideration of the speech of the Honourable the Lieutenant Governor at the opening of the session.

THRONE SPEECH DEBATE

Mr. Norton moved, that a humble address be presented to the Honourable the Lieutenant Governor as follows:

To the Honourable Pauline M. McGibbon, OC, BA, LlD, DU (Ottawa), BAA (Theatre), Lieutenant Governor of Ontario:

We, Her Majesty's most dutiful and loyal subjects of the legislative assembly of the Province of Ontario now assembled, beg leave to thank Your Honour for the gracious speech which Your Honour has addressed to us.

[3:45]

Mr. Norton: Mr. Speaker, it is both an honour and a great privilege for me, as a freshman member of this assembly, to be called upon to move this address to Her Honour the Lieutenant Governor.

I'm certain that all of the hon. members in the Legislature will join me in thanking her for her words of confidence and encouragement and the challenge which she issued to us at this time when we, as legislators, and the people we serve face perhaps one of the most difficult periods in our history.

In the weeks and months which lie ahead we, the members of the 30th Legislature of the province, must come to grips with some of the most complex problems ever to be faced by people in public service—problems which we share with our fellow citizens throughout Canada and problems which indeed we share with people throughout the world. The solution of these problems will demand of us not only co-operation within this House but also co-operation with the other levels of government in this country. The tools by which the solutions will be sought will of necessity be imperfect economic tools.

It is my privilege to be among the first in this session to offer to you, Mr. Speaker, my sincere congratulations on your election to the post of the Speaker of this assembly. We are all confident that you will continue to serve in your role with the distinction and impartiality which has marked your service in that office in the past.

I also wish to congratulate the Premier (Mr. Davis), the leader of our government, a man whose qualities as a public servant, a politician and administrator have been amply demonstrated throughout his parliamentary career.

I should also like to congratulate the members of his cabinet, the new members and those who are continuing in cabinet posts. Particularly, I would like to wish well the two new members of the cabinet who also are new to this House, the hon. B. Stephenson and the hon. Mr. McMurtry.

I am proud to stand in this assembly as the successor to one of the finest gentlemen I believe ever to hold office in the Province of Ontario. He is a man of great strength of character, who served this House over a period of 12 years, both as a member and as a minister of the Crown; a man whose quality of service brought honour to himself, to this

House and to the people he served throughout Ontario. Mr. Syl Apps has set a very high standard and a very fine example for me to follow.

In representing Kingston and the Islands I represent a riding which has a very special place in the history of this province and of this nation. I believe we are the oldest permanently settled community in Ontario, having recently celebrated our tercentary. It is a community which played a special and very significant role in the earlier development of parliamentary democracy in this country. It is a community which, if not the birthplace of Confederation, is surely the place where it was conceived. I was going to carry that further but I thought better of it before the assembly sat this afternoon.

In some respects Kingston and the Islands is a microscosm of Ontario. We have an interesting mix of urban, suburban and rural lifestyles, with the urban component becoming more and more cosmopolitan and multicultural as our population grows and changes.

We share with the other urban centres in this province the challenge of meeting the needs of the people for more adequate housing, more adequate public transportation and the development of a greater employment opportunity as well as most other contemporary urban problems.

Our differences from other urban centres in Ontario in this respect are mainly differences in scale. There is a great concern that, as growth in our community continues, the mechanism be there and the strength be there to ensure that it be carefully planned to protect the quality of the life of our people and the quality of the natural environment with which we in our riding are so greatly blessed.

We are proud of our reputation as one of Ontario's principal tourist and recreational centres, a reputation due mainly to our historical character, the hospitality of our people and the beautiful natural setting at the confluence of the great St. Lawrence and Cataraqui rivers. But we feel strongly the need to develop a broader industrial base to expand employment opportunities and to diversify our local economy. The industrial parks assistance programme referred to in the Throne Speech at the opening of this session is a particularly welcome source of assistance to our community.

We are especially pleased to be able to be the main host community in Ontario in 1976 as the world focuses its attention on the 1976 Olympics, Kingston being the site for the sailing events.

As a newly elected member in this Legislature, I would like to focus my attention for a few moments upon the tasks that lie ahead of us. As I think has been gathered from the discussions that have taken place since the Legislature opened, probably the most pressing issue facing us is that of coming to grips with the economic ills that plague our nation and the world.

There are many simplistic answers to the puzzling questions that international and domestic economic turmoil have posed to all concerned citizens. There are some who would blame the public sector exclusively for the burden on the taxpayer and the slow growth in our economy. There are others who would seek to blame only labour or only private industry in their development of the analysis of what is going wrong.

I happen to believe that to spend time pointing fingers and trying to affix blame is in itself perhaps one of the most non-productive responses to the real economic crisis that many of us sense.

It is important that we do not lose our perspective here in Ontario. It is important that we recognize that, as a province, those who are in need are better served here, those who are productive are more encouraged here and those who enjoy life are more numerous here than in any other jurisdiction in this great Dominion.

It is all too easy in seeking simple answers to overlook the progress that we have already made in this province. It is the social problems, economic threats and financial insecurity created by the economic conditions of our time that are the critical enemies which all of us in this Legislature must turn our attention to. That, I think, is the lesson we can learn from the decision of the people on Sept. 18 and that, more directly than any other single directive, is the mandate that all of us in this Legislature, regardless of our political affiliation, have a duty to fulfil.

I believe that the Throne Speech read by Her Honour represents a clear and concise programme for immediate action and immediate response to those issues which are most critical in Ontario today.

I want to say to those in the loyal opposition that while in the 1950s and the 1960s it was appropriate and perhaps mandatory to err on the side of bigness, on the side of central planning or on the side of large expenditures to meet large needs, it is surely clearer today than ever before that people do not want hollow promises from government. They do not want programmes from government that they themselves cannot

afford. The simple principle of being able to afford what you propose is a very basic principle insofar as the credibility of government in our entire democratic system is concerned.

I come to this Legislature as a new member committed to serve my constituents and to working with all the other members of this Legislature, regardless of political affiliation, to see that the broad public interest of the people of Ontario is served in every possible way. I will not be party to any pie-in-the-sky government. I will not be party to politics of misrepresentation or groundless optimism. The people want the truth. They want to know what government can afford, they want to know why a government programme is necessary and they want to know why a programme is necessary now.

The very same responsibility that we in government face, the one of self-justification, is one which no thinking citizen in this province would believe that those in the private sector do not themselves face. It is perhaps a critical factor in the presentation of a free market economy. It is the only way to guarantee a continued right to pursue profit fairly in our society. A government which knows of a social ill but which will not move to see it resolved is a government that is, in and of itself, part of a greater social ill. A government that seeks to create the impression of a social ill so that it can move for political gain to rectify an alleged ill at great social cost, is a government that perpetrates its own irrelevance and cynicism at a cost to the entire parliamentary and democratic system.

I feel confident that this Legislature will move to endorse the pragmatic, direct and the responsive approach to the issues facing today's Ontario that is included in the Throne Speech which it is my great privilege to speak in support of. I feel even more confident that despite the scars of previous campaigns there is, among the majority of the members of this Legislature, a definitive and clearly perceived common desire to work out solutions together to problems that face our society.

There may be more politics and more negotiations, more give and take in this Parliament than there has been for some time. That does not mean that there cannot be a level of public service and public responsiveness that would be a source of pride to any self-respecting public official. It is to help achieve that level of public service that I believe I was sent to this Legislature, and it is to be part of that effort to serve the public that gives me greatest pride.

In closing may I say that I trust that I share with all my colleagues in this House the sense that we, that is, all of us, have an important leadership role to fulfil in facing the economic difficulties that are testing our people and our province and our nation at this time. It is at times of crisis that we are often able to demonstrate the greatest strengths and qualities of character, and this may be such a time. The people we serve may well look to us, each of us, the way we conduct ourselves in this House, the seriousmindedness with which we approach the task which is before us. They may look to this as a barometer by which to judge the seriousness with which they participate in the broader attack on our economic and social problems in this country. How else can we justifiably seek their confidence at a critical time like this?

Our Premier, who, in the face of federal government intransigence, led this nation's efforts to pressure the federal government into demonstrative leadership, is now, in the face of federal actions, urging us to join in support of proposed measures in the national interest. This initiative on his part, I suggest, has enhanced his national stature as a leader.

There will be differences of opinion in this House; there will be times of testing and conflict, and I am sure conflict that I and other freshmen to the Legislature have not experienced before in such magnitude, but above all, sir, I trust that we will not lose sight of the broader public interest which we are here to serve and the principal responsibilities we have to discharge to the people of Ontario. May we seek to do so in the very highest and finest traditions of this institution.

Mr. Jones: Mr. Speaker, I am indeed privileged to have this opportunity to second the motion of the hon. member for Kingston and the Islands for the adoption of the Speech from the Throne presented by the hon. Lieutenant Governor of the Province of Ontario.

The people of this province are indeed grateful that Her Honour, the Lieutenant Governor, has shown such a great interest and concern for their well-being. The Speech from the Throne has laid the foundation of our deliberations and actions over the months ahead for the welfare of the people, combined with a good common-sense approach. Our government will be called upon to deal with a great many diverse and complex issues which face us during these troubled economic times. I feel certain that the new cabinet,

under the capable and inspiring leadership of the Premier, will continue to provide for this province in the most productive and beneficial manner.

I would like at this time, Mr. Speaker, to congratulate the new ministers of our government, the Minister of Correctional Services (Mr. J. R. Smith), the Minister of Government Services (Mrs. Scrivener), the Minister of Colleges and Universities (Mr. Parrott), the Minister of Community and Social Services (Mr. Taylor), the Minister of Labour (B. Stephenson), the Attorney General (Mr. McMurtry) and the Minister without Portfolio (Mr. Henderson).

Further, I wish to extend my congratulations to those ministers who are changing portfolios and those who are retaining cabinet positions held during the 29th session. I also wish to offer, Mr. Speaker, most sincere congratulations on your election to the post of Speaker of this assembly. I know that all the hon. members of this Legislature are fully aware of your wealth of experience, your years of service as deputy chairman and chairman of the committee of the whole House.

I am proud to be here as a new member today, representing the new constituency of Mississauga North. I was also proud to see and be, with the other members present today, a part of what I sense is history—in the swearing in ceremonies of our new Ombudsman.

Our riding is geographically large and presently includes approximately 80,000 constituents in political terms. Mississauga North forms part of a most impressive historical record. Former members of the county of Peel, such as Gordon Graydon and Col. Thomas Kennedy, a past Premier of Ontario, have made outstanding contributions to the political life of our province. I hope that I will be a worthy representative in this same tradition.

I am both humble and proud that the new riding of Mississauga North is composed of parts of the former ridings of Peel North and Peel South, being represented respectively by our Premier and the chief government whip, the member for Mississauga South (Mr. Kennedy). These men have been and are outstanding examples of public servants.

My constituency is composed of a large part of the city of Mississauga. To many the image of Mississauga is an area of rapid urbanization. And it is that. Some people seem, though, genuinely surprised that the riding includes some of Ontario's most productive farmland. I am happy, as you will notice by the apples, Mr. Speaker, to share some of the fruits of this agricultural history in abundance with fellow members of this House.

In our area, one can see a mixture of rural and urban community together. There is a blending of some of the older villages, such as the village I come from, called Streetsville, and we have, of course, Malton and the new cities—Meadowvale and Erin Mills. We have, indeed, a diverse community in this new Mississauga North, in the centre of this region of Peel. What we are out to do is to effectively have a combination of the old and the new and I, as a member of this Legislature in that community, will do all that I can to work with others in maintaining a balance of both the preservation and the growth of this area.

Another important aspect of my constituency is that it includes the International Airport. I am well aware of the problems of residents who live near a major airport. I listened, of course, intensely and with interest to the comments that have gone on in this House since this session started and I noted how often the airport was mentioned. I live with it. So I bring to this House, hopefully, some first-hand advice, thoughts and comments that I hope to have an opportunity to extend, due to the recent exercise of dialogue with the people of my riding.

I am aware of the need for foresighted land-use planning while keeping in mind noise cone locations and traffic patterns. I am also well aware of the tremendous investment in roads and ancillary services required to support an international airport. It is clear that our government took a bold step in their rejecting of a spending of hundreds of millions of dollars for the Pickering airport, in view of our current economic circumstances, in view also of the changing travel habits and in view of our energy situation. I would also like to go on record as saying further that my constituents are opposed to any runway expansion at Malton. So am I and so is our government.

It seems to me as a new member that we need to see that, and the public needs to see, that governments are prepared to take dramatic steps in order to reduce spending. We have all heard the comments in these last few days and we heard earlier this day of the need for the fiscal responsibility. Here was, I repeat, a bold step by this government. We must have more Pickering decisions if Canada's economic situation is to have the attention that is required at this time.

I think it is important that we establish at the outset that the economic challenges facing our province and the policy matters which

members of this Legislature are going to be addressing themselves to, will have to be dealt with effectively. If there is an attitude that intimidates within this Legislature, we are divided into enemies and friends.

It can be said, and said again—and it must be said again—that the only enemies I see in this Legislature are the threats of economic insecurity which everyone in this Legislature is committed to combat.

I think it also important that we say at the outset that no party in this Legislature can claim to have a monopoly on public concern or concerns for the wage-earners mentioned earlier today or, as they are some times referred to, "the little men." It is a sad commentary on politics today that there are many who seek, it seems, to fill their careers, to fill their own futures, by pointing to some as the friends of the corporate elite. I heard it in this House on the first day of my attendance; the primping of themselves as friends of the working man.

I am sorry that the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Lewis) is not in his chair at this time. I speak with very sincere respect to the Leader of the Opposition in whose present riding I grew up and I was one of six children in a working class household. The pretence advanced during this last election —hopefully we won't see it advance further in this Legislature but I have the suspicion it will—was that his party and his members are the only ones who are to help the wage-earner—or "the little man" as I heard yet again—in Ontario. This is insulting to my side.

Mr. Deans: Are you feeling a little vulnerable?

Mr. Jones: One of the great temptations in Ontario today is that of the simple solution.

Mr. Deans: Why don't you tell him his maiden speech is supposed to be non-provocative?

Mr. Jones: The one-line answer to the complex problems that face the people of this province is no longer acceptable to the voters. All politicians must share in the guilt of having created the assumption publicly that one-line answers might work. I would submit that the people don't believe they work any more and won't believe politicians who try to suggest they can.

Interjection.

Mr. Jones: In seconding the motion on the Speech from the Throne, I am stating as clearly as I can that it is a realistic speech for today's Ontario. I came from a constituency where there are many young people who have just purchased a home or are trying to purchase a home. Many live in apartments, beginning a life together, if you wish, and they don't start with a basic cynicism about the political process. They don't begin with mistrust or distrust I say, as a member of this House, specifically to those of my colleagues in this Legislature, who are elected for the first time. It is my conviction that the working men and women of this province truly want this Legislature to work and they want the government of Ontario to be effective.

It seems to me that the next election will be an important one for Ontario, as was the last; it will be a terribly important one, and the public should have appropriate facts for its consideration.

If, for example, the New Democratic Party believes that a socialistic policy is appropriate for this province, let it say so. In the clearest of terms, I will be aggressive in putting forward my arguments to oppose that view and I would be less than forthright if I didn't indicate it in these, my first comments.

Interjections.

Mr. Jones: I make these comments not in a partisan sense, but with the sincere desire to reduce the frustrations of the electorate which I saw in the last election.

If individuals are to be representatives of our constituents then let us tell it as it is. It is sad that the political parties might choose the politics of confrontation—we have seen it—the politics of rattling the ballot box, as one would a sabre in medieval and feudal war. Indeed, I would think that the people of Ontario are tired of confrontation and they want a meaningful, co-operative government from those of us in office.

I would hope that in dealing with the substantial thrust of the Speech from the Throne we are able to understand that it is a speech which pinpoints key problems and isolates those on which the government can act now.

If there are those opposite who believe that we should move quickly, without consultation and observing the comments of today from the federal government—there is a new anti-inflation programme—and when provincial governments, including Liberal and New Democratic governments in other provinces, have a consensus to be found on mat-

ters like rents unilaterally during what is clearly a serious national economic crisis, then let them say so and say so in this House.

If there are those who believe that the only way Ontario can do its part in an anti-inflation programme is by creating the eleventh set of guidelines we heard of earlier, or its own set of rules and regulations and its own bureaucracy and spending more of the people's money to find some way of protecting the purchasing value of the people's money, if that is the only way they think Ontario can be helpful let them say so.

The posture of this government has been responsive and we have indicated maximum co-operation for economic action with the national government of this country. We have indicated areas within the programme that we disagree with and we are working for change. Nevertheless, we are on whatever national team can be put together to try to deal with the economic pressures which are attacking the lifestyle of every constituent who sent a representative to this Legislature on Sept. 18.

If there are those in this Legislature who think they can serve Ontario better by creating another bureaucracy or more cumbersome world rules that could work against the success of any such programme, then let them say so.

We have outlined in the Throne Speech several measures which are designed to assist various groups in our society in coping with the pressures of inflation.

Among those most seriously affected by increases in the cost of living are the many pensioners who are existing on fixed incomes. In order to assist our senior citizens, new aid to low-income pensioners in meeting their rental obligations would be an important feature of this legislative session. I know that this special assistance will meet with province-wide approval.

Also in this session, our government will be implementing a programme of rent restraint applied to the cost of rental accommodation. These measures will be supplemented by changes to the existing landlord and tenant legislation to provide protection for tenants against unfair and improper eviction and minimum lease times and adequate notice of landlords' intentions not to renew. Further initiatives will be undertaken to increase the supply of rental accommodation.

[4:15]

For homeowners, assistance on mortgages in excess of a certain percentage will directly reduce the cost of borrowing money to purchase homes. This initiative will complement the first home-buyer grant of $1,500 and other programmes which were implemented by the Province of Ontario earlier this year. Measures such as these will go far to fulfil our government's commitment to provide adequate housing at a reasonable cost for all residents of Ontario.

Energy, in all of its forms, has been a source of considerable concern. We've heard again today that be it gasoline to drive our cars, fuel to heat our homes or electricity to run our factories, all have been subject to shortages and to substantial price increases, or both. Our government plans to introduce measures during this session to provide security of supply now and in the years to come, for what we need for present expenditures and for our energy demands of tomorrow.

Ontario has, for the past few years, been numbered among North American leaders in the development of new legislation to protect consumers. We can be proud of the measures undertaken such as the Business Practices Act, the Consumer Reporting Act, the Travel Industry Act, to name just a few. Many of our initiatives have been copied and adopted by other jurisdictions both in Canada and in the United States. There is, without a doubt, much more we can do during this session of the Legislature. I hope our government will continue to develop this area of concern.

As with consumer legislation, Ontario has stepped up to the forefront of concerned jurisdictions in the field of environmental protection. Our government has brought forth initiatives designed to control and prevent contamination of our water, our air and our soil. During the next few weeks, legislation will be introduced to further control certain forms of pollution. I am sure the government will meet and overcome threats to the environment such as the very difficult problem inherent in the dissemination of metal mercury in some of our northern lakes and rivers. We feel confident that the measures to be taken will go far to remedy those difficulties.

I represent a vibrant and fast-growing community. It is a community which has some very real needs and it is a community which has been served well by this government in the past. It is a community which wants leadership from this Legislature and wants direction. I'm here to indicate to my colleagues I am committed to working within a Legislature which provides that type of service to the people I represent.

I am confident that all of us here in this Legislature will support the direct and responsive approach which has been set forth to remedy the problems we are facing in Ontario. Although the months ahead of us will be difficult ones I am confident that we can look forward—and I do so—with a feeling of optimism.

Ontario, led by our government, has continued to provide a quality of life for its residents which is rivalled by few other jurisdictions—in transportation, education, consumer protection, environmental protection and housing. Our province is a leader and I say to the people of Ontario, don't let them take it away from you.

Hon. Mr. Welch moved the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to.

Clerk of the House: The 13th order, House in committee of supply.

ESTIMATES, MINISTRY OF TREASURY, ECONOMICS AND INTER-GOVERNMENTAL AFFAIRS (concluded)

On vote 1006:

Mr. Chairman: When we rose at 6 o'clock last evening, I was about to recognize the member for Timiskaming on item 2.

Mr. Bain: Yesterday in the questions that were asked of the hon. minister there was considerable discussion of regional government. There was also a considerable number of requests for action by the minister. Today I would like the minister to not act and to give us the assurance that he and the government will not act in this area for a considerable time to come.

I am sure the government realizes that what had initially been received across this province in the late 1960s as something that was worthwhile trying—that is, regional government—has in many respects not materialized in the way the government had hoped it would. Even in highly urbanized areas of this province, areas in which one could say there is justification for regional government, the fruits of regional government have not materialized. Indeed, all that the people have received in areas that are now under regional government is a second tax bill which they can ill afford.

During the last provincial election, we were advised in Timiskaming that one of the areas that would be worthy of regional government was the Tritown area. Since that came from the Conservative candidate at the time, I would now like to know whether that was government policy or whether it was merely an off-the-cuff remark. The people in the Tritown area do not want regional government and I would hope that the Treasurer would be able to assure us today that the government has no plans in mind to even undertake a study in that area, let alone give it serious consideration.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: I can give the member that assurance. No study has been requested and no study is contemplated.

Mr. Bain: By the government?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Yes.

Mr. Bain: Thank you. The second area of planning that I would like to mention to the minister is the situation in Timagami. Timagami is an improvement district and in the past has come under the guidance of several ministries, one of those ministries being the Treasurer's own.

Timagam is a very pleasant community located on the shores of Lake Timagami in the northeast arm and has had a considerable attraction for thousands of tourists each year. Unfortunately, for the last 10 years, and especially for the last five years, the people of Timagami have felt they have had to fight a battle to survive. They have got the impression from this government that the government wants the people in Timagami to leave the village and move to the new townsite. They have got that impression for two reasons: No. 1, Sherman Mine has plans to start operation on its east pit, which comes very close to the present settled area of the village; indeed, there are maps that show there is a very rich ore body underneath the centre of the village. The people of the village feel that the government is siding with the mine and indeed has denied the people of Timagami adequate water and sewage services for the past eight years in order to gently persuade them to move to the new townsite.

During the last election, I suppose as a mere coincidence, the people of Timagami were promised a sewage system that would entail holding tanks. Of course, the people of that community would prefer a more permanent sewage system. I know that the Treasurer and other ministers have been considering the problems of water and sewage services in Timagami. Can he advise us when he will be meeting with the people of Timagami to discuss the actual type of sewage

system and water system that the government is prepared to participate in to alleviate a very serious problem that has existed in Timagami for the past number of years?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: I would just make one comment. I don't think the people of Timagami should feel threatened. I can't speak for others, but perhaps the Minister of Natural Resources (Mr. Bernier) is more familiar with what is going on at the mine and with that particular problem; I believe the Minister of the Environment (Mr. Kerr) was involved in it at one point as well.

From a straight economic point of view, going back far enough, I think far and away the cheapest thing to have done would have been move the old townsite to the new townsite or some place else. We have never looked at it from a straight point of piew of economics; we have always looked at it also from the point of view of what people want and what they are comfortable with.

Again, the Minister of the Environment would be more knowledgeable on this than I am, but I don't think I have run across a concentrated area in the province that is more expensive to service than the old village of Timagami. For that matter, proportionately there are few areas where there have been greater pollution problems, as the member is aware. It happens to be a beautiful lake, a great asset of the area, and a great asset of the province as well.

We haven't been as quick in coming to grips with the pollution problems there simply because of the enormous cost. We might have come to grips with problems of cost sooner, I suppose, had we been more cavalier in our attitude toward the people—but that has never been our attitude.

Coming down to the present, Management Board and cabinet have approved for the first time—really on an experimental basis—the use of systems other than a sewage treatment system for the old town with provincial subsidy. This might involve holding tanks or, some of us—and I hope the Minister of the Environment, who is here, is listening to this—oh, he isn't here; it's the past Minister of the Environment—we would like to think that in some instances, if it is appropriate, they would use a system that was developed in Kent county and now being manufactured in Midland or Penetang by a company called Waltec. There may well be other systems that can be used as well—not a sewage treatment system, but individual treatment systems.

Approval was given by Management Board and cabinet for a subsidy on that basis and discussions have gone ahead, although I can't tell you where the discussions stand at the moment. I have a meeting arranged with the Minister of Health (Mr. F. S. Miller) and the Minister of the Environment for tomorrow morning, I guess, not particularly related to Timagami, but that will undoubtedly come up as one of the subjects to be discussed.

I don't think I have had any request to meet with the trustees of the improvement district. Perhaps I have and it is lost somewhere in the mail, but I don't believe I have. So far as I know, my officials have been meeting with them, although primarily it is a matter for the improvement district to sort out with the Ministry of the Environment in particular and to some extent with the Ministry of Health. If I can be of any assistance I will be glad to, particularly if they use the right system.

Mr. Godfrey: Mr. Chairman, I may not be putting the question to the proper source, and perhaps the Treasurer will be kind enough to advise me how this could be handled, since I believe it falls under his panoply.

The Treasurer is aware of the problems that exist in Durham West as a result of the recent airport, the now defunct airport. The problems can be broken down into two rough areas: 1. Those people whose properties have been expropriated or acquired in the North Pickering development, and, 2. Those persons who live adjacent to the defunct airport site who have had expropriation without compensation, namely as a result of having had their land confiscated.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: I don't want to interrupt the member but the responsibility for the North Pickering corporation is with the Minister of Housing (Mr. Rhodes).

[4:30]

Mr. Godfrey: I appreciate your direction, sir, but I would suggest that this happened before the Ministry of Housing took over, namely the acquisition of land by the province under, I believe, the Planning Act, which I believe is in your rubric. I may be wrong on that. However, it does deal with the Treasury and comes down to whether sufficient consideration has been given to setting aside funds for those persons whose properties were acquired early in the process, oft times under duress by government agents—for those who have made representations to have further moneys paid to them. Has there been

provision made in your Treasury report for consideration of that?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: No, not in my estimates. If there were such moneys available, they would be in the estimates of the Minister of Housing, which as you are aware, are still to come before the Legislature. So I am not cutting this off from debate, but that's where those questions, I think, should properly be asked.

Mr. Godfrey: Thank you. I am sure you will appreciate my confusion because many of the people who live in the area are similarly confused as to where they should go for relief.

The second has to deal with the land-use freeze which was put on the area around the airport site. And this land-use freeze is continued. As you know, there are many people who have had their developmental rights constrained by this land-use freeze. My question is whether consideration has been given in your budget to compensating these individuals for the loss of their developmental rights.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: No, there is no money in my budget. Again, I am not trying to put the member off, but that land-use regulation—the zoning orders largely north of the then proposed airport site—is again administered by the Minister of Housing.

Mr. Godfrey: If I may, sir, I can appreciate they are administered by them but I believe that the money eventually comes from yourself or, at least, your ministry. If provisions have not been made for that, then I suggest these people are going to remain uncompensated. I would plead with you to give this consideration, because this amounts to a fair amount of penalty to these people who have had the misfortune to locate themselves near an area which is no longer being used for its expressed use. And I would hope, sir, you would take that into consideration.

Mr. Spence: Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the minister a question in regard to Dealtown. What progress has been made? Is that development going to take place? I was asked that many times during the election. I wonder if the minister could outline to me—what stage is that housing project in at the present time?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: That is a question which should be put to the Minister of Housing, Mr. Chairman. But since I am 99 per cent sure that the new Minister of Housing, who is a very knowledgeable, capable person, will never have heard of Dealtown—

Mr. Spence: That is why I asked you.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: —and I have—it is in the member's riding; it's next door to where I live—I can tell him that nothing has happened. The report is still being circulated within the government. I think, two or three weeks ago, the reeve of Raleigh was in and, I believe, talked to several people in Housing about where it stood. I think there are still comments being made by various ministries of the government. Presumably, housing is the next step. But I really can't speak for the minister or for the ministry. I believe their next step when they have those views will be to meet with the Raleigh council and with others.

Mr. Davidson: Mr. Chairman, I would like to direct my remarks to the Treasurer with regard to the region of Waterloo. As most of you are aware, or I am sure the Treasurer is aware, the riding of Cambridge and the city of Cambridge comprise a part of that region. In addition to the city itself there are communities of Ayr and the township of North Dumfries. The people within that area are very much concerned.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: I know North Dumfries. I don't know the area as well as I should but I do know North Dumfries.

Mr. Davidson: It is a part of the township, but it is a community within the township.

Mr. Nixon: Very beautiful community.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: It used to have a good reeve at one point.

Mr. Davidson: They also have some excellent New Democrats. If I might point out—

Hon. Mr. McKeough: I'm not sure that the former reeve would put it just that way.

Mr. Davidson: If I may point out my concern today is the concern of the people living within that area with regard to what regional government has done in terms of increased taxation and loss of service. This is with regard to some of the services that they have been accustomed to prior to regionalization.

As we are all aware we will find that in any area that has been regionalized one of the major problems that exists is increased taxation and how this affects people within the communities. So much so, that in some of these smaller areas including Ayr and North Dumfries, many of the people are now becoming quite concerned as to whether or not they are going to be able to maintain

the homes in which they live and whether or not they are going to have to sell their homes because of the taxes that now have to be paid in those areas.

I am concerned also about several issues which have been presented to your government, and which, in fact, at least to my knowledge, have not been replied to as of this date. I refer specifically to a brief that was presented to the Treasurer by the Chamber of Commerce of the city of Cambridge. It is dated May 25, 1975, and outlines their objection to regionalization and sets out what they feel would be a compromise situation. Also there was a letter dated Oct. 21, 1975 which I happened to receive—and I'm quite sure you did because I had it delivered to me in my office—in which the township of Woolwich, which is in the very northern part of the riding, requests an immediate review of regional government within the Waterloo area. This concern runs from the very south of the area to the very north and I'm asking the hon. minister if he has as yet responded, or intends to respond, to either one of these requests?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: I don't think that I have received either one of them. I'm aware of one of them, I guess, through a press report, but I haven't received either one of them because of the mails.

But again, I met with the Waterloo regional council two or three months ago. They didn't express to me their view that a review was needed and I think that I would indicate to them that we are not about to embark on a review so early in the game.

Mr. Davidson: I don't know why the Treasurer could not possibly have received a brief that was dated May 23, 1975 and presented directly to his cabinet at a mini cabinet meeting held in the city.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: And answered that day. I'm sorry, I thought there was another one.

Mr. Peterson: Mr. Chairman, I'd like to direct a question to the Treasurer, because I'm very concerned about the long-range planning which affects the community and regional planning that Hydro is doing. It is very difficult to determine the jurisdiction for this massive planning that is required which has such dislocating effects and has such environmental as well as economic costs.

I'm very concerned about how the Treasurer views the responsibility for our energy planning, particularly our Hydro planning province-wide. On one hand we have the Porter commission that is planning for a 10-year period and beyond with respect to certain capital works and capital programmes. But it seems to me that the responsibility at this particular time should rest with the government and should be on an ongoing basis.

The Hydro planning has enormous impact on every aspect of our province and on every community. Terrible dislocations are happening for example, the Bradley-Georgetown line and various other alternatives and programmes that are being contemplated. I would like to hear the Treasurer's view on how this planning should be done and, indeed, who should be responsible, and with what type of agency on an ongoing basis.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Mr. Chairman, I guess the Porter royal commission was my idea—not Porter; no, it wasn't. It came out of the Ministry of Energy, though, through me. I am somewhat familiar with this area although it is now, I think, as I said yesterday, resting with the Provincial Secretary for Resources Development (Mr. Irvine).

The ultimate responsibility is the government's in terms of the location. We have to approve by order in council the location of generating stations. I don't know that we have to approve specifically transmission lines but, ultimately, if there is an expropriation the Minister of Energy (Mr. Timbrell) has to approve the expropriation. We have approved routes of transmission lines on the probably reasonable grounds that at some point there will be an expropriation; our approval should come before rather than after.

Of course we both appoint the board of Ontario Hydro and, most important from our point of view, Hydro uses the credit of the province. If for no other reason than that, we have a very large interest in what they do.

The Porter royal commission is examining the period 1983 to 1993, and they will examine and make recommendations both to Hydro and to ourselves—to the world, if I can put it that way; certainly to the province. The ultimate determination will have to be ours when they conclude.

The Porter royal commission is primarily a vehicle to get two things: Maximum public input into the process from all parts of the province; and, secondly, to get the opinion of five very knowledgeable people who will hear this evidence, both from Hydro and from government ministries as well, and from agencies which will express their opinions. Those five people will try to bring it together in some sort of logical way and make recommendations on it.

I assure the member that the ultimate responsibility has to be ours; there's no question about that. I think it's also fair to say that we were inclined perhaps to leave the provision of low-cost electricity and the responsibility for it with Ontario Hydro to a greater degree when it was low cost and when it was taken for granted—this is from my point of view—and when Hydro's capital requirements were not anywhere near as large as they are today. Because today they are as large as they are, we have a much greater interest than we used to have and some real concern.

What we try to do in our ministry is not to let our concern for the province's borrowing ability and credit rating overweigh what is also part of our responsibility in Treasury, which is the broad economic planning. That, of course, requires electricity—and electricity, I guess, at almost whatever cost. We try to weigh those two things.

Mr. Peterson: What concerns me, and I appreciate the Treasurer's remarks, is that you've taken a fairly arbitrary time period, from 1983 to 1993, but it seems to me the planning we've got to do now is for 50 years from now and 100 years from now. You have almost put an impossible problem in those people's hands.

I attended a meeting in London last night; it was well run and I compliment Dr. Porter on that. They were very concerned about having a participatory programme, I think, with maximum input. At the end of this study they can probably publish two papers, one on how to run meetings with respect to public participation and another one, hopefully, with some suggestions on long-term planning for Hydro.

[4:45]

I believe you should be doing this kind of thing on an ongoing basis. We're taking a far too short-sighted view—not nearly a long enough view—of this very critical programme. Energy, and particularly hydro planning, is probably as critical as any other item in your jurisdiction. With the control of energy policy, you probably have one of the most important weapons in the planning of the province for the next hundred years. I don't feel that enough recognition has been given to this on a long-term basis. I find it very difficult to figure out why the arbitrary 10-year period was selected and why these kinds of people shouldn't be responsible on an ongoing basis for the long-term planning of energy responsibilities and energy capacities in the province.

Mr. Chairman: Before I call on the member for Nickel Belt (Mr. Laughren) I feel compelled to remind the committee that we are now down to 30 hours and 30 minutes for all of the estimates that have to be dealt with in committee of supply here in the House. I am advised that by unanimous agreement all of the estimates of Treasury, Economics and Intergovernmental Affairs will be completed by 6 o'clock, which only leaves you about an hour and 14 minutes. I am wondering if you want to pass over some of these items relatively quickly in order to get to some of the later votes. We have 1007, 1008 and 1009 still to be completed. Perhaps we have spent more time on this vote and on this item than on any other that we will have time for. Is there some kind of agreement that we would pass vote 1006 by a certain time, say, by 5:15? Do you think that would be useful?

Mr. Deans: That would be agreeable to us, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman: All right, with that understanding then, I will call on the member for Nickel Belt.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Before that, shall I just answer that question? The time frame of the particular 10 years—and really this should be raised with the provincial secretary or with the Minister of Energy—could have been longer, but realistically I don't think it could have started any earlier. Hydro took the view, and the government agreed, that we had some time to look at what was going to be constructed in 1983 and beyond, but up until 1983 with a 10-year lead time we really have to get started right now. Up until 1983—with Bruce B, I am not sure—I would think practically everything has been committed and approved. The timing may be varied but basically there was a list of exceptions of things that would not go to the Porter royal commission when the Porter royal commission was suggested. I think all those exceptions, or nearly all of them, have now been approved. Construction may not be under way but it is getting close to that.

I guess what the member was really coming at was that perhaps we should be looking beyond 1993. I don't quarrel with that. From our point of view in Treasury, we look farther ahead than that. Hydro is and certainly the Ministry of Energy is, though probably not much beyond the year 2000 because 25 years is, unfortunately I guess, as far as most of us can see at this point in time. I would suspect, if we can get the Porter commission under our belts and if public participation in that way works, that it will be expanded into something ongoing and perhaps not just on a narrow frame of one source of energy, elec-

tricity, but would be something more encompassing. That's something you had better talk to the Minister of Energy about and not to me.

Mr. Peterson: Just to follow up on this, what disturbs me very much about this—and it relates to several other things that are going on in the ministry—is that we have the Ontario Energy Board taking a role, we have an all-party committee of the Legislature taking a role, we have cabinet taking a role, we have Hydro taking a role and now the Porter commission is taking a role. All are complementary but have different jurisdictions and different responsibilities.

It seems to me that this is a totally fouled situation. I think the government should come to grips with this issue and bring it under one body, one agency responsible to the Legislature, an all-party committee or the Ontario Energy Board or something, which could consolidate all of these views in the short term and in the long run and have one central set of information coming into the government upon which to make these decisions.

I think it would be very difficult to do planning when you are doing short-run planning and long-run planning on an uncoordinated basis.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: I don't want to be provocative on such a fine autumn afternoon—that is not my nature in any case—but as one who is not as attuned to things as I would like to be, I sort of have the impression that part of Hydro's problems seem to be with a committee of this Legislature because some of the gentlemen opposite were not content to leave the future of particular aspects of Hydro's thinking to the Ontario Energy Board or to the board of Ontario Hydro or to the government. Some of these things have come about because we are open, responsive and willing to change and anxious to share the heavy responsibilities with all.

Mr. Martel: That's something new for you or for anybody who has seen you around here. Some of us have been around as long as you have. You can't say that strongly.

Mr. Chairman: Order, please.

Mr. Martel: So responsive.

Hon. W. Newman: If you are going to talk sit in your seat.

Mr. Deans: He is just trying it out for size.

Interjections.

Mr. Chairman: Had the member for London Centre completed?

Mr. Peterson: I would like to reply to that because I think we are into a very important issue. I am not sure that the Treasurer's interpretation is the same as the general public's interpretation or that of the other members of this Legislature. I don't think those are the issues.

I think we have allowed this thing to be handled in such a political way that we have been unfair to everyone concerned. We don't know who is responsible for the planning and we don't know who is doing what on one hand. The entire Ontario Energy Board exercise was a waste of time and money because there is no teeth and no power and nothing they could do. All it did was defer the problem for another few months.

Now we have to go back to the same old rigmarole with an all-party committee of the Legislature. It seems to me that this whole thing could be uncomplicated and made responsive to the public through the Legislature. That is clearly where these responsibilities have to lie. These are clearly the people who are responsible for the decisions which affect every single citizen and when you present the citizens of this province with the opportunity of working for a month a year, each one of them, to pay back Hydro's debt and you explain those alternatives very clearly, those are very clearly political decisions. They have to be made on a political basis and decided by political people. We can't have this hodge-podge going on as it is because we will never get to solve the real problem.

Mr. Laughren: It is called representation. May I first commend you, Mr. Chairman, on the job you are doing in the chair. I am sure that historians will look at you and the job you are doing in your stewardship as the benchmark to which others will aspire.

I wanted to ask the minister—the non-provocative minister—if he is aware of some of the increasing problems in the small northern communities which have no municipal status. They had their hopes raised and their expectations increased significantly in the last two years by his ministry's conducting public meetings in the small communities, indicating to them that all was going to be well and that all that was required was more public participation and then the small communities would be able to obtain grants.

There were a couple of problems with this: 1. When the ministry went in its officers didn't realize the sense of alienation there is

in those small communities in the north; 2. They didn't realize how much it was going to cost them in order to bring those people up to receiving the same level of amenities which others take as a right in this Province of Ontario.

I am wondering whether or not the minister has sat down or had his officials sit down with the people who are working on that project and conducting those public meetings to put it in the context of an overall plan for the small communities in northern Ontario. I think the way it was going before was every community was being regarded as having a different set of problems when, in fact, they don't have a different set of problems. All the small communities up there have a common set of problems. There may be some differences, but they all lack medical services, fire protection and recreational services. The minister should deal with those problems to start with and say to those communities: "It is part of a set of principles of this government which say there is a minimum level of services to which you are entitled." He doesn't need to tell the communities in the north that they pay the same sales tax, the some OHIP premiums and the same income taxes, some of which revert to the province, as do people in communities which receive amenities considerably in excess that they do.

I'm hoping that the minister will have something to say about the problem of those communities and indicate that he is prepared to reintroduce a northern communities Act that will establish a minimum level of services throughout all of those unorganized communities. I appreciate the fact that it's going to be expensive and I realize there's a catching-up process there, but if it means that the communities in the south which have had so much have to give up a little and contribute more to the levelling of the standard of living in Ontario, then so be it. I see nothing at all wrong with that.

I might say there is one community in particular that is being used, not so much by me but by the media, and not just the media in the immediate area but all across Ontario, as an example of a small community that has been neglected. That's the town of Gogama.

I sent a note to the present Minister of Agriculture and Food (Mr. W. Newman) when he was the Minister of the Environment. He realized there was a considerable pollution problem in terms of their drinking water and that something had to be done. The water in more than 50 per cent of the wells is polluted with nitrates, which are injurious to the health of infants, and no subsidies at all coming from the provincial government because it is an unorganized community. I understand the problem, but surely it wasn't that difficult to make an exception or to bring in the Act and get on with doing it. Instead of that, the Ministry of the Environment installed a community pump —actually it's a tap, but the word "pump" flows more easily. It's more descriptive of an attitude as much as the service itself.

In a community of 600 people, with many times that number in the summertime as a result of tourism, to establish a community tap as though that's the solution to the problem of polluted water supply is truly ludicrous in Ontario in 1975. Surely that's got to end. That's one thing I wanted to say about the small communities, the unorganized communities, and I'd like to know what the minister has to say about that.

Secondly, when we talk about regional planning and we form regional governments, such as we now have in the Sudbury area, it implies that some of that will be taken over by the region, rather than having the province do it all. I agree with that. The planning people in Sudbury have worked very hard; they've done some excellent work on alternatives for the future in terms of planning, land-use development and so forth. But they're still running into a brick wall because of a couple of things. One is the lack of revenues—but it's not sufficient to say that every municipality has a lack of revenues.

There's no question that resource-centred communities in northern Ontario, such as Sudbury, have more acute problems than cities in southern Ontario such as Oshawa, Windsor, and Hamilton. There's no doubt about that whatsoever. The unique problems of servicing in rock make it very expensive and time-consuming.

Last night I attended a meeting of the regional council, at which it was stated very clearly, as a result of some very good work by the planning and financial people in the city, that they are faced now with having to approve in 1975 about $66 million worth of capital works, but the most they can afford to implement is $33 million. In round figures there's a shortfall of $33 million. That's the sort of problem faced by the communities such as Sudbury; even though they are given the right to do the regional planning, they can't cope with that. It doesn't matter what privileges are turned over to them; if we are not going to increase the revenues, then nothing is going to change. We've talked to the Treasurer for years about the need to properly

assess the mining industry in the Sudbury area, to no avail.

[5:00]

Mr. Martel: Yesterday he told me it's a long story. So talk to him about it.

Mr. Laughren: I know it belongs in the hon. minister's lap because he is the Treasurer. He collects the taxes of this province. If the hon. minister wants to say that the Ministry of Revenue is responsible for collecting taxes from the mining companies, fine; but the hon. minister has the responsibility for assessing the taxes that will be taken from the mining industry.

Mr. Martel: No, no.

Mr. Laughren: Oh yes; you do. Surely it's the minister who decides what the resource taxes are in the Province of Ontario. The Minister of Revenue does not do that. When we asked him about it he said: "All I do is collect the taxes. Go see the Treasurer. He decides who will pay what taxes." So it's not good enough to shrug that off on to the Minister of Revenue.

So I say to the hon. minister that if we're going to solve the problems in the Sudbury area within the regional municipality of Sudbury; if we're going to be able to do the kind of long-range planning that's necessary to avoid some of the problems that were created in the past through lack of planning, then we need more resources to work with.

I don't have to be told there are unlimited demands on limited resources. I fully apprecite that. But I would say to you that there is at catch-up process to do in the mining communities and that Sudbury fits into that category very well. There needs to be a whole different approach to the taxation of the resource-centred communities.

The other part of the projection in Sudbury was that the labour force in mining was going to drop from 15,000 to 12,500 in the next 20 years or so. The labour force in the service industry is going to multiply by seven times to well over 100,000; 127,000 I believe it was. What that means, of course, is that we're developing now a community which is wealth-consuming, namely the service sector, as opposed to wealth-creating, which is the mining sector. There is no large projected increase in manufacturing but there will be a large increase in the service sector.

As long as the hon. minister and his government stand back and let the private sector deal with resources as they see fit, that's exactly what's going to continue to happen. I think the hon. minister knows that we know what the answer is in the Sudbury area. We know what the answer is with all the resource-centred communities: it is to take those resources out of the hands of the private sector and put them in the hands of the public sector where they belong. Then we can develop those resources for the interests of all people in Ontario, not just the private sector.

We're seeing a classic example right now in the Sudbury area where one of the two big resource operations, Falconbridge Nickel Mines, is on strike. They have declared war on the community, not just on the Mine, Mill and Smelter Workers. We have orders being given from Texas as to how the negotiations will go in the Sudbury area. That is something to which the hon. minister should not acquiesce and to which the members of the government should not acquiesce. It's no wonder that public opinion is shifting away from this government, and particularly this minister's view of the private sector and how the private sector will put everything all right; that if we just leave it in the hands of the private sector then everything will be just fine and benefits will be maximized. It is just not so when you're talking about the resource sector.

Those are two things on which I would appreciate a response. One, the unorganized community problems; and two, the whole question of financing in resource-centred communities such as Sudbury.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Mr. Chairman, I recognize the time constraints. I dealt with both of those things yesterday and, if the member has a look at Hansard, he will find my answers.

Mr. Martel: You didn't say anything.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: He may not agree with the answers.

Mr. Laughren: I read Hansard from yesterday.

Mr. Martel: There were no answers, you just ducked.

Mr. Chairman: Order, please. I have two members on my list. One is Grey and one is Grey-Bruce and with some kind of agreement that they would confine their remarks to no more than five minutes, we can complete this vote by 5:15.

Mr. McKessock: Mr. Chairman, as a member who lives on the Niagara Escarpment and represents a lot of people who also live on the Niagara Escarpment, I would like to

express our concerns for the many controls that have been placed on us and about which we are very disturbed. This has also shown up very clearly on the election of Sept. 18. With all due respect to our past chairman of the Niagara Escarpment, I would like to state just a few things we would like to see change and I would hope to get a response to this.

We would like to eliminate the Niagara control area altogether. Failing this, we would like to modify the controls to within 300 feet of escarpment or to the closest lot lines. There is no real objection to the preservation of the Escarpment, but if the people of Ontario want the Escarpment preserved it should be legally expropriated and paid for.

The preservation of the Escarpment does not require arbitrary land-use controls for areas up to 13 miles. These should be eliminated. The Escarpment can be readily preserved with a maximum of 300 ft in most locations. It should be mandatory that any method of preservation should not be allowed to interfere with farm operations or installation of farm use. There should be no development permit required from the Niagara Escarpment Commission for farm-related buildings, including a home or any farm, regardless of its boundary proximity or size.

We think that development controls should not prohibit the reasonable use of land for housing, commercial or industrial uses. Controls of such uses should continue to reside with the municipality which is more directly concerned to the needs of the populace. We feel that local governments are quite capable in our area of making these decisions for themselves. Planning, to be meaningful, must be for the residents of the area, not for the benefit or advantage of a non-resident population. While we can appreciate the province's concern that the country should be reasonably maintained for future generations, it should not be done at the expense of a small portion of the current generation.

While we are not necessarily against provincial intent that planning must cover wide areas and not be fragmented at municipal levels, the method should not be to arbitrarily impose controls from Queen's Park. If planning is not for the people in the area, the result is arbitrary state control based upon dictatorial methods. The democratic process implies that those most directly concerned, that is property owners, should have a strong voice in what is being done with their properties. This has been totally obviated by the present legislation. While the preservation of the Escarpment is, in our view, necessary, it is equally important that for the road construction and building industry there be an adequate supply of gravel and aggregate.

Mr. Lawlor: We shouldn't share the Escarpment with anybody.

Mr. McKessock: It is more reasonable to impose controls that oblige pit and quarry operators to restore the land after excavation than it is to impose blanket prohibitions.

Mr. Lawlor: That's the value of prohibitions.

Mr. McKessock: Similar situations seem to prevail with respect to logging; at the present time it appears that there is a licence to remove 10 per cent of standing timber. In the first place this is totally incapable of being properly administered. In the second place adequate municipal and county controls already exist.

While generally we approve of the concept that the shoreline on bodies of water within the province should not be totally encapsulated to private ownership, the present controls appear to be an overreaction to the situation and should revert to the present levels of municipal governments. For many years, the Bruce Trail has operated effectively on the base of property owner participation without overthreat.

The recommendation of the Gertler report that the Bruce Trail should be expropriated or maintained by way of permanent easement has effectively lost for the Bruce Trail Association the co-operation and goodwill of numerous property owners. This is a classical example of the folly of using a big stick when co-operation meets the objectives. It is appropriate that the Bruce Trail should exist on the basis of tolerance by property owners and responsibility on the part of the Bruce Trail Association. It seems incredible that such an excellent objective achieved by mutual consent and co-operation should require any legislation.

Since the above recommendations appear to have totally removed any judicial function from the Niagara Escarpment Commission, we recommend that the commission be disbanded immediately. I would appreciate a reply and I would hope that the commission would take into consideration the slackening of a lot of these controls.

Mr. Chairman: It is my understanding that the hon. member for Grey-Bruce wants to talk about the same subject. Perhaps he could continue now and the minister could reply to both speakers at once.

Mr. Sargent: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Mr. Minister, the fact is that we had 98 per cent of the people of Ontario telling two per cent of the people, "We want your land," and you, the centralized control at Queen's Park, are going to take it from us, and I wish these eggheads down here who believe in conservation would appreciate that civil rights do mean something to people.

Mr. Lawlor: Nothing to lose but your friends.

Mr. Sargent: I will get to you in a minute. You are always talking about civil rights but these things are important to people. We have millions of acres of land being frozen. People whose families have paid taxes on their land for generations are told they cannot sell it.

Mr. Makarchuk: Maybe it's because winter is early this year.

Mr. Sargent: They cannot do anything with it but they must pay taxes on it. I suggest to you, Mr. Minister, that if you want this land you buy the land but don't tell a man be must pay taxes on it yet can't develop it or can't sell it. That is not democracy. If the NDP think that is democracy let them stand up and say so.

Mr. Laughren: More power to the speculators, eh?

Mr. Sargent: No government has the right to tell a man he can't develop his land or can't sell it, but you are telling them. So you appoint a commission of 20 people—

Mr. Laughren: The Liberal Party is moving to the right. You are further right than McKeough.

Mr. Sargent: Sometimes, fellows, you must realize that civil rights are important. You fellows are always harping about this, now listen for God's sake and keep quiet for a second.

Mr. Martel: That's not nice.

Mr. Chairman: Order, please.

Mr. Sargent: Sometimes you are pretty sick, Elie. Keep quiet today.

Mr. Martel: I will not speak well of you again.

Mr. Sargent: It is important to all my people to be told that they cannot sell their land, they cannot do anything with it and they must pay taxes on it. A whole township has been frozen. Everything is in limbo in the whole area.

Mr. Makarchuk: You had an early winter up there, did you?

Mr. Good: Look, Makarchuk, you are lucky to be back here.

Mr. Chairman: Order, please. The member for Grey-Bruce has the floor.

Mr. Sargent: The building permit they are asked to fill out has about 20 or 30 questions on it and you must fill them in and tell them how you are going to paint your barn or your outhouse.

We had a case of a lady whose family had owned property on the water there for generations. They lived in Connecticut. They sold their home and their farm in Connecticut and they came up and put in a $10,000 septic tank. They go to apply for a building permit and they can't get it because the land is frozen. So you have a bunch of eggheads, by our thinking, down in Queen's Park living in highrises telling us how we will give you our land but you won't pay for it. What kind of democracy is this?

What are we going to do, Mr. Minister? Are we going to listen to this group of people who are appointed and not elected? They have their meetings in secret, the files are not available to me as a member of parliament, the councils are not told what is going on. I respect the time limit and I thank the Chair for giving me the chance to speak about this, because this is very important to people and their rights.

I ask you, Mr. Minister, to let us run our own show. This is our land, it isn't your land. You say you are going to freeze it and you have frozen it, and what are we going to do? So along with my colleague I say, let us run our own affairs, let us make the decisions on what we will do with our land, not you or some appointed officials. It is very important to us.

Mr. Swart: I recognize that the time is up for the vote on this. I wasn't aware that we were going to deal with all the items under this by the 5:15 deadline. I'll make my remarks very short.

[5:15]

The first point that I should make is that I would clearly dissociate myself and my party. This is not necessary, as the voters did it rather recently. From the comments made about the Niagara Escarpment Commission by the two speakers on the left, we fully support the idea of the preservation of

the Niagara Escarpment. However, we would like to make it a bit more democratic than it has been up to this time.

I wanted to fit my remarks into the context of the master plan for Ontario and the need to simplify the bureaucracy that we have in the planning process. In this regard I won't go into details as I had intended. I want to say that if we did have the master plan for Ontario—the land use and development plan—we perhaps would not need the Niagara Escarpment Commission, nor would we need the three levels of planning that we now have: The province, the region and the local municipality.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Just think how upset we would have everybody. At least we have localized it at this moment.

Mr. Swart: I suggest that we could cut out some of that bureaucracy and still have much more effective planning than we have at the present time. It is my understanding that the Act to provide for the Escarpment commission provides that it won't meet at all once they have produced the master plan and turned it back to the regions and local municipalities. I would just urge the minister that he assures us that this happens.

I want to make four other points, however, because it is in existence. It's not going to be dissolved now. I would suggest that the master plan cover only the area adjacent to the Escarpment. My understanding is that the Niagara area covers the whole district from Welland right to the lake. That is the master plan which is going to be developed by the Escarpment commission. I don't think this was the intent of it and we should leave the planning to the regional municipalities there. For the rest of that, it should be confined to the Escarpment commission.

I would also like to point out to the minister, if he is not aware of this, that some of the Escarpment is left out of development control. In Niagara-on-the-Lake some of it has been left completely out of development control. I think this was inadvertent, perhaps. But whether it was or was not inadvertent, that should be included.

Third, and in direct contradiction of what the hon. member said earlier, I think that the pits and quarries should be under the Escarpment commission rather than excluded from it as they are at the present time. Surely, if we have a body charged with the job of maintaining the Escarpment, it should have control over one of the most serious threats for the destruction to the Escarpment. Yet, they do not have that authority. It is specifically excluded.

Finally, I want to make the point that the meetings, particularly where they are in getting into the master plans for the preservation of the Escarpment, should be open to the public. The public should be invited to attend those meetings and the Escarpment commission should try to get all the public input they possibly can. At the present time, at least up to this date, people do not even know where they are meeting and there is no publicity given to the meetings. In fact, no one is attending them. I understand that, in just recent times, the proposal is to downgrade the background papers. These were supposed to be pretty important papers in the development of the master plan for the Escarpment. Now I understand that they are going to be downgraded. I would ask the minister to take appropriate action on these four matters.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Mr. Chairman, very briefly, I would just say this: The Niagara Escarpment has not been without its problems. I had hoped there would have been time today for the former chairman to say a few words, but perhaps in the course of the Throne Speech debate he will be able to bring us up to date or as up to date as he can on some of the things that went on during his time as chairman.

Anything new creates problems or lack of understanding. Within the last few months I think both the commission, those dealing with the commission and the commission staff have perhaps got a better appreciation of some of the frustrations of something which is brand new in certain parts of the province, and development control itself is of course something which is really brand new to all of us.

The commission are charged with a responsibility that is not only a difficult one but one which by the nature of the legislation is something that really has not been tried to any great extent in this province or, for that matter, on this continent. There are a number of pitfalls but a number of things are being worked out. The commission, in panels or subcommittees, now are meeting with a number of the municipalities. There was a meeting with Grey yesterday, I believe. There have been a couple of meetings with Grey at the staff level, and I believe there was a meeting with them at the commission level yesterday. There is a meeting at Niagara-on-the-Lake tomorrow. I think considerable progress is being made.

I would say to my friend from Grey-Bruce that we have no intention of packing in the commission. We think this is something that is worthy of preservation, not just for the people of Bruce county or Grey county; it is a provincial resource. All of us would like to be able to do with our own land whatever we would like to do. That is not the way our society exists, be it in Toronto, Chatham or Grey. We all are subject to zoning laws. We haven't all been subject to development control; I quite agree with that. But simply to suggest disbanding the commission is not something which we on this side of the House propose to endorse.

Mr. Sargent: Will the minister accept a question?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Yes.

Mr. Sargent: I thank the Treasurer for his breakthrough here in terms of having some compassion for our people. Will he then entertain recognition of the fact that we can make our own planning and do our own controls up there and not down here?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: I am quite sure it is the objective of the commission—it is the objective of the government, of course—to prepare a master plan for the Escarpment. When that plan is prepared and when there is a degree of planning expertise locally, then ultimately that function will be turned over—I wouldn't think to the local municipality, but probably to the county municipality or, in the case of the southern part, to the regional municipalities.

I think it is fair to say that there are parts of the Escarpment which have a greater planning history, with municipalities that have been at the game longer and probably will be able to take on these functions sooner rather than later. I have no idea what a timetable might be at this point, but in terms of day-to-day administration it is not something we want to stay in forever. I think for a long time there will be a need for a Niagara Escarpment Commission in a co-ordinating role, but in terms of day-to-day administration it is a function from which, to use the particular word we are using at this moment, over time we hope to become disentangled.

Mr. Sargent: One further question: Will the Treasurer entertain the principle, if land is frozen and people are prevented from developing their land, of buying that land or taking the freeze off?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: There is no freeze. There are things which are being allowed, there are some things which are not allowed.

Mr. Sargent: What does he mean, there is no freeze? The whole township of Sarawak has been frozen; everything is in limbo. You can't do anything with it; you can't sell it and you can't develop it, but you have got to pay taxes on it. What is the Treasurer going to do about that?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: It is not correct to say you can't do anything—

Mr. Sargent: It is correct. The Treasurer doesn't know what he's talking about.

Mr. Chairman: Order, please.

Mr. McKessock: Could I ask one more question? There is some place in the United States where they buy the development rights. Would this be possible here?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Reverting to Sarawak township, up to Oct. 1 there had been 18 applications received by the commission. Seventeen of those applications have been processed, and 16 of them have been approved. None of them has been rejected; one was deferred, and there is still an application to be considered.

Of the 18 which had been received, 17 have been processed and 16 approved, which is 94 per cent actually. To say that everything is frozen and that nothing is happening is, I say to my friend from Grey-Bruce—not for the first time—completely incorrect.

Mr. Sargent: On a point of order Mr. Chairman, it is a matter of record that the township of Sarawak and its reeve are talking about amalgamating with Owen Sound, because they are frozen completely. It is part of the law that we are frozen in Sarawak. Mr. McCague knows that is a fact. Sarawak is frozen.

Mr. Chairman: If the hon. member has no point of order, I assume that he is continuing the debate.

Mr. Bullbrook: He doesn't need one. He can say what he wants to in the committee.

Mr. Chairman: We will continue the debate. Does the minister wish to respond any further?

Vote 1006 agreed to.

On vote 1007:

Mr. Swart: Mr. Chairman, as the critic for municipal affairs in my party, I obviously

want to speak to the matter of the one-third of $1 billion in these estimates for unconditional grants. Let me say immediately that I am aware that some considerable progress has been made by the government and by the opposition benches towards unconditionalization. I am aware that real improvement has been made in the last five years in provincial assistance. I am aware that there has been a substantial improvement made in recent times in equalization between the various municipalities in the province.

However, we need yet to go a bit further in this. In Niagara region there has been, I suggest, a complete equalization. Regardless of the percentage of industrial assessment that a municipality does or doesn't have, the tax rate now paid by that municipality, the taxes paid on a home in any one of the 12 municipalities in Niagara region are almost identical, whether it is a municipality with 54 per cent industrial assessment or 11 per cent or even less. The only variation is in the efficiency of the provision of services.

However, this does not apply to the same degree in other areas of the province. I suggest particularly that it doesn't apply to those cities which are not in regions. Cities such as London and Thunder Bay don't receive the same sort of assistance as do the cities within the regional governments.

I want to say too that although provincial assistance, as I mentioned, has improved it still has a long way to go. In looking at the figures on provincial and municipal taxes from the Canadian Tax Foundation, we find out that Ontario has the second highest municipal debt per capita in Canada. The property tax, with all the additional assistance, has increased something like 78 per cent in the 10 years from 1963 to 1973. In 1974, Ontario had the second highest per capita property tax levy in Canada at $230 per capita.

I suggest that if we had the figure for 1975, it would show that Ontario has the highest per capita property tax in Canada. We don't yet have those figures, but in the Niagara region, for instance, property taxes of all municipalities there went up on an average of 16 per cent in 1975. In some of the other provinces, particularly Manitoba and British Columbia, there have been pretty substantial changes and improvements made in the financing of local government.

I am sure that everyone in this House recognizes the fact that property taxes are by and large regressive. Because I suppose they have been reduced proportionately they are not regressive to the same degree that they were at one stage, and with the tax rebate, this has helped in this regard, but they still are exceedingly inequitable.

[5.30]

Two conditions now exist, Mr. Minister, which make me suggest to you that you should give consideration to making some fairly substantial changes. The market value assessment on which future tax will be based is going to come into operation, I believe, in 1976 or 1977 taxes, and though in some respects this may be an admirable thing, the facts are that there is going to be a real shift in the tax burden between different types of property. I am aware of course that a commitment has been given by the government that they will make adjustments so that in fact this shift doesn't take place, but the assessment shift will be there.

What concerns me about this is that in our changing society, with the price of housing escalating as it has been for the last two or three years, further shifts can take place if you have it on market value, and market value may not be the equitable formula that some people may have thought it was going to be at one time. I suggest that we should be looking to some other source for revenue to municipalities to a greater degree than we have been in the past.

Members of this House will know that British Columbia has taken steps to give a proportion of the revenue received from their natural gas taxes to the local municipality—something in the neighbourhood of $40 million, I believe. Members of this House will also likely know that Manitoba is going to institute in the coming year the transfer of two points of the income tax and one point of the corporation tax to the municipalities. If we did the same sort of thing in this province as they are doing in Manitoba, it would mean that there would be something like $40 to $50 million—

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Can I just correct my friend? Manitoba is also doing away with the unconditional grant. On the same basis, our municipalities in this province would suffer. I would be glad to give the member the details of what the Manitoba plan would do here.

Mr. Swart: I suggest that when the figures are out in a year or two they will show that this has been beneficial to the property tax payer in the Province of Manitoba—

Hon. Mr. McKeough: I will send you some of the figures on that.

Mr. Swart: —and I suggest that consideration has to be given by this government very

quickly, especially in view of the effect of the announcement made today by the minister that they are going to limit the moneys which are going to go to municipalities according to the revenue which the province receives. In the commitment that was given by this province—I think it is called the Edmonton commitment—they indicated it would not be less than that. Now they are down right to the bottom in what they are going to be transferring to the local municipalities in this coming year.

I suggest, with the additional costs that they are having, that this isn't good enough—that we have to find some other source of funds so that the property tax burden—an unjust tax burden, a burden that falls most heavily on those who are least able to pay—can be lifted at least to some degree.

Mr. Martel: Now is your chance.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Mr. Chairman, I will just make two comments. First of all, I haven't got it here but I did detail in the speech exactly what would happen if the Manitoba plan were put into effect here. Our municipalities would be behind rather than ahead. I'm sorry I don't have those figures but I will send them to the member. I just make one other point—our residential property taxes on a per household, and per capita basis have gone down between 1970 and 1975 in real terms. Mill rates for those four or five years virtually stood still in this province. Per capita income, of course, has risen dramatically; per household income has risen rapidly. I have forgotten the figure but five years ago property taxes used to be 2. something per cent of disposable income, and now that figure is 1.8; it has fallen quite dramatically.

Certainly our property taxes are among the highest in Canada. The fact is we have the highest incomes before taxes in Canada; we have the highest incomes after taxes in Canada; we have the highest disposable incomes in Canada. We live very well, as we all know, in this province. As a result, among other things, our property taxes reflect the services which we have achieved over the years.

Mr. Bullbrook: God endowed us as the richest province in Canada.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Quite right, and gave us the benefit of good government for so many years, too.

Mr. Martel: When did that happen?

Mr. Singer: Whatever happened to it recently?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: I am not sure that came from God, though.

Mr. Bullbrook: And both its riches and its government are being dissipated year by year.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: The other point I would simply make is that Manitoba and British Columbia, the two provinces which for some reason or other the member mentioned as having lower property taxes—I can't quite understand why he picked those two.

Mr. Swart: And Saskatchewan has a tax rate on property much lower than Ontario's too.

Hon. Mr. McKeough. That's part of the litany. You know per capita, per household, the lowest taxes, I believe, are in Quebec, reflecting their income. The member, of course, might take a little look at the rate of personal income taxes in Manitoba, British Columbia and Saskatchewan and then at the rate here and he might draw some conclusions from that.

Mr. Chairman: Shall vote 1007 carry?

Agreed.

Vote 1007 agreed to.

Mr. Good. On a point of order, Mr. Chairman, were we dealing with vote 1007 in its entirety and not just the first item?

Mr. Chairman: Yes, in its entirety.

Mr. Good: I am sorry, I didn't realize that. Previously we dealt with 1006 item by item.

Mr. Chairman: I said to the hon. members "Shall vote 1007 carry?" And they said "Carried," so I assumed that was the way it was to be.

Mr. Good: I thought you were referring to item 1. I had a few questions under item 2.

Mr. Chairman: The vote was carried; however, if the members will permit you to ask a question, the Chair will recognize you.

Mr. Good: Forget about it. I just wanted to know what plans the Treasurer has for increasing payments under the tax assistance for municipalities relating to provincial properties? We know we have come a long way in the last six or eight years regarding provincial properties held in right of the Crown

for Ontario. The municipalities now get revenue from the universities, the penal institutions, the hospital properties under hospital training schools and what not.

I am wondering what projections the minister has on the level of revenue received by the municipalities—this would include the provincial park tax payments. Are there projections what they might be or when they might be increased? I think right now they represent something—

Hon. Mr. McKeough: I can answer this question very quickly. I have no plans to enlarge on this at the moment; the government has no plans. Any further activity in this area would be coincident with reassessment, with taxation reassessment; and the earliest that would happen would be 1977.

On vote 1008:

Mrs. Bryden: I want to speak on item 3 of vote 1008, which is labelled employment incentive programmes. I believe the vote here is mainly for completing payments under previous employment incentive programmes adopted in this province. I would like to ask the hon. provincial Treasurer if has any plans to bring in an employment incentive programme for 1975-1976? The last time that we had an employment incentive programme, that I can recall, was in 1971. That happened to be just before an election.

Mr. Martel: By coincidence?

Mrs. Bryden: By coincidence, yes. The hon. members opposite did quite well in that election in 1971. But then we had another election in 1975 and I didn't see any discussion of the unemployment situation and there was no employment incentive programme brought forward. Perhaps that accounts for the fact that the hon. members opposite changed from a majority government to a minority government.

At any rate, there doesn't seem to have been any recognition by this government that we do have a serious unemployment problem in this province. The number of unemployed at September 1975 in this province was 183,000 people. A year ago, it was only 135,000 people, so there is an increase of 50,000 people out of work and looking for work in this province. What measures could be brought in to put these people to work?

I have a few suggestions for the hon. minister and I'd like him to consider them and see if the hon. minister couldn't possibly bring in a supplementary estimate to finance them.

The hon. minister might, for example, go in for a much bigger housing rehabilitation and renovation programme. That could be put in place almost immediately and provide work this winter. Housing construction—of course we know that we have a serious housing shortage—it takes a little longer to get housing construction under way but the hon. minister could get it started so that something is happening by March or April.

Day care centres; we still have a great shortage of these. More funds could be provided and the distribution of the funds that are available could be accelerated.

Municipal winter works; I think there's lots of work that municipalities are putting off, in the way of repair, maintenance and clean up, because of the pressure on their budgets. The province could assist with that and get work for those 50,000 people.

Community services; I think there were about five times as many requests for LIP grants this year from the federal government as were filled. The province could move into some of those areas and provide its own LIP. Many of the projects that were turned down were very worthwhile ones and they would provide employment.

On-the-job training; we still have certain areas where there seems to be a shortage because there are not enough trained workers. In other areas there are too many workers who don't have the training. That could be part of the package.

Finally, there are special cases which I think could come under a vote called employment programmes. One is the situation of the Grassy Narrows Indians. They must be provided with alternative means of livelihood, because their fishing livelihood and their guiding livelihood for fishermen has been destroyed by the mercury pollution. This is a very special case and we have to get some action. It seems that this would be a suitable vote for the hon. minister to add some funds to look after that problem. I would urge that he consider this very seriously, because unemployment is a very serious problem and it's going to be more serious this winter.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Mr. Chairman, I don't disagree with what the member has said about unemployment. The last time it was at high levels was in 1971. The measures we took then really had nothing to do with the upcoming election.

Mr. Martel: Bill Davis had $10 million that time for day care.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: That's right, and the regular vote has been considerably expanded since then.

Interjections.

[5:45]

Hon. Mr. McKeough. I'm really quite interested, because I think since Jan. 14, the hon. member for Beaches-Woodbine is the first member who has raised that question in the House. The matter of unemployment, to my great surprise, was not a great issue during the recent election. It was not one of the four concerns expressed so eloquently by your leader, and I mean that most sincerely. I am really quite fascinated that since Jan. 14, when I was reappointed Treasurer, this is the first time this issue has been raised in the House; a very interesting phenomenon —and I have commented on that outside the House—as opposed to 1970 and 1971 when the level was not as high, it was a matter of daily questioning at that time; interesting.

However, that's just a reflective note. Unemployment in the province is improving. The levels of unemployment are going down but they are not down to where we would like to see them, obviously. Again, I don't for one minute want to be provocative.

We chose in the April budget, reflecting our concern about the levels of unemployment, to go a particular route, which was a stimulative route through tax cuts as opposed to some of the methods which the hon. member has mentioned in her remarks. We didn't go the route, through the municipalities, with some of the make-work projects. We are conscious of the fact that the federal government actually increased some of its LIP funding.

We have put a great deal of money into housing, which has done something for employment. We cut taxes, which we believe had a very direct effect on unemployment levels in a certain number of industries—the automobile industry, for example, and the construction industry—and we went that route rather than the route of government expenditures. I can say that from the point of view of government expenditures and getting value I think for our dollar, in my view it was the right route to have gone. In answer to the question, I have no present plans for any stimulative action this winter. We are encouraged by the dropping levels of unemployment in this province, but if that trend doesn't continue, then I think we will have to take a very good look at some of the specifics which the member mentioned.

Mrs. Bryden: May I just ask the minister a question? He replied to most of the comments I made. He didn't say anything about the Grassy Narrows employment problems. Is there a possibility of a special project being financed for them?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: I don't think through my estimates. We have gone through this argument before in the House. I suppose it's hard for the Treasurer not to say that it doesn't belong in his estimates, because, as was pointed out, all the money comes—well, it really all comes from Revenue, that's where I suppose it should come. But if something were to be done by way of employment for people in the Grassy Narrows area, then I think it would come through one of the ministries which is more directly involved, and obviously the Ministry of Natural Resources, the Ministry of Health, the Ministry of Community and Social Services and the Ministry of the Environment have been particularly involved. If they developed an employment programme it could end up in our ministry, but the impetus would come from them. Perhaps they are developing something in their own estimates, but I don't think they have approached us.

Mr. Good: I would like to say a few words regarding the manner in which the government handles payments and response when a flood or other disaster occurs within the province. At the time of the Grand River flooding last year there was a considerable amount of uncertainty, a great deal of anxiety and very little concrete direction given by the government as to what level of assistance might be available to the people who were so adversely affected by the flooding of the Grand. As we have seen over the years, the government usually ended up with a dollar for dollar assistance on the amount of money that was raised at the local level.

I can remember, on the day after the flood, going out to Bridgeport and telling people who had at that time set up a toll-gate at the bridge crossing the river and were collecting a considerable amount of money to make sure they keep track of the amount, keep it separate, and perhaps the province would reinstitute its plan of matching dollar for dollar. It was not very long before it was very evident that dollar-for-dollar assistance from the province would be totally inadequate. But it was a great length of time before any answer was given as to what the assistance would be.

I understand that the minister has resisted the idea of setting up permanent funding with

definite guidelines so that individuals and municipalities would know, when disaster strikes, what type of assistance would be forthcoming from the government. Certainly the Grand River problem, along with others that have occurred in eastern Ontario in recent years, spells out the necessity that there be permanent guidelines and that there be permanent funding available when disaster of this type does strike.

We argued in the Legislature for days and for weeks regarding the investigation that was necessary to see if the flood could have been prevented or a degree of it could have been prevented. I am wondering if the minister would have any comments as to whether the government is considering permament guidelines in this matter or whether the two-for-one or the four-for-one is now established as a precedent and that this is available in the future.

Mr. Ruston: Use Wintario.

Mr. Good: Certainly I feel that the present ad hoc method of dealing with these things is very unsatisfactory to the people who are adversely affected.

Mr. Ruston: Use Wintario funds.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: I don't know that this could be regarded as a precedent for every situation. It is certainly a precedent for larger situations.

For example, in my own community in the flood in Wallaceburg the dollar-for-dollar assistance was quite adequate and looked after the situation. In very large occurrences, such as this, it wasn't going to be adequate and that was why the government made the change which it did in the formula in the summer of 1974.

I don't think I would want to say that the Grand River formula was the formula from here on in. I think these things still have to be looked at as things on their merits. That is not the right term; they have to be looked at in light of the special circumstances and the ability of the particular municipality to handle it or not handle it on its own. I don't think it is etched in concrete forever.

Vote 1008 agreed to.

On vote 1009:

Mrs. Bryden: I would like to ask the provincial Treasurer if he could give us some details on the Ontario Land Corp. programme; as to how much land the corporation has purchased, how much it has leased, how much it has sold and who the directors of the corporation are.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: The corporation is made up of seven civil servants. There are four from my ministry, plus Mr. Wronski from Housing, Mr. Lantz from Agriculture and Food and Mr. York from Industry and Tourism. From my ministry are Mr. Honey, Mr. Bell, Mr. McIntyre and Mr. Russell, who is being replaced by Mr. Omand from my ministry; Mr. Russell moved to Revenue.

I don't know that I have the acreages. Nothing has happened this year in terms of further purchases other than the ongoing completion of the purchases at North Pickering, Edwardsburgh, Townsend and Cayuga. There obviously isn't money in the estimates to do it. That's how it has been contemplated. I can get the figures as to the exact acreages, but they have not changed, except that North Pickering may have shrunk a little bit from when last we put these figures in front of the House, whatever the acreages were; we've been completing those purchases.

Mrs. Bryden: May I ask whether the Spencerville land assembly is included in this item?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Edwardsburgh, yes.

Mrs. Bryden: I noticed the latest report of the Treasury showed a $5-million repayment of capital for the land corporation. What was that for?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: I believe that was a reduction in the amount we thought we would spend. Was that in the quarterly report?

Mrs. Bryden: Yes.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: In the budget there was an amount of $10 million or $11 million put in the land corporation for the industrial parks programme of the Ministry of Industry and Tourism. That was reduced by $4.5 million in the supplementary actions. I think that's the figure the hon. member would have seen in the quarterly report. If I am wrong, I'll get back to her, but I think that's what it would be. It wasn't a refund. It's just a reduction in spending.

Mr. G. I. Miller: Could I ask one question of the minister? Have the land purchases been completed for the Townsend and South Cayuga townsites?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: There apparently is some filling in going on, I am told. I'll get those particulars for the member. I know he is interested in both of them.

Mr. G. I. Miller: Could we have up-to-date details?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Yes, I'd be glad to provide them. We will write to the hon. member and give him a status report on both of them.

Vote 1009 agreed to.

Mr. Chairman: This completes the estimates of the Ministry of Treasury, Economics and Intergovernmental Affairs.

Hon. Mr. McKeough moved the committee rise and report.

Motion agreed to.

The House resumed, Mr. Speaker in the chair.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Speaker, the committee of supply begs to report it has reached certain resolutions and asks for leave to sit again.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Mr. Speaker, tomorrow the House will go back into committee of supply and, I believe, will consider the estimates of the Ministry of Education. I am told that they will probably finish those shortly after 11, and then there will be another set of estimates which you can announce.

Hon. Mr. McKeough moved the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to.

The House adjourned at 6 p.m.

APPENDIX

INSTALLATION OF OMBUDSMAN OF ONTARIO

Mr. Speaker: The Reverend Father Henry Maloney, priest of Our Lady of Mercy parish in Bancroft, Ont., will deliver the invocation.

Rev. H. Maloney: Let us pray.

Almighty God, father of all men, we pray for your son and servant, Arthur, as he assumes the heavy burden of the office of Ombudsman for this Province of Ontario. Send down upon him, we beseech you, your holy spirit, to endow him with your gifts of knowledge, wisdom, fortitude and understanding. Grant him the spirit of right judgement and courage, the spirit of love and reverence in your service so that, laying aside all private interests, prejudice and partiality, he may discharge worthily his responsibilities as officer of the Legislature of this province to the glory of your blessed name and for the good of this community of your people.

In the words of your humble St. Francis of Assissi, make him an instrument of your peace. Where there is hatred, let him sew love where there is injury, pardon; where there is doubt, faith; where there is despair, hope; where there is darkness, light; and where there is sadness, joy.

Amen.

Hon. P. M. McGibbon (Lieutenant Governor): Pray be seated.

Hon. Mr. McMurtry: Mr. Speaker, you will recall that on July 4, 1975, this Legislature by resolution requested of the Honourable the Lieutenant Governor in council the appointment of Arthur Edward Martin Maloney, one of Her Majesty's counsel learned in law, as Ombudsman for the Province of Ontario pursuant to the Ombudsman Act, 1975, which the House approved in the spring session of the Legislature.

I believe that the members of this House expressed confidence in Mr. Maloney, a most distinguished citizen of Ontario, and I am sure that all members of the House will want to be identified with the support of this the Legislature.

I believe it is now Her Honour's pleasure to respond to the resolution.

Hon. Mrs. McGibbon: Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to inform you, and through you the assembly, that I have approved the order passed by my executive council in accordance with the address of the assembly which you presented to me on July 9 this year, appointing Mr. Arthur Edward Martin Maloney as the first Ombudsman for the Province of Ontario.

It is with great pleasure that in the name of Her Majesty, I express thanks to Mr. Maloney for accepting the very onerous responsibility of his new office. This is a very historic occasion in the life of the province and its people, whose interest will be better served because of the Ombudsman's availability to all citizens of the province.

I know that Mr. Maloney will bring to his new duties the same ability and energy that have made him such a distinguished citizen of Ontario. I know also that the position of absolute neutrality which has been accorded by the Ombudsman Act to his office, his authority to report to the assembly and his independence from the executive will be a source of great satisfaction to those people seeking his help; and that his neutrality and independence will be honoured by the executive and the legislative branches of the government.

I am now pleased to ask the Premier to present Mr. Maloney to you, Mr. Speaker, for the administration of the oath as required by statute.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Your Honour, Mr. Speaker, members of the Legislature and guests: As you stated, Your Honour, this is a very historic occasion and I would like to welcome a number of Mr. Maloney's friends. Without singling out any because it would be very awkward to do so, there is one gentleman here, Your Honour, whom I would like to welcome to the Legislature. That is the former Prime Minister of Canada, a very great Canadian—who, incidentally, has a book available for all of those who are interested; and, sir, I want no commission for my stating that—but I would like to welcome to this House, Mr. John Diefenbaker.

I was going to say something, Your Honour, that might not be considered totally impartial on this impartial occasion; I shall refrain from doing so.

Your Honour, the concept of the Ombudsman originated in Sweden some many years ago; it is one of the longest surviving parliamentary democracies in the world. Over the years, this same concept has been adopted by other nations and jurisdictions, including seven Canadian provinces. Ontario has joined

this tradition now for two fundamental and, we believe, timely reasons.

Firstly, we have to maintain an overriding concern and respect in our society for the rights, the freedoms and security of the individual. Secondly, because of the larger complexities now facing each individual in today's world there is a greater need for reinforcement of our belief in these rights in a proved and practical manner. Specifically, this new office offers stronger protection for the individual before the power of the state. It will be the role of Ontario's Ombudsman to investigate recommendations, decisions and actions committed or omitted in the administration of the government of this province, whether by petition or on his own initiative and it will be the Ombudsman's function to recommend action in each case.

Mr. Speaker, Ontario has had a proud and enviable record of upholding and defending the rights of the individual. The Ontario Human Rights Code, now 15 years old, prescribes in law certain basic moral principles governing the behaviour of individuals toward each other and of institutions toward the individual. The body of civil rights legislations enacted in 1971 by this Legislature provided the most comprehensive programme of any jurisdiction in Canada for the protection of individual rights in relation to administrative procedures in government today.

What we seek in the creation of an Ombudsman for all Ontario is still greater accessibility for the individual to the security of freedom under existing law in a democratic society. As Ontario's first Ombudsman I commend to you Arthur Edward Martin Maloney, QC, whose appointment has been made on the resolution and with the approbation of the members of this Legislature and which has been greeted with wide public accord.

It is not surprising, Your Honour, and Mr. Speaker, that Mr. Maloney, a native of this province, is one of Canada's most distinguished citizens. He is from a family renowned for its contribution to the public life of Canada and Ontario.

His father was a federal member of Parliament, and his brother, who was known to many of us here, was a member of this House, as was his grandfather. Mr. Maloney himself served as a member of the Parliament of Canada from 1957 to 1962. I think above all else Mr. Maloney has distinguished himself by his outstanding service to the cause of justice in this country, both in its advocacy and its defence.

It is also interesting that a member of the family, a very close relative of Mr. Maloney, was able to offer the prayer here today. Arthur, you are fortunate to have that spiritual guidance within your own family, the guidance I know that you accept seven days a week—I am not sure of that.

On behalf of the government, Your Honour, Mr. Speaker, and the people of this province, we entrust to him this new challenge in the full knowledge that we shall be well and ably served.

Mr. Speaker, Mr. Maloney is now prepared to take the oath of his office, which the statute requires be administered.

Clerk of the House: Do you, Arthur Edward Martin Maloney, solemnly and sincerely promise and swear that you will faithfully and impartially, and to the best of your skill and knowledge, execute the powers and trusts reposed in you as Ombudsman for the Province of Ontario? Do you also solemnly and sincerely promise and swear that you will not disclose any information which you receive as Ombudsman, except as you may be permitted by law, so help you God?

Mr. Maloney: I so swear.

Clerk of the House: Do you, Arthur Edward Martin Maloney, sincerely promise and swear that you will be faithful and bear true allegiance to Her Majesty, Queen Elizabeth II, so help you God?

Mr. Maloney: I so swear.

Clerk of the House: Pauline M. McGibbon, Province of Ontario; Elizabeth II, by the grace of God, of the United Kingdom, Canada and Her Other Realms and Territories, Queen; Head of the Commonwealth, Defender of the Faith—to Arthur Edward Martin Maloney, greeting.

Know you that having special trust and confidence in your loyalty, integrity and ability, and in pursuance of the provisions and by the authority of the statute in that behalf made and enacted, we have thought fit to nominate and appoint, and by these presents do nominate and appoint you, said Arthur Edward Martin Maloney, Ombudsman for the Province of Ontario, to have, hold, occupy, protect and enjoy the said office during our pleasure and your residence within our Province of Ontario, together with all and singular the rights, privileges, emoluments, fees and perquisites which to the said office belong or of right appertain; in testimony whereof we have caused these our

letters patent to be made patent and the great seal of our Province of Ontario to be hereunto affixed.

Witness—the Hon. Pauline M. McGibbon, an Officer of the Order of Canada, Doctor of Laws, Doctor of University (Ottawa), Lieutenant Governor of the Province of Ontario, at our city of Toronto, in our said province, this 30th day of October, in the year of our Lord, 1975, and in the 24th year of our reign.

By command,
(signed) Margaret Scrivener, Minister of Government Services.

Mr. Speaker: I know that the assembled guests here today would be delighted to have our Ombudsman, Mr. Arthur Maloney, address them at this time.

Mr. A. E. M. Maloney: Your Honour, Mr. Speaker, Mr. Premier, Mr. Lewis, Mr. Nixon, your lordships, your honours, distinguished members of the House, your distinguished guests, ladies and gentlemen:

I want to first of all express my gratitude to Her Honour the Lieutenant Governor for what she has said, and on behalf of all assembled express our gratitude to her for her kindness in inviting us to the reception which is to follow.

I wish also to thank you, Mr. Speaker, and through you, Mr. Roderick Lewis, QC, and Mr. John Holtby, for the excellence of today's arrangements.

As I view the members of the judiciary who are present today, representative of all of the courts of the province, headed by Chief Justice Gale and Chief Justice Este, in all of which courts it has been my privilege for the last 30 years to have appeared and to have pleaded with varying degrees of success, I am filled with nostalgia at the prospect of not being able to appear again before you as counsel, certainly for a period of 10 years. The prospect of never addressing a jury again in that time is one that is not easy for me to contemplate.

I am consoled, however, by the fact that it has now become my privilege to serve a much wider constituency of people, which I look forward to doing with all my heart.

I am happy to see here today my counterpart from Alberta, Rev. Dr. Ivany, and also the Ombudsman from Nova Scotia, my friend, Dr. Harry Smith. The Province of New Brunswick, which is at present without an incumbent due to the unfortunate decease of Dean McAllister, is represented, I am glad to say, by Mr. Charles Ferris.

I have already had the privilege of meeting all of my fellow Ombudsmen in Canada. They have generously shared with me the knowledge and the expertise that they have acquired over their longer period of operation.

I am immensely grateful to the Rt. Hon. John George Diefenbaker for his presence here today. A few weeks ago I took part in the Ottawa celebrations for his 80th birthday. I said then and I say again, this most distinguished man has a place that is all his own in the hearts and the affections of the people, no matter what their politics, their race, their colour or their creed. For John Diefenbaker there will never be a last hurrah; he will just go on for ever.

My mind goes back to May 22 when I sat in the gallery of this chamber with my friend Roy McMurtry, now the hon. Roy McMurtry, Attorney General and Minister of Justice of our province. We listened to the Premier, the Hon. William Davis, as he put my name in nomination as the first Ombudsman of Ontario.

It had been apparent to me from the time discussions about the possibility of my appointment commenced that the Premier and his colleagues in the government took a very serious view of the proposed legislation and were determined that it should be set up to function in the most effective way possible.

It is an understatement for me to say that I was deeply touched by what followed in so far as the opposition parties were concerned. The support given to my nomination by Mr. Stephen Lewis, the Leader of the Opposition, and Mr. Robert Nixon, the leader of the Liberal Party, and the subsequent unanimous endorsement by all of the members of this House of every political party, reinforced my determination to serve this House and the people of Ontario without bias or prejudice of any kind.

If the legislative chamber of a true parliamentary democracy functions as it should the atmosphere will almost always be highly charged. The fact that I will serve this House within that atmosphere without being part of it is a challenging prospect which I welcome and to which I look forward.

It would be an oversight of first-rate magnitude if no mention were made by me on this elegant occasion of the hon. member of this House who was the pioneer in the field of legislation relating to the office of Ombudsman. Members of all political parties would surely expect me to identify Mr. Vernon Singer, the distinguished member for Wilson Heights.

I look upon each member of the Legislature as an ombudsperson in his own right. It is my intention and my expectation that the expertise, that happily my office will acquire, that the service of my staff and our facilities generally will be an indispensable adjunct to him as he finds his way, like the rest of us, through the increasingly complex labyrinth of government.

So as to help him in his function and so as to enable us to meet him more easily, and any of his constituents whom he wishes to bring to see us, the Ombudsman has been given, I'm very happy to say, an office in the legislative building itself. It will remain open throughout the year and so long as the House itself is in session will maintain the same hours as you do in the chamber. The lights will not go out in room 157 until after the day's proceedings have been completed here.

Sur les armoiries de l'ombudsman ontarien figure le griffon, animal mythique à corps de lion et à tête à ailes d'aigle, qui représente l'union de la force et de la vigilance. C'est un symbole qui convient à celui qui doit se faire le gardien des droits du citoyen. A une époque où le rôle de l'administration publique a pris tellement d'extension que la portée de ses activités nous touche dans presque tous les aspects de notre vie, le citoyen aura besoin d'un recours à un ombudsman impartial lorsqu'il se croirait lésé par l'acte ou l'omission d'un fonctionnaire.

Des gens sont venus ici de tous les pays du monde pour nous aider à bâtir une société dans la liberté, une société dont les bases ont été jetées par les Anglais et les Français. On reconnaît cela sur les armoiries de l'ombudsman. Les trois trilliums qui se trouvent juste en-dessous du griffon symbolisent le droit à la justice sociale et à l'intégrité culturelle des Anglais, des Français, et des autres ethnies qui font la richesse de notre patrimoine.

Toute carrière présente au commencement ses difficultés. Celle de l'ombudsman offre un défi spécial, puisqu'il s'agit non seulement d'un commencement personnel pour moi, mais aussi du commencement d'une institution que nous n'avons pas connue auparavant. L'Assemblée législative, en créant le poste d'ombudsman, s'est inspirée de l'exemple d'autres pays ayant une tradition de démocratie parlementaire comme la nôtre, où l'on a cru bon d'avoir un ombudsman pour protéger le citoyen contre l'injustice administrative.

Pour ma part, j'accepte ce défi. J'ai le privilège d'être le premier ombudsman de l'Ontario et je ferai tout pour être digne de la confiance que l'on m'a montrée.

I have had the opportunity, since my appointment was confirmed, to meet with the deputy ministers of approximately 12 of the provincial ministries, together with their top aides and advisers. Arrangements are under way to enable me to meet with the balance in the very near future. I have experienced nothing but co-operation and encouragement from every one of them, and I look forward to serving the people of Ontario the more easily and the more effectively from the knowledge I have that they too are determined that the office of the Ombudsman shall really work.

One of the commitments I made when I agreed to assume the responsibilities of this position was to draw up a blueprint for the office that would be best suited to the needs of Ontario. To accomplish this I undertook, as I carried on the functions of the office in the first year, to make a study at the same time of its functioning in the other provinces and in other jurisdictions of the world, a few of which I undertook even to visit.

As a matter of fact, it will interest you to know—and I will be giving you a more detailed report in due course about this—that I have already inspected the offices and have met my counterparts in the United Kingdom, France, Germany and Israel, and have had discussions with over 50 knowledgeable men and women who were high-ranking members of their staffs. It is hard to exaggerate the value that someone in my position derives from this kind of direct face-to-face contact with those who have already acquired so much experience in carrying out this kind of responsibility.

The pluralistic nature of Ontario's society makes it imperative that the Office of the Ombudsman should be as representative as possible. It pleases me more than I can say to know that represented in today's assemblage are representatives of all the great ethnic minorities of Ontario. I was not long in public life myself before I realized the immense contribution that this vital element of our Canadian society made to our political, cultural and economic growth and development. I want them to know that I am very sensitive to their problems and to their needs. It will interest them and you to know that presently serving on my staff are personnel who are representative of, and have linguistic capacities in, not only English and French, but also in Italian, German, Russian, Ukrainian, Czech, Slovak, Polish, Estonian, Yiddish and Hebrew.

When I abandoned my career at the law to enter unchartered waters, I derived in-

spiration from Oliver Wendell Holmes, who, when he was appointed Justice of the Supreme Court of the United States, said: "It is required of man that he should take part in the actions and passions of his time or face the peril of being judged not to have lived."

Woodrow Wilson once said: "I used to be a lawyer. Now I am a reformed character." In my life I have been fortunate to serve both as an advocate before the courts of the land and also as a member of Parliament. I can say now, as did Artemus Ward 50 years ago: "I am no longer a politician, and my other habits are good."

Now I look forward to the challenge and the opportunity of this new office. For the Office of the Ombudsman as an institution to further protect the rights of man is an idea whose time has come.

During the remarks that I delivered in French, I referred to the emblem or symbol of my office, the Griffin, a cross between a lion and an eagle. My brother Henry, in his beautiful invocation, referred to the prayer of St. Francis. He loved animals and animals instinctively loved him. I suspect he would have had mixed feelings about my Griffin or about the possibility that it might ever use his gentle shoulders as a perch; but as I assume my new duties I will always remember that St. Francis also prayed for the courage to change those things which can be changed, the humility to accept those which cannot and the wisdom to know the difference—a prayer that any ombudsman would be well advised to adopt.

Thank you.

Mr. Lewis: Your Honour, Mr. Speaker, Mr. Ombudsman, Mr. Premier, my colleagues in the Legislature and all distinguished guests: I feel it a privilege to participate at the appointment of Arthur Edward Martin Maloney as Ombudsman in Ontario. Indeed, anyone with so mellifluous and felicitous a name as that was destined for this office. I feel equally privileged to share, however briefly, some time in the presence of the Rt. Hon. John Diefenbaker to whom, like others, I shall present my copy of his memoirs for autograph before he leaves.

I understand the solemnity of the occasion. I wonder if I may be allowed an anecdotal opening, the truth of which you will have to entrust me with.

Some months ago, I was sitting late evening with my wife watching the Barbara Frumm show on television. Barbara Frumm was interviewing Arthur Maloney, and if memory serves me it was about the jury system and the Morgentaler case. Arthur Maloney was responding to the questions with lucidity, perception, sensitivity and that protectiveness of jurisprudence which even I, as a layman, have learned to treasure.

I turned to Michelle and said: "What an unusual man is that. What a fine ombudsman he would make for Ontario." Extraordinarily enough, a week or 10 days later I guess it was, much to my surprise I assure everyone, the Premier stood and made the announcement; all of these events preceding by much time the more recent political events.

The choice, all of us felt at the time, was inspired and the affirmation and pleasure with which the appointment was greeted is no less now that the appointment is confirmed. The office has about it a certain majesty as does its first incumbent. I've always had difficulty separating office and holder. In this position, as perhaps in no other, the principle of the one is expressed through the incumbent; the theory becomes the practice of the incumbent.

All of us I think in this Legislature have felt about the ombudsman some simple and compelling principles.

First, and most obvious, that the complexity and bureaucracy of the modern state requires the protection, the vigilance and the accessibility of an ombudsman.

Second, and equally obvious, that the citizens of a free and democratic society must sense that justice in its broadest interpretation is available to them all; and where not, the Ombudsman must forever be the unfailing court of of last resort. The Ombudsman himself, we think—all of us in this Legislature, Mr. Ombudsman—must be absolutely unfettered in his authority to pursue justice for those who feel themselves wronged; and that the exercise of that authority should be as searching, as tenacious, as unrelenting as the Ombudsman wishes, regardless the discomfort or embarrassment to the political nobility of any given day.

When an ombudsman opens his office and pursues his job, immediately problems present themselves. There are many in this province—I think even of the demonstration which greeted this Legislature when it opened this week—there are those whose sense of frustration and anger and grievance is such that the office of Ombudsman will be seen as the focal point in the pursuit of justice.

You have, of course, Mr. Ombudsman, the unfailing support of the opposition in this Legislature. Indeed, I think it fair to say that the strongest evidence of our loyalty to the new Ombudsman is our enthusiasm for your decision to hire away from the New Democratic Party, from the NDP caucus, the single most indispensible member of staff and colleague any of us have had for 20 years. And may I say, without seeming to be presumptuous, that if, by chance, divine providence should ever fail you, then I urge you to turn to mortal providence in the person of Ellen Adams.

We wish you well.

Mr. Nixon: Your Honour, ladies and gentlemen: This is, of course, an important day for us all, but we in the Liberal caucus have a bit of a proprietary interest in it as well, because I and my colleagues have participated in the debate, I believe at least nine years in this House, in which the advantages of the creation of such an office were discussed in this very chamber. So we were particularly pleased when, by the unanimous decision of this House, the office was created just now a few months ago.

It goes without saying that all of us as elected members believe in the efficacy of the position itself, the tested approach that has been taken by other jurisdictions before Ontario ventured into this important procedure and position for the safeguarding of individual interests, which are of such great importance to us all. But one of the aspects which pleases us more than perhaps anything else is the ability and background, the proved ability, of the incumbent who was here this morning sworn in in your presence, Your Honour.

According to the Toronto columnists, who seem to be able to sense the vibrations from the thoughtful responses of the Conservative Party, it is the new Attorney General himself who perhaps was most active in persuading Mr. Arthur Maloney to abandon what has been one of the greatest legal careers in Canada, with all sorts of fulfillments. I probably didn't realize how important it was until the Ombudsman himself mentioned it in his excellent address a few moments ago.

So I'm sure that we owe some appreciation to the indivduals who were able to persuade Mr. Maloney of the importance of this position. It is anything but a facade. It goes to the very roots and the depths of the democratic process, and I would predict, Your Honour, that he will be called upon to show the strength of that position and his own individual strength in the procedures associated with his office.

I was also particularly pleased to hear in his remarks this morning, his dedication to a close association with all of us as elected members of this House, because a former Premier, in expressing an objection to the position, had said: "We are all ombudsmen and surely we don't need another."

I believe very strongly that we do need another, and that his association with the elected members of this House will be the cornerstone and the foundation of a long and productive association.

Mr. Speaker: Your Honour and distinguished guests, today we have inaugurated a new parliamentary office in Ontario. I share with all my colleagues in the House the sure knowledge that the Ombudsman will act with diligence and impartiality. The Legislature wishes him well.

CONTENTS

Thursday, October 30, 1975

Anti-inflation programme, statement by Mr. McKeough 67

Anti-inflation programme, questions of Mr. McKeough: Mr. Lewis, Mr. Nixon, Mr. Foulds, Mr. Bullbrook 74

Bell Canada investigation, questions of Mr. Handleman: Mr. Lewis, Mr. Nixon 77

Anti-inflation programme, questions of Mr. Wells: Mr. Nixon 77

Teacher-school board negotiations, questions of Mr. Wells: Mr. Nixon, Mr. Foulds, Mr. Lewis 78

Television reception in Metropolitan Toronto, question of Mr. Snow: Mr. Williams 80

Canadian Westinghouse, questions of Mr. Bennett: Mr. Deans 80

Greenhouse industry, question of Mr. W. Newman: Mr. Mancini 81

Rent controls, question of Mr. Rhodes: Mr. Davison 81

Pickering airport, questions of Mr. Snow: Mr. Givens, Mr. Reid 82

Violence in hockey, question of Mr. McMurtry: Mr. Samis 82

Rent review, question of Mr. Rhodes: Mrs. Campbell 83

Water pollution, questions of Mr. Kerr: Mr. Angus, Mr. Singer 83

Ontario net cash requirements, questions of Mr. McKeough: Mr. Sargent, Mr. Shore 83

Use of hazardous chemicals, question of Mr. Miller: Mr. Mackenzie 84

Ontario sales tax, questions of Mr. McKeough: Mr. Haggerty, Mr. Roy 84

Motion re select committee to study reports of the Ontario Commission on the Legislation, Mr. Welch, agreed to 85

Motion to select committee to review Ontario Hydro rate proposals, Mr. Timbrell, agreed to 85

Highway Traffic Amendment Act, Mr. Roy, first reading 89

Debate on the Speech from the Throne, Mr. Norton, Mr. Jones 89

Motion to adjourn debate, Mr. Welch, agreed to 95

Estimates, Ministry of Treasury, Economics and Intergovernmental Affairs, Mr. McKeough, concluded 95

Motion to adjourn, Mr. McKeough, agreed to 112

Appendix: Installation of Ontario Ombudsman 113

SPEAKERS IN THIS ISSUE

Angus, I. (Fort William NDP)
Bain, R. (Timiskaming NDP)
Breaugh, M. (Oshawa NDP)
Breithaupt, J. R. (Kitchener L)
Bullbrook, J. E. (Sarnia L)
Bryden, M. (Beaches-Woodbine NDP)
Campbell, M. (St. George L)
Cassidy, M. (Ottawa Centre NDP)
Conway, S. (Renfrew North L)
Davidson, M. (Cambridge NDP)
Davis, Hon. W. G. Premier (Brampton PC)
Davison, M. (Hamilton Centre NDP)
Deans, I. (Wentworth NDP)
Evans, D. A. (Simcoe Centre PC)
Foulds, J. F. (Port Arthur NDP)
Gaunt, M. (Huron-Bruce L)
Givens, P. G. (Armourdale L)
Godfrey, C. (Durham West NDP)
Good, E. R. (Waterloo North L)
Haggerty, R. (Erie L)
Handleman, Hon. S. B. Consumer and Commercial Relations (Carleton PC)
Jones, T. (Mississauga North PC)
Kerr, Hon. G. A. Environment (Burlington South PC)
Laughren, F. (Nickel Belt NDP)
Leluk, N. G. (York West PC)
Lewis, S. Leader of the Opposition (Scarborough West NDP)
MacDonald, D. C. (York South NDP)
Mackenzie, R. (Hamilton East NDP)
Makarchuk, M. (Brantford NDP)
Mancini, R. (Essex South L)
Martel, E. W. (Sudbury East NDP)
McKeough, Hon. W. D. Treasurer, Minister of Economics and Intergovernmental Affairs (Chatham-Kent PC)
McKessock, R. (Grey L)
McMurtry, Hon. R. Attorney General (Eglinton PC)
Miller, Hon. F. S. Health (Muskoka PC)
Miller, G. I. (Haldimand-Norfolk L)
Newman, Hon. W. Agriculture and Food (Durham North PC)
Nixon, R. F. (Brant-Oxford-Norfolk L)
Norton, K. (Kingston and the Islands PC)
Peterson, D. (London Centre L)
Reid, T. P. (Rainy River L)
Renwick, J. A. (Riverdale NDP)
Rhodes, Hon. J. R. Housing (Sault Ste. Marie PC)
Roy, A. J. (Ottawa East L)
Ruston, R. F. (Essex North L)
Samis, G. (Cornwall NDP)
Sargent, E. (Grey-Bruce L)
Shore, M. (London North L)
Singer, V. M. (Wilson Heights L)
Snow, Hon. J. W. Transportation and Communications (Oakville PC)
Spence, J. P. (Kent-Elgin L)
Swart, M. (Welland NDP)
Timbrell, Hon. D. R. Energy (Don Mills PC)
Wells, Hon. T. L. Education (Scarborough North PC)
Williams, J. (Oriole PC)
Yakabuski, P. J. (Renfrew South PC)

No. 4



Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT — DAILY EDITION

First Session of the Thirtieth Legislature

Friday, October 31, 1975

Speaker: Honourable Russell Daniel Rowe
Clerk: Roderick Lewis, QC

THE QUEEN'S PRINTER
PARLIAMENT BUILDINGS, TORONTO
1975



CONTENTS

A list of the speakers taking part in the debates in this issue of Hansard appears, in alphabetical order, at the back of this issue.

Daily contents of proceedings also appears at the back of this issue. Reference to a cumulative index of previous issues can be obtained by calling the Hansard Reporting Service indexing staff. Phone 965-2159.

Hansard subscription price is $15.00 per session, from: Sessional Subscription Service, MGS, 9th Floor, Ferguson Block, Parliament Bldgs., Toronto, M7A 1N3. Phone 965-2238.

LEGISLATURE OF ONTARIO

FRIDAY, OCTOBER 31, 1975

The House met at 10 a.m.

Prayers.

Mr. Stokes: Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to introduce to you and to the House, 44 grade 11 and grade 12 students from Marathon High School under the supervision of Mr. and Mrs. Alec Gouthro, Miss Marianne Hoople, Mr. Gunther Wirtz and Mr. Victor Gionet. Would you please welcome them to the Legislature this morning.

Mr. Kennedy: Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to introduce a group of students, in the gallery, from South Peel Secondary School together with their teacher, Mrs. Wills. Would you join me in welcoming those students and their teacher.

Mr. Renwick: Mr. Speaker, I too would ask the members to welcome 25 students accompanied by Mrs. Reid from Danforth Technical School in the great riding of Riverdale.

Mr. Warner: Mr. Speaker, I would like the House to welcome students from grade 12, Bendale Secondary School and their instructor, Mrs. Bournes, from the great metropolitan area of Scarborough. Would the House welcome them this morning.

Hon. B. Stephenson: Mr. Speaker, may I please ask you and the House to welcome 16 students from Seneca College of Applied Arts and Technology in the beautiful riding of York Mills, with their teacher, Miss M. Belfiore.

Mr. Lewis: I thought there were students here from Scarborough West.

Mr. Speaker: Statements by the ministry.

SPENDING REVISIONS

Hon. Mr. Auld: Mr. Speaker, the "Supplementary Actions to the 1975 Ontario Budget" from the Treasurer (Mr. McKeough) as of July 7, 1975, indicated that we were determined to find, within our original spending estimates, sufficient savings to finance $178 million in new measures. These savings were to be achieved without sacrificing the delivery of essential services, without defaulting on our commitments to local governments and without distorting our priorities.

A two-part plan was to be used to achieve these expenditure cuts and internal efficiencies. The first part of the plan involved programme cuts and postponements, while the second involved the cutting of internal government costs.

It was the second part of this plan which gave Management Board the responsibility of implementing eight cost-control measures in order to produce savings of some $81.9 million in 1975-76. This figure was later increased to $87.9 million, and it is with regard to these eight internal cost-cutting measures that I now report.

Measure 1 imposed an immediate cut on replacement staffing for all internal administrative functions and, with normal attrition, envisaged complement reductions of approximately 1,500 by the end of this fiscal year.

To realize the full impact of this measure, it must be seen in the context of the earlier cut ordered in the April budget for 1975-1976, and also our reductions in civil service complement in 1974-1975.

Mr. Nixon: That shows how much fat there was in the government to start with.

Hon. Mr. Auld: The Treasurer announced in the 1975 budget that the civil service complement levels had been reduced from the April 1, 1974, level by 2.3 per cent.

Mr. Nixon: It's amazing you were able to do that.

Hon. Mr. Auld: This reduction, coupled with the further reduction of 1,500 by the end of the current fiscal year, brings the total combined reduction of civil service complement and OPP to well over 3,000, or just under four per cent.

Mr. Nixon: How are we going to get along? Who misses them? Three thousand gone and who misses them?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Hon. Mr. Auld: This is being achieved despite allowing net increases to the com-

plements of the Ontario Provincial Police, security guards, and environment plant operators.

Measures 2, 3 and 4 included an immediate moratorium on the hiring of consultants, a 10 per cent reduction in data processing budgets, and a 10 per cent reduction in direct operating expenditures.

Mr. Nixon: That's why your speeches have improved.

Mr. Singer: Who is going to do the dirty tricks work?

Hon. Mr. Auld: Together, these measures are to produce a total saving of $62.9 million. These reductions now have been identified, or are in the process of being identified.

Mrs. Campbell: That is what your consultants are costing us.

Hon. Mr. Auld: However, the work of the government must go on, and to permit ministries to proceed with their approved programmes and projects, with reduced dollar amounts, the moratorium on the hiring of consultants has been lifted.

The further reduction of civil service complement by means of measure 1, and the saving of $62.9 million under measures 2, 3 and 4, have now been achieved in the first seven months. There remains a further $18 million under measures 5, 6, 7 and 8.

Those measures deal with reductions in planning and design staffs; improved inventory management; consolidation and rationalization of regional offices and a review of the resources devoted to research. All these, of course, take longer to analyse and, at this point in time, I can report that Management Board is monitoring the progress being made in these areas and, on these particular measures, I will probably have a report later on in the fiscal year.

Mr. Nixon: Spectacular.

ANTI-INFLATION PROGRAMME

Hon. Mr. McKeough: I might just briefly report to the House that we have Telexed the federal Minister of Finance, Mr. Macdonald, this morning, indicating our support for the change he is proposing in terms of the $600 guideline and the move which he has made.

Mr. Lewis: My colleague from Carleton East (Mrs. Gigantes) suggests we all move to Ottawa, then the minister won't have to Telex or phone. He wouldn't even have to sit here at all; we could just move.

Mr. Speaker: Oral questions.

TORONTO TEACHERS' NEGOTIATIONS

Mr. Lewis: May I ask the Minister of Education, now that the teachers predictably seem determined on a course of events which will lead to a very major and undesirable strike in the Metropolitan Toronto area has he plans for any personal intervention? What has he requested over the next few days specifically to try to deter what now appears to be an almost inevitable outcome?

Hon. Mr. Wells: First, Mr. Speaker, I'd like to differ with my friend in saying "inevitable outcome." I've always assumed, and I'm sure he knows from the last provincial election, one cannot presume any inevitable outcome of a secret ballot.

Mr. Lewis: Almost impossible, I say.

Mrs. Gigantes: Peace in our time.

Hon. Mr. Davis: The NDP are the most surprised people.

Hon. Mr. Wells: I think perhaps my friend was surprised at some of the conclusions from the secret ballots which were put into that ballot box.

Mr. MacDonald: Confession is good for the soul. I haven't heard that kind of analysis before.

Mr. Lewis: That certainly gives me hope for the future.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Don't get too optimistic.

Hon. Mr. Wells: I emphasize that because—

Mr. Lewis: I am not too optimistic—conscientious.

Mr. Speaker: Order please. Let's have one person speaking at a time.

Hon. Mr. Wells: We are all jumping one step ahead of the procedures outlined in Bill 100 governing collective bargaining, which calls for a supervised vote on the last board offer and a supervised strike ballot which the Education Relations Commission is now in the process of organizing and which, I understand, will be held next week. Really, until that event takes place we cannot assume anything because a secret

ballot is called for and a secret ballot will be held. Although we may be able to look into our crystal ball and foretell very well what's going to happen, we have to assume until that happens that the people haven't decided.

Mr. Lewis: Why is the minister waiting until it is too late?

Hon. Mr. Wells: We are not waiting. Let me say this, though: After the discussion of a few days ago, I again looked at the bill governing collective bargaining for teachers. We debated it long and hard in this Legislature and one of the cornerstones of that bill is the Education Relations Commission. I think I fulfilled my pledge to this House to appoint some of the best people possible to that commission We have on there Owen Shime as chairman and the deputy chairman is Prof. Harry Arthurs.

Those commissioners, and I've spoken to them, are the ones, I think, who should come into play at this particular time. I think they, of course, are feeling their way because this is the first really serious case they've had to deal with. I've talked to Mr. Shime and as the commission he stands ready to be of any possible help, as charged by this House with overseeing teacher-board negotiations.

I think it is premature at this time to do anything else but to ask the commissioners what they see their role is or should be as we approach what might be a very serious situation. I certainly stand ready to be of assistance at any time, as I know my friend will be in his particular capacity with the parties.

Mr. Lewis: Nobody asks me.

Hon. Mr. Wells: This House passed a piece of legislation and we set up this important commission. I think they have to see what their role should be in this particular instance. I'm sure they also feel that until that vote is taken, we cannot say for sure that they are heading down the road toward a strike in Metropolitan Toronto.

Mr. Lewis: One supplementary: Leaving the crystal ball aside, doesn't the minister think he is leaving it dangerously late in this situation? Given the Ontario Education Relations Commission, given the vote—which I suspect last night's meeting probably predetermined — doesn't the minister think he is leaving it dangerously late, as Minister of Education, still to refuse personally to intervene with only about 10 days to go? Can the minister not summon himself to get the parties together to see if we can avoid the outcome?

Hon. Mr. Wells: Mr. Speaker, as I said a few minutes ago, I stand ready, if the parties feel that I can be of assistance. If they will call me, I'd be happy to see what assistance I can be to them.

I want to emphasize very clearly that I don't want to undercut this new Education Relations Commission which may be sitting there now devising ways in which it should talk to the parties.

Mr. Lewis: It is wondering what to do.

[10:15]

Hon. Mr. Wells: If they are wondering what to do, I have to suggest, with respect, that they are far more experienced labour mediators than either I and probably my colleague.

Mr. Lewis: Oh yes, much more than I am.

Hon. Mr. Wells: I am sure that they are sitting there, given the responsibilities that this Legislature handed to them, to try to decide what they should do, because I am sure that there is no one in this Legislature or anywhere who wants to see a teachers' strike in Metropolitan Toronto, none of us.

Mr. Lewis: Then you'd better move in on it.

Hon. Mr. Wells: If the parties would like me to meet with them, if they will communicate with me I'll certainly be happy to meet with them any time.

Mr. Nixon: Since the reports this morning indicate that the Toronto board is very unwilling to offer more than the 10 per cent or the 12 per cent of the federal guidelines, and according to one report an authoritative source is quoted as saying they are waiting to hear from the provincial authorities as to what they can do, would the minister not think that the minister would be justified in stepping in at this stage, as has been suggested by myself and the Leader of the Opposition, because the circumstances of the federal wage and price controls were not foreseen when we passed Bill 100 and when the Education Relations Commission was established.

Hon. Mr. Wells: I think the answer the Toronto board was looking for was given by the Minister of Finance for Canada yesterday in the House of Commons, or in some statement to someone, and it is reported in

the papers this morning. That, I think, is the most definitive answer we've had in that particular area as of yet, and we welcome that, because what we need are some hard, definite answers rather than grey, hazy answers.

Mr. Nixon: Wouldn't this justify the minister's personal intervention in this, since the situation has changed?

Hon. Mr. Wells: With respect, Mr. Speaker, I think I just answered that particular question in my exchange with the Leader of the Opposition.

Mr. Nixon: Perhaps I haven't made myself clear, Mr. Speaker, but the point is that the minister has said we passed the law and established the Education Relations Commission and that it should be allowed to function. My point was that we did not envisage federal wage and price controls which are imposed directly on this, which must surely involve the political authority and not the appointed authority—and that's the minister.

Hon. Mr. Wells: Certainly it involves us at a particular time, but there is a separation of function here; we are talking about the function of negotiation and procedures to arrive at a contract in Metropolitan Toronto and the outcome of the various processes under Bill 100, and the Education Relations Commission is charged with overseeing that whole particular attitude.

Mr. Nixon: The minister is actually talking about an imminent strike.

Hon. Mr. Wells: I think Mr. Macdonald said, and I think everyone has said—and this certainly applies in the private sector as well as the public sector which is governed by the Ontario Labour Relations Act, again an Act of this Legislature—that nothing in the federal programme negates any of the procedures or rights under any of these labour statutes and the people should continue using those particular bills. In this case, the Education Relations Commission is charged with overseeing matters concerning teacher-board negotiations. Let's let them have a chance.

Mr. Nixon: After we have a strike.

Mr. Bullbrook: By way of supplementary, if I may, do I correctly understand the minister to mean that the normal procedures and functions under Bill 100 are to be carried through, notwithstanding the intervention of the federal guidelines—

Mr. Lewis: Yes.

Hon. Mr. Wells: The answer to that is yes.

Mr. Bullbrook: May I finish? —and the exportation of his responsibility to Ottawa? Is that what we understand?

Hon. Mr. Wells: The normal procedures and the responsibilities and rights and everything under Bill 100 should be carried through and are in no way negated by the federal programme.

FARM INCOME STABILIZATION PROGRAMME

Mr. Lewis: To the Minister of Agriculture and Food: Now that he has mastered his portfolio in its entirety, what has happened to the farm income stabilization plan and when is he going to pursue the commitment made in the Throne Speech of the last Parliament?

Hon. W. Newman: Mr. Speaker, I have already been pursuing it. I met with the federal Minister of Agriculture and Food on Wednesday of this week and discussed the farm stabilization programme—

Mr. Nixon: You're going to let them do that too, I understand.

Hon. W. Newman: —and I am quite satisfied that things are moving along satisfactorily.

Mr. Lewis: Just a second—on a supplementary—with what is the minister quite satisfied? To what extent will the province fulfil the commitment he made to the farmers of Ontario? When are we to have the farm income stabilization plan which was promised and budgeted for?

Hon. W. Newman: If I remember correctly, we have always said that it should be on a national basis.

Mr. Lewis: Like everything.

Interjection.

Hon. W. Newman: Do you want to ruin the agricultural industry in this country?

Mr. Lewis: I'd like an agricultural industry in Ontario.

Hon. Mr. W. Newman: I'm telling you we just don't want to ruin it.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Hon. W. Newman: I have said that I would be meeting with Mr. Whelan; I have met with him, and we have discussed farm stabilization programmes. I have already said

in a speech that if we cannot make satisfactory arrangements on a national basis we will move into the field ourselves.

Mr. Lewis: Like controls.

Mr. Foulds: How long?

Mr. S. Smith: They may be our cousins but they are your masters.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: Tell us, who is getting strained now?

Mr. Bullbrook: My colleague is on a different level, physically and intellectually, from the Minister of Housing.

HOUSING SITUATION AT RED LAKE

Mr. Lewis: A question, if I may, of the Minister of Housing. If I can ask "Mr. Danson" to come to attention for a moment, I would like to put a question to him.

Is he aware of the desperate housing situation in the little community of Red Lake? If so, is he prepared to respond to it?

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: I am certainly aware of the situation in Red Lake. I have the opportunity to discuss it with their representative quite often—even more so now.

Mr. Singer: They talk about little else.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: As I understand the problem—and I don't pretend to know all of the problems as yet—the Red Lake situation is being dealt with continually in an attempt to provide new housing.

Mr. Reid: Meanwhile, they still have the problem.

Mr. Lewis: By way of supplementary, does the minister realize that the government purchased a larger portion of land to develop under the HOME programme and finds, because of services and related costs, that they cannot build houses at less than roughly $60,000 a house and that the council and the community are frantic because of the expansion of Reed Paper, Ontario-Minnesota and the Griffiths Mine? Would the minister meet with the council to try to iron it out since the housing crisis accelerates through the community? They called me just yesterday.

Mr. Renwick: The Minister of Natural Resources (Mr. Bernier) shouldn't prompt his colleague.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: Frankly, I was not aware that this sort of situation had developed as to the cost.

Mr. Lewis: It has.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: Perhaps that is brand new. Certainly I would be quite happy to meet with the council of Red Lake and discuss the matter with them.

Mr. Singer: And the member for Kenora (Mr. Bernier).

Mr. Nixon: A supplementary question: Does the Minister of Housing understand that the first time most of us met the member for Kenora he was standing in the middle of the road in one of those northern towns with a banner that he himself had strung across the main street? We were in the presence of the then Premier and it said, "Mr. Robarts, Kenora needs housing". That was in 1962 and we haven't got it yet. That was his election platform in 1963.

Mr. Speaker: Is this question of urgent public importance?

The hon. member for Brant-Oxford-Norfolk may ask his questions now.

Mr. Lewis: It was in your own community.

Mr. Nixon: Since 1962; it is almost incredible.

Hon. Mr. Bernier: That housing was supplied.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: I would just like to respond to the hon. member by saying I wasn't up in that part of the world at that time and didn't see the banner. Neither was the member for Brant-Oxford-Norfolk.

Mr. Nixon: We have had Tory government ever since and there is no housing.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: You weren't there either.

Hon. Mr. Bernier: The member has only spent 15 minutes there.

Mr. Nixon: That was when you were a Liberal, for heaven's sake.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: And that was when the Liberals were in second place.

Mr. Nixon: We need him right now. We need him.

Mr. MacDonald: He's got one foot in each of the sinking ships.

ADVERTISING OF RENT REVIEW

Mr. Nixon: I would like to direct a question to the Provincial Secretary for Resources Development. Did the minister consult with the Premier (Mr. Davis) before he authorized the insertion of the series of ads, specifically in the Globe and Mail of Saturday, Sept. 13, over his signature, purporting to be a notice to tenants informing him that the municipalities and the province would be co-operating in the establishment of rent review boards?

Hon. Mr. Irvine: I would be delighted to see what advertisement the member is referring to. Would he pass it over to me, please?

Mr. Singer: Oh, come on.

Mr. Nixon: This isn't a supplementary, but just for clarification, surely he recalls the advertisement that was placed in support of the Conservatives' third housing policy during the election campaign.

Hon. Mr. Davis: That's better than not having any housing policy at all.

Mrs. Campbell: Oh, we had a policy.

Mr. Nixon: Did he consult with the Premier before the advertisement was inserted, because the Minister of Housing, as he then was, signed the ad?

Hon. Mr. Irvine: Mr. Speaker, we are getting a bit more definitive. Really, I would think the leader of the Liberal Party would know by now—

Mr. W. Hodgson: You didn't lose very well.

Mr. Yakabuski: He's a poor loser.

Hon. Mr. Irvine: —that he should tell me exactly what date it was, what advertisement he is referring to.

Mr. Nixon: I told the minister Saturday, Sept. 13.

Hon. Mr. Irvine: As far as my consulting with the Premier is concerned, I consult with him daily and hourly if necessary.

Mr. Nixon: A supplementary: Is the minister aware that the Election Expenses Commission, in reference to that ad, has passed a minute saying as follows:

> In the opinion of the commission, the advertisement offended the spirit of the Act and it was incumbent upon a ministry of the government to exercise discretion during a campaign period with respect to the type of advertising and the provisions of this Act—

that's from the minutes. In view of that, what action is the minister, who was the Minister of Housing at the time, going to take? Is he recommending to the Treasurer that action be taken to recover from the Conservative Party the costs of these advertisements which, in the opinion of the Election Expenses Commission, offend the spirit of the Act?

Hon. Mr. Irvine: Mr. Speaker, whether or not it offends the Act I am not absolutely sure, but what I will do is recommend to the Treasurer and the present Minister of Housing to consider whether it does offend.

Mr. Singer: He is going to second guess the commission, is he? That's interesting.

Mr. Nixon: A question of the Treasurer: In view of the fact that this is an opinion expressed in the minutes of the Election Expenses Commission, would he take action as Treasurer to recoup from the Progressive Conservative Party the costs of these advertisements? In case he gets in touch with them from time to time.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Mr. Speaker, I think really it's the Minister of Government Services (Mrs. Scrivener) who—

Mr. MacDonald: Going on along the line.

Interjections.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: —runs the collection bureau of the government. My observation would be that one can't get blood out of a stone. The Conservative Party doesn't have the wealth the Liberal Party has.

Interjection.

Hon. Mr. Davis: That was the position before the election, Bob.

Mr. Nixon: I would like to direct a question to the Premier, with your permission, Mr. Speaker, because while there may be a degree of levity about that bloodless stone, surely this is the first infraction of the intent of the Act of any significance. It was used, no doubt under the direction of the Conservative campaign managers, to use public funds to shore up a situation which was becoming extremely serious. I would like to hear from the Premier what action he is going to take to see that this situation is put properly straight.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, the hon. leader of the third party in this House is asking me—

Mr. Nixon: Just call me the member for Brant; that's what you used to do.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I assumed he was still the leader of the third party for a period of time.

Mr. Nixon: What is the Premier going to do about the ad?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I am quite prepared—

Mr. Nixon: Is the party going to pay it back?

Hon. Mr. Davis: I haven't had any communciation that I know of from the commission. I assume, if they considered it serious, they would communicate with us as I am sure they will on any other concerns they have about the last election. There may have been other matters brought to their attention; I am not sure of this. I would like to ask the leader of the third party where were all the financial lists he was going to publish prior to the election?

Mr. Conway: Answer the question.

Hon. Mr. Davis: We haven't seen them yet. Where are they?

ONTARIO NORTHLAND RAILWAY STAFFING

Mr. Bain: I would like to direct my question to the Minister of Transportation and Communications: Recently the Ontario Northland Railway has cut back freight crews because there is a temporary loss of business due to the pulp and paper mills' unwillingness to sign a contract with the workers of those mills. Will the minister assure us that this temporary loss of business will not be used as an excuse to reduce permanently the number of freight crews?

Hon. Mr. Snow: Mr. Speaker, I was not aware that the freight crews had been reduced. I can see certainly the problems in the paper industry having an adverse effect on the volume of freight. I was aware of that. I will certainly discuss the matter with the chairman of the ONR at our next meeting which I believe is next Wednesday morning. [10:30]

Mr. Bain: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary: I assume the minister will make that information available to us. Also, I would like to ask the minister, in regard to the ONR, that although the ONR had budgeted to build loading sheds in Elk Lake to accommodate the shipping of the production of United Asbestos in Midlothian township, it was unable to obtain the contract to ship that mine's production. Was the contract lost because the marketing experts in North Bay couldn't get their bids straight?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. This seems to be far removed from the original question and the answer thereto. This is supposed to be a supplementary to the answer given. A new question would be in order later, if we have the time.

PAYMENT FOR CATTLE PURCHASES

Mr. Worton: I have a question of the Minister of Agriculture and Food. Could the minister inform the House as to what steps his department is taking in relation to the suppliers of cattle to Essex Packers at the Guelph Correctional Centre, in order that they can be assured of payment for these cattle? As I understand it, there have been NSF cheques returned to many of the suppliers.

Hon. W. Newman: The Essex Packers beef operation at Guelph does have a financial problem. At this point in time we are trying to sort it out. I believe as of Oct. 17 all cheques are now being honoured by the—I think it's the Scotiabank, or one of them. Before that time there were some NSF cheques involved. There is some payment due from the Minister of Correctional Services (Mr. J. R. Smith), which has been approved. Certainly, I have been in touch with the bank on a personal basis to try to see what we can do to ensure that the farmers get their money on those NSF cheques.

Mr. Singer: Can you guarantee payment personally?

Mr. Worton: A supplementary: Can we be assured that the money the minister has on hand will be kept in trust for those suppliers before other payments are made? I'm talking of people who are owed between $20,000 and $30,000.

Hon. Mr. Newman: I understand there is no legal way, because this was a commitment that was made to hold back the funds. As a matter of fact, we're just working on that today.

RENT REVIEW

Mr. Williams: A question for the Minister of Housing. Would the minister be

prepared to give consideration in the preparation of his rent review legislation to incorporating therein a provision whereby all landlords would be required to post in appropriate, common areas of all the rental premises a schedule of rental rates, so that existing tenants would be assured of having an equity in application of rental rates to equal accommodation throughout the facilities; and so that potential future tenants would know what the prevailing rates were throughout the rental premises?

Mr. Samis: Who wrote that one?

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: Yes, Mr. Speaker, we would certainly consider that in the development.

Mr. MacDonald: It is a good idea.

Mr. Martel: Tell them to wait. You're courteous.

Mr. Laughren: Talk to Barney Danson about it.

METRO TORONTO CHILDREN'S AID SOCIETY BUDGET

Mr. McClellan: I have a question for the Minister of Community and Social Services. As the minister may know, the 1975 budget of the Metro Children's Aid Society has not yet been approved by the ministry, although it has been recommended by Metro council. Would the minister explain to the House why he intends to cut some $800,000 from the budget of this vital community service, which has not been increased, as the minister knows, in about three years?

Hon. Mr. Taylor: I surmise that the member has received his information from a press article dealing with a certain in camera session which is going on presently. When that proceeding is terminated I will be in a position to respond; but I would question the accuracy of the newspaper report on a number of accounts.

Mr. McClellan: Supplementary: Would the minister advise the House when he will have this information?

Hon. Mr. Taylor: When the hearing is concluded I will have the information. Insofar as the cut is concerned, as you know if you read the article, there was a request by the Children's Aid Society for 115 additional workers, when in fact my ministry had authorized 80 additional workers. There were some other matters with reference to funding, saying that the moneys were not in the ministry. It was a matter of allocation of those funds for different purposes, not that the funds were not in the budget.

As I have pointed out earlier, there are a number of inaccuracies in that particular paper, and when the hearing is concluded and I have the report, then I'll be in a position to give you something on it.

NORTH PICKERING DEVELOPMENT

Mr. Eakins: A question, Mr. Speaker, of the Minister of Housing: Will the minister inform us as to the status of the North Pickering project now that the government has reversed its previous support of the Pickering airport?

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: Mr. Speaker, the decision on the airport has not had any change as far as the status of the North Pickering project as of this very moment.

Mr. Singer: As of this very moment.

Mr. Nixon: What about this afternoon?

Mr. Lewis: You don't know that—just keep your options open.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: You don't either.

Mr. Ruston: It changes moment by moment.

Mr. Singer: They might build the airport next year.

Mr. Speaker: Order please. The hon. member with a supplementary?

Mr. Eakins: Given that the now cancelled airport was planned to stimulate economic activity, will the minister tell us exactly what economic base exists to justify the creation of a city the projected size of North Pickering?

Mr. Nixon: The Toronto-centred region plan.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: I can't tell the member that this morning.

Mr. Singer: No, no. Try for this afternoon.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: Mr. Speaker, for the benefit of the members of the third party I am prepared to present whatever information can be gathered as to whether or not any change will be made in the status of that project.

The initial question from the hon. member, and quite properly so, is whether there was any change in the status, and the answer was no. Then to ask me to provide a total economic rationale on the city as it is now proposed is ludicrous. We will get it for him if it is necessary.

ARTIFICIAL INSEMINATION SUBSIDY

Mr. Wildman: Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the Minister of Agriculture and Food. Is it the minister's intention to raise the artificial insemination subsidy for northern Ontario—

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: Right on, Bud.

Mr. Breaugh: Are you looking for a job, Rhodes?

Mr. Wildman: —above its present level of $2 per service since it has remained—

An hon. member: You would go cheaper, would you?

Mr. Wildman: —since the 1950s, and operators in Algoma are losing approximately $3.50 per service?

Hon. J. R. Smith: What a maiden speech.

An hon. member: That's a lot of bull.

Mr. Wildman: Also, if the minister intends to raise the subsidy, when will he do that and by how much; and how will the subsidy be paid to ensure that only farmers using these services will benefit from the subsidies?

Hon. W. Newman: Mr. Speaker, I know it is a very serious matter and the member wasn't speaking for himself, but I would be glad to answer the question.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: Don't bet on that.

Interjection.

Hon. Mr. Newman: May I say that we have had a stay of closing up the United Breeders in the northern part of the Province of Ontario and we are negotiating with them at this point in time to work out a satisfactory arrangement. We realize just how important the AI units are in northern Ontario to the breeding stock up there, to make sure that they still have the necessary materials there to help them, and we are already negotiating. We have had a stay of execution of closing down their operations and we hope to work out something satisfactory. It may not be on a direct fee basis, it may be on some other basis, but we are working with it at this time.

Mr. Wildman: A supplementary to that: If it is intended to maintain the quality of the stock through maintenance of the subsidy, can the minister give us some idea as to the amount that it might be raised to, since right now they are losing approximately $3.50 per service?

Hon. Mr. Newman: Mr. Speaker, some units are losing more than others on the service costs. It varies from unit to unit, and that is why it is not quite as simple as the member is saying. In some areas it goes up as high as $5 per service while other areas are only losing 25 cents per service, so we have to look at the overall picture.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: Going to have an answer rated X.

Mr. Bullbrook: Is this one of Lorne's special duties?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Let's have a select committee.

Mr. Speaker: Order please. We are taking quite a bit of time on this and I think we had better get on. There are many other people wanting to ask questions. We had a couple of supplementaries there and that is enough on that for this morning.

KRAUSS-MAFFEI SYSTEM

Mr. Singer: Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the Minister of Transportation and Communications.

Is the minister able yet to honour the commitment given by his predecessor on at least three occasions that the figures would be produced for us as to the cost of Krauss-Maffei to the people of Ontario including extra-departmental costs? Those figures had been promised, as I say, at least three times by the former minister.

Hon. Mr. Bernier: Read your press reports.

Hon. Mr. Snow: I think those figures are available. As a matter of fact, I don't think there was any cost to the taxpayers of Ontario.

An hon. member: Oh, yes, there was.

Mr. Singer: By way of supplementary, would the present minister undertake to look at Hansard and see the way the question was

put and the way his predecessor gave answers, and undertake to honour the commitment given by his predecessor on at least three occasions?

Hon. Mr. Snow: Yes, I'll certainly refer to Hansard and to the commitments made by my predecessor. But my previous answer still stands and I'll supply the figures to back it up.

RETAIL GAS OPERATIONS

Mr. Philip: A question for the Premier: It's my understanding that this morning two of his ministers will be meeting with the organization of Ontario retail gas and automotive services. Is the government prepared seriously to consider divorcement legislation prohibiting the oil companies from operating retail gas operations in this province?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I think that question should be properly directed to one of the two ministers who, I gather, are meeting with some of the retailers today.

Mr. Lewis: Why not let it be redirected to them?

Mr. Philip: I will redirect the question then.

Mr. Speaker: That will be permissible.

Mr. Lewis: The Minister of Energy.

Mr. Philip: To the Minister of Energy then: Is he prepared seriously to consider divorcement legislation prohibiting the oil companies from operating retail gas operations in this province?

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: He was looking at another minister, but I think he was asking me.

Mr. Martel: You are the Minister of Energy, I think.

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: The last time I checked it was still on the door. The Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations (Mr. Handleman) and I did meet this morning with two representatives of the Ontario Retail Gasoline Association, at which time they presented to us a four-page submission of the problems that they see with their particular element of the petroleum industry and the problems that they are having. They also presented to us, in that four-page submission and in the discussions afterwards, some suggestions which, from their point of view would help to solve their problems as they see it.

We undertook to consider those recommendations within the Ministry of Consumer and Commercial Relations and within the Ministry of Energy. I told the two gentlemen that I would put this matter before the cabinet subcommittee, hopefully within the next 10 days, and consider it. Certainly some of the parts of their submission have the potential for further increasing prices to the consumer beyond what we think are acceptable prices at this time, looking ahead to the point where the royal commissioner will complete his work.

There's also the fact, that the royal commissioner will be considering various problems of the retail sector of the petroleum industry in phase 2 of his work, including the question of price differentials between northern and southern Ontario in particular, and the commissioner will be holding public hearings around the province.

Mr. Philip: Supplementary: Would the minister care to explain how the price will be increased by this kind of divorcement legislation and would he care to explain whether he has considered the position of the Consumers' Association of Canada in this regard which in fact agrees with the ORGA position?

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: It wasn't just divorcement legislation that was discussed, it was a number of other possibilities which were put forward by their counsel, Mr. Bromstein. The Consumers' Association did, I believe, appear before the royal commission. They have not sent anything directly to me. I haven't seen any briefs from them. I don't know whether the Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations has. He's shaking his head, indicating he has not heard from them. I would be interested in hearing from them to know how they feel about ORGA's position.

HAM RADIO OPERATORS

Mr. B. Newman: Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the Minister of Transportation and Communications. Is the minister aware that ham radio operators provide many free emergency radio services; and is the minister likewise aware that the Province of Ontario is probably one of the only jurisdictions in North America that does not recognize the services of the ham radio operators by providing special licence plates? Will the minister give favourable consideration to permitting and providing special licence plates to the ham radio operators, and if not, why not?

Hon. Mr. Snow: Mr. Speaker, I am certainly aware of the excellent service that the ham radio clubs do give. I know I have a very active one in my own riding which has given excellent service during several emergency situations. I know this matter has been discussed previously. I will certainly look into the matter again.

HIGHWAY PAVING CONTRACTS

Mr. Grossman: I have a question of the Minister of Transportation and Communications. In view of the Premier's statement with regard to the paving of the Spadina corridor —and I must quote in order to ask the question:

> As a further proviso that arterial roads be placed in the Spadina corridor between Lawrence and Eglinton, we would require that Metro Council develop a plan to ensure that traffic generated by the new roadway will remain on other Metro Arterial roads

could the minister tell us whether or not a plan has been received from Metro pursuant to the proviso; and if it has not, will the minister remind Mr. Godfrey of this proviso when he does meet him?

Hon. Mr. Snow: Mr. Speaker, to my knowledge we have not received any plan from Metro on this matter as yet; the policy has not yet been decided. A meeting is scheduled with Mr. Godfrey some time next week. I certainly will bring this matter up again at that time.

[10:45]

ANTI-INFLATION PROGRAMME

Mr. Warner: My question is of the Treasurer of this province. In the light of the indication of this government's intention to cooperate fully with the federal government in its anti-inflation programme, and in the light of its indication yesterday of the increase in the sales tax of Jan. 1, 1976, does this government intend to make application to the anti-inflation board for such a large increase in the sales tax?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: No, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Warner: Supplementary: This is a 40 per cent increase.

Mr. Speaker: Your question?

Mr. Warner: Can the minister give us a reason why the government should not apply to the anti-inflation board for such a large increase?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Yes, because taxes in the white paper are something which are not considered in the guidelines.

Mr. Foulds: Doesn't the government think it should set an example?

ELECTION CAMPAIGN PROMISES

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Speaker, a question of the Premier: Would he advise the House the amount of dollars promised during the election not budgeted for, and also advise if any of these promises have been gone through by orders in council?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, there were two or three suggestions during the election campaign, the total of which was several hundreds of millions of dollars less than that promised by the Liberal Party of the Province of Ontario.

An hon. member: The third party.

Mr. Lewis: But considerably more than any undertaking that we made.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Well, I am not sure. I have not checked the figures recently, but I think that the total was probably substantially less than that of official opposition now. Probably the largest amounts related to the question of the rent supplement for the senior citizens, which I can only assume from the member's question he will personally oppose when it is brought to the House.

The other commitment that was given does involve an alteration in expenditure.

Mr. Ruston: You really are reaching.

Hon. Mr. Davis: It was the commitment that if the federal government could not find a way to isolate or insulate the prime rate on interest from the housing industry, so that people could afford to purchase or carry houses, we were in fact prepared to introduce a form of tax credit up to $500 on the differential above, I recall, of 10.25 per cent. There are some dollars involved—no question about it—in the commitment that was given during that campaign.

I can only assume once again—and I just hope the hon. member's point of view is not shared by his colleagues—that he personally will vote against that. But I sense that the majority of members in this House, if we bring in such legislation, will rather enthusiastically support it. I would think those were

the two major commitments. As I say, they were hundreds of millions of dollars below those promised by the third party in this House today.

Mr. Nixon: How about the 89 others?

Mr. Conway: What would the election expenses commission think of that?

Mr. Sargent: The Premier had better be nice to us because we can put him out of business.

Hon. Mr. Davis: I'm being very nice. I'm giving the member's colleagues a chance to vote for the legislation.

Mr. Sargent: Cut the doubletalk. Does the Premier plan to honour his commitment across Ontario and break down locally what he promised and let us know what the score is? Would he please?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I pointed out the two major components in what was said during the campaign. Yes, we're quite prepared to live with those commitments.

ANTI-INFLATION PROGRAMME

Mrs. Bryden: Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask a question of the provincial Treasurer. In the event that the new cozy arrangement between the members opposite and Ottawa does not work out, is the provincial Treasurer prepared to bring in his own excess profits tax as part of the anti-inflation programme, since he appears to be so strongly in favour of it and he has complete control over the corporations tax?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: It's a possibility.

Mr. Lewis: A possibility?

Mrs. Bryden: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker: I also notice that he is only in favour of an excess profits tax if the profits are not reinvested. Does that mean that if the oil companies with their huge profits, invested—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. Is the supplementary question flowing from the answer?

An hon. member: Yes.

Mr. Foulds: I'd like the Treasurer to define what that possibility is.

Mrs. Bryden: I just want to know if the oil companies invested their profits in some other country, for exploration in Australia, say, would he still not put an excess profits tax on them?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: I would think the suggestion we made yesterday would be that they be reinvested in Canada.

SUPPLEMENTARY BUDGET

Mr. Shore: Mr. Speaker, could I direct a question to the hon. Treasurer? In his supplementary budget in July he indicated that because of the federal budget the revenue from corporation taxes and other items would be reduced by approximately $100 million, $60 million of which was as the result of corporation taxes. Two and one-half months later a revised supplement suggested instead of a $60-million adjustment it had gone up by $20 million.

Mr. Speaker: The question?

Mr. Shore: Can he reconcile those figures which differ approximately $80 million?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: I'll get a reconciliation for the member. Corporation taxes in some ways are the taxes most difficult to predict because of the insolvent payments. Without going into detail, it's the one we really don't know where we stand on until practically the last month of the year. I will get a reconciliation for the member of that apparent discrepancy.

Mr. Shore: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: A very brief one.

Mr. Shore: It is very brief.

Mr. Speaker: Is it arising from the answer?

Mr. Shore: Yes. Can I assume that there are any major discrepancies in adjustment that would affect the reading of the budget as a result of the fact that the Treasurer can't know until the last date?

Mr. Reid: Or are there any other mistakes?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: I'd want to think about that.

NIAGARA GRAPE CROP

Mr. Swart: This question is directed to the Minister of Agriculture and Food. Would he inform the House whether the total grape crop in Niagara Peninsula has now been purchased under the financing plan an-

nounced during the last election? Would he also state whether he believes that this plan should be the continuing policy of the government and not just a plan in an election year?

Hon. W. Newman: Mr. Speaker, it was not just an election year gimmick, if that is what the member is trying to say.

Mr. Nixon: No?

Mr. Singer: No? Perish the thought!

Hon. W. Newman: It was a programme to help the grape producers. As far as I know, to the best of my knowledge, it has been implemented. We also have an ongoing programme to replace—I don't know the various varieties as yet; I'm not that knowledgeable about grapes.

Mr. Nixon: Three years ago you were fostering imports.

Hon. W. Newman: As I say, we also have an ongoing programme to help bring in the kind of grapes that are more readily usable in the production of better wine in the Peninsula area.

Hon. Mr. Welch: Very progressive policy.

Mr. Swart: Supplementary question.

Mr. Speaker: Order please, the time has expired now. May I suggest that there seem to be too many supplementaries. Surely not every question requires a supplementary. There are many people, I'm sorry to say, who have original questions which they wish to ask.

Mr. Bullbrook: And nobody has asked the Minister without Portfolio (Mr. Henderson) a question yet.

Mr. Speaker: Right, I agree.

Mr. Bullbrook: If he gets in his seat we will ask him a question. How are you? How is that?

Hon. Mr. Henderson: Very disappointing.

Mr. Speaker: Petitions.

Presenting reports.

Hon. Mr. Snow presented the Ontario Northland Transportation Commission annual report for the year ending Dec. 31, 1974, and the Ontario Telephone Services Commission annual report for the year ending Dec. 31, 1974.

Hon. Mr. Timbrell presented the Ontario Energy Board annual report for the year ending Dec. 31, 1974, the Ministry of Energy annual report for the year ending March 31, 1975, and the Ontario Hydro annual report for the year 1974.

Mr. Speaker: Motions.

Introduction of bills.

Orders of the day.

Clerk of the House: The 13th order; House in committee of supply.

ESTIMATES, MINISTRY OF EDUCATION

Mr. Chairman: Does the minister have any opening comments?

Hon. Mr. Wells: First, Mr. Chairman, let me follow what many members have said and congratulate you on your appointment to this very important position. You've handled it in an excellent manner to date and I'm sure that this will continue. We are going to miss some of the exchange, if you stay in that chair during the full debate, that we usually engage in about education in northern Ontario. But I'm sure that you'll find ample time to put the deputy in so that we'll be able to have lots of opportunity to debate some of your real concerns about education in your area. But congratulations on your appointment.

Mr. Chairman: Thank you.

Hon. Mr. Wells: In presenting the estimates of the Ministry of Education, I am today asking the legislative assembly to approve expenditures for the fiscal year 1975-1976 of more than $1.7 billion.

Mr. Chairman: There is too much undercurrent in the Legislature, would you keep it down so we can hear what the minister has to say, please?

Hon. Mr. Wells: This is a large amount of money, and education in Ontario is a large and expensive enterprise. As we move through this debate we will be discussing the individual items that make up this total amount. When we get into the detail, I think that it is sometimes easy to overlook the forest because of the trees. Therefore, I would like to speak to a few basic issues in these remarks this morning.

[11:00]

In examining an expenditure of this size two very simple bread and butter questions arise. First, why are we spending this much

money and, second, how do we know that we are getting our money's worth? How do we know we are getting the quality that we have a right to expect?

In answering the first question I think we have to talk about where the money goes.

Basically the budget of the Ministry of Education breaks down into three major categories. In the first of these, 87.4 per cent of our budget is turned over directly to local school boards in grants to assist them in operating their schools.

Secondly, 8.6 per cent of this budget that we are discussing today is for transfer and statutory payments made directly to other educational agencies and programmes such as the teachers' superannuation fund, the Ontario Institute for Studies in Education, the Ontario Educational Communications Authority, research and other grants.

Thirdly, the remaining four per cent of this budget can be categorized as direct operating expenditures, which include not only administration and support services but also the schools operated directly by the ministry, such as those for the blind and deaf, the Ontario Teacher Education College and our extensive correspondence course programme.

Mr. Chairman: Order, please. There is far too much noise in the committee. Would you give the minister an opportunity to be heard, please?

Hon. Mr. Wells: These estimates, Mr. Chairman, for 1975-1976 represent an increase of 10.1 per cent over those of a year ago. I might say that the overwhelming percentage of this increase arises from increased grants to local school boards to avoid a situation where they might have to cut back on the quality of their programmes because of inflationary pressures on their budget.

I think it is also worth noting that we have been able to hold our budget increase to 10 per cent during a period when the inflation rate has been over 12 per cent.

Of course, in looking at spending in education, we also have to talk about the purpose or goal of education. You can go for your definition to sources like educational philosophers such as Plato and Rousseau all the way down to Dewey and Whitehead, or you can go to the man on the street. No matter where you go, I think that from any source two ideas emerge. The first is that there is a social purpose to education. We educate so that people can contribute to society and can live responsibly and in harmony with others. But there is also an individual purpose to education. We educate so that the individual can pursue those goals that have personal significance. If these are our goals, then to whom should they apply? That is a very important question.

Throughout most of history and in many parts of the world the answer in effect has usually been, to a small and privileged minority. This was once the answer in Ontario but in recent decades we have perhaps idealistically but nevertheless very purposefully and effectively said the answer to that question is to everyone. In doing so, we have set ourselves a social challenge of immense scope and consequence. I don't think we have fully met that challenge in many quarters yet or perhaps fully come to realize the consequences of it. But we have come a long way from the stage in which we used to think that fairness and equality of educational opportunity demanded only that a place be found for everyone at the starting line.

There is much rhetoric surrounding the phrase, "equal educational opportunity for all." In Ontario, we are taking the rhetoric seriously. We've taken realistic and effective steps to serve a larger and larger proportion of all age groups, and we have done so through a time of unprecedented population growth. In fact, from 1965 to 1970 we were building classrooms at a rate of five a day. But the challenge could not be met only by enlarging the system. Each increase in the percentage of the age group being served brought a proportionate increase in the range of needs to be met. To make sure that equality of opportunity was not a mockery we had to ensure that the exceptional needs were met. We had to ensure that the variety of programmes matched the variety of pupils' abilities and interests, and that the ways in which schools assisted learning matched the many different ways in which people could learn.

It is in pursuing this challenge of universal and genuine access to opportunity that I think our cost lies. We can search for administrative efficiencies. We can bargain hard on teachers' salaries and class size. We can eliminate unnecessary equipment and facilities—and I think we are doing all these things—but the plain fact that emerges is that the very large financial commitment which this province makes to education has its foundation in the fact that, through the schools, we are trying to provide a genuine opportunity to all the children of this province to develop their potential to as great a degree as possible.

The second question I would like to answer concerns the matter of quality. What are we

doing to ensure that we are getting the quality to which we are entitled, to ensure that we are getting our money's worth?

Quality, of course, means different things to different people. To some people it seems to mean a highly competitive system concentrating on a narrow range of academic subjects, graduating, in the end, a small group of highly literate students who, with minimum assistance, can perhaps write an analytical essay or tackle integral calculus to the complete satisfaction of their professors.

There are a great many voices today calling for a return to this highly elitist form of education but to me this would be a very regressive step. In my view, quality is defined in the same terms as we define our basic goal. A quality education system is one that develops efficiently and effectively the greatest possible potential of the largest possible number of students. It means a system where the academically talented can sharpen their intellectual wits to the highest possible standard.

It also means a system in which care is taken in the beginning years to ensure that everyone acquires the basic knowledge and skills which are fundamental to everything else that follows. It means a chance for the fast learner to gallop ahead. It also means patient help for the perceptually handicapped child who mixes up his "b"s and "d"s and "p"s and "q"s so that he or she can reach a useful level of reading and writing.

A quality education system means the chance to study algebraic functions and relations as well as the chance to catch up with mechanical arithmetic. It means that those who need to are studying basic sentence structure while others, perhaps, are researching essays on the constitutional history of Canada.

Quality has as much to do with what goes on in the occupational classes as it does with what happens in grade 13. Quality is meeting the needs of the two million individual unique students who come every day to our schools and meeting these needs well. Quality also has to do with high standards, realistic standards which relate to individual goals.

It means if one is university bound, meeting the standards of intellectual rigour which are realistic if one is going to go to university. It means that the student in a special vocational class, learning to be a service station attendant, for instance, is expected to be a first-rate service station attendant. It means, in whatever programme for whatever student, setting a target which requires hard work and persistence to reach but a target which is never out of reach. It means the honest assessment and reporting of achievement and it means levelling with parents regarding their children's progress.

The quality of education and the public's perception of quality of education has a close tie, I think, with the concept of local autonomy. In Ontario, we have probably gone farther than any other province with the concept of letting local school boards and local schools make vital curriculum and, indeed, spending decisions within the framework of broad provincial guidelines and standards laid down by the Ministry of Education, but this policy has given rise to an odd paradox in our province.

The idea of local autonomy is applauded, of course, by almost everyone. Few people argue with the basic policy of giving individual school boards and schools the flexibility to adapt their programmes to meet the specific needs of their pupils. The paradox lies in the fact that the practical application of local autonomy has been the source, directly and indirectly, of a great deal of the public concern expressed about education over the past few years. I think the reason is straightforward enough. When individual school boards or schools break with tradition in what they consider to be the best interests of their pupils, many parents cannot understand the reasons for the changes and this leads to a feeling that standards have been lowered and that there is no central sense of direction in our school system.

Usually, I find that such misunderstandings arise from a straight lack of communication between the schools and parents, or more broadly between the entire education community and the public. In fact, I am convinced that one of the biggest challenges for education today is to involve parents in the schools in a meaningful way. I say this because lack of involvement implies lack of communication and lack of communication brings the lack of knowledge, misunderstanding and mistrust. Without good, honest communication—informing parents and others of what the schools are doing and why—local school boards and schools cannot hope to initiate changes in their programmes without arousing suspicion and a sense of uneasiness among parents and among the public.

However, despite the sometimes unsettling side effects of local autonomy, we as a government remain firmly committed to the idea of delegating as much decision-making authority as possible to the local level, with a rider that the Ministry of Education will continue to fulfill its responsibility in making sure

that high province-wide standards are being set and that high province-wide standards are being met in the best interests of all young people in the province.

Let me use a few specific examples to show how this shared responsibility between the ministry and local authorities must work. To start with, look at the core curriculum in our high schools. We have all heard some pretty emotional rhetoric on this matter and much of it bears little relation to what is actually happening in the schools.

To those who seem determined to perpetuate the myth that there is no core curriculum in our high schools, I can only suggest that they take an honest look at the present practices in virtually all of our secondary schools, because there is a core curriculum and the statistics prove it.

English and Canadian studies are, of course, mandatory for every student. In grades 9 and 10, 100 per cent of the pupils are taking mathematics, 89 per cent are taking science, 83 per cent are taking physical education. In the upper grades, English and maths and sciences are taken by just about every student. We have documented this.

The ministry's officials policy on the high school diploma requirements is laid out in a booklet called HS1. In it there is nothing to prevent a local school board from recommending to its students a solid core curriculum plus a good variety of meaningful and challenging options. In fact, I have been encouraging individual schools and school boards to take up this responsibility and to make sure that it is done. We put the onus on locally-elected school trustees and their principals to develop recommended core programmes for their pupils, because that's where the responsibility belongs.

In saying this, it nonetheless continues to be our policy that a student and his parents, having examined and discussed the recommended package of subjects which has been suggested by the school, can substitute one subject for another in the package. This is allowed, after consultation with the principal, in the name of flexibility and attention to individual needs and goals. If there has been any doubt up to now about this interpretation of our policy, which I have just enunciated, let it be dispelled once and for all.

There are still those who, while espousing local autonomy, at the same time talk as if they would like to go back to the days when everything in education was dictated from Queen's Park.

We don't believe in that, because it doesn't allow the schools the flexibility they need in meeting each child's individual needs. It was like that years ago and we all know what happened—many teenagers fell by the wayside soon after they passed the age of compulsory school attendance. Back then, only 40 per cent of the 15-to-19-year-olds were in school. Today the figure is 80 per cent.

Over the past year we have been taking decisive steps at the elementary school level, underlining again and again the overwhelming importance of the basic skills—the knowledge and skills upon which all later learning is based—in the early years of a child's education. This is important. This is where the foundation is laid and we have left no room for doubt in anyone's mind that the foundation must be strong.

As most members know, we introduced this year a new official curriculum policy for the primary and junior divisions of Ontario's elementary schools. It's called "The Formative Years" and it strongly re-emphasizes and stresses the three Rs—reading, writing, arithmetic, spelling, grammar and all the other basics that are necessary to get a child off to a good start.

[11:15]

So, inherent in the concept of local autonomy in education is the onus and responsibility of locally-elected school trustees and their educators to make positively sure that the high standards set by the province are being met in every classroom across the province. In keeping with local autonomy, these are the people who must have the operational authority to ensure that the basics and a strong core curriculum are in every school and that the programmes offered are in keeping with the policies of the Ministry of Education.

However, it is obvious that the ministry has a part to play here, a greater role, perhaps, than has been perceived in recent years. We cannot abdicate our responsibility to monitor and evaluate current practices in education; and, believe me, we have no intention of doing so. In fact, for about 10 months now, we've been quietly regenerating the regional offices of the ministry which are located in nine cities across the province.

The tone of their activities is taking a turn away from what had been viewed as a passive, consultative role and we're moving more in the direction of increased ministry involvement with the local school board and the local level. We see our regional office people fulfilling a very totally vital function in sensing needs, assessing

the impact of our policies, explaining these policies and, together with local school people, ensuring that they are put into practice.

At the same time we're moving in these directions, we're also going to look at specific steps that can be taken to improve the evaluation of pupil performance, and the reporting of each pupil's progress to parents.

We've already conducted extensive research into these matters. We've confirmed, for example, that there is indeed a great deal of standardized testing going on in Ontario schools, even though it seldom surfaces for public view. About 80 per cent of our elementary and secondary schools are using these kinds of tests for diagnosis and remedial purposes in order to help teachers identify problems and to take corrective measures with individual children.

The four most widely used tests in this province are: the Canadian test of basic skills; the metropolitan achievement test; the Stanford achievement test; and the sequential tests of educational progress. I mention these only to point out that such tests do exist and are being used widely in our schools at the present time. We know, in fact, that their use is increasing quite dramatically, and we encourage this most strongly. But we also believe that there is still much room for improvement in the whole area of testing, evaluation and reporting to parents.

To start with, we believe that there is a need to take a hard look at reporting methods that are used by schools to inform parents of the progress of their children. The basic purpose of reporting is to give parents a reliable indication of how well their child is doing at school, subject by subject, and to evaluate the various social and personal attributes that make for a well-adjusted, well-rounded child. Ideally, such reporting should be an early-warning system in some instances for parents and, at the same time, also a stimulus for praise, encouragement and parental guidance at home.

Today many schools do an excellent job of this. But, unfortunately, there are still many examples of schools leaving parents guessing as to the real meaning of report card jottings and often parents are not alerted to trouble spots until a problem is well-advanced.

There is one further aspect to this matter of reporting pupil progress to parents, and it is the very specific matter of giving parents a reliable indication of how well their child is faring in relation to other children in the same age or grade grouping. I see a valid need for an evaluation system to enable schools to tell parents that in such key areas of the curriculum as reading, mathematics and English, their child is achieving at such-and-such a level in relation, say, to province-wide or national norms.

I would not want to see a return to the days when pupils in each class were ranked first, second, third or so on down to last. The effects of this kind of pressurized comparison at the class level are far more destructive than beneficial, particularly on average and below-average pupils who are struggling to do as well as they are. However interesting such comparisons might be to parents, they can be devastating to a child's confidence and performance. But I do think that parents deserve to know how well their child is achieving in comparison to other children measured against, say, provincial or national norms.

We are going to give serious consideration, beginning immediately, to ways in which tangible improvements can be achieved in this broad area of assessing pupil progress and reporting it to parents. We are going to assign a small team of people to investigate and evaluate what is being done at present in various areas of the province and to look at the best ideas and pupil reporting techniques that can be found. We will then inform schools and school boards of our findings and strongly suggest that they re-examine their reporting methods to ensure that parents' expectations are being met.

The key is, as I said, to make sure that schools do a first-class reporting job to parents, helping parents and the schools themselves to better evaluate each child's progress and thus to better enable them to provide encouragement and assistance to the child as required.

I have mentioned these particular activities and plans to make it clear that we are turning a critical and introspective eye on our activities, that we are not complacent about the status quo, that we are determined to continue to evaluate and improve the quality of what is being done, that we are determined to continue to evaluate and improve the quality of education in this province, and that we are taking a kind of hard-nosed and practical measures that are needed to ensure that we are getting maximum value for our educational dollars.

I began these remarks by posing two questions: Why is the cost of education as

great as it is and what are we doing to ensure that we are getting the quality that should result from this expendiure? I think I have given a general answer to the first question and a more detailed answer to the second.

I have said many times that Ontario takes a back seat to no one in the high quality and standards of our school system. This is due to the dedication and quality of those in education—our teachers, our administrators, our trustees—and our system serves well the children and young people of this province, as it should.

I would say that those who seem bent on criticism, seemingly for the sake of negatism alone, should ponder the fact that Ontario is still looked upon as a leader in education, which I guess is the reason this province at any given moment is the host to visitors from all over the world who have come here to look at what we are doing.

Mr. Foulds: Mr. Chairman, let me add my congratulations to those of us who are delighted at your own appointment. I have known you for some time, perhaps longer than have most members of this Legislature, and I know you will handle those duties with fairness and talent.

Education in Ontario, 1975. Where is it at? Where is it going? This morning the minister has given us a speech, in which I think for the first time in the four years that he and I have exchanged words in the Legislature and in the committee he has shown some interest in the philosophical thrust of education. He has shown some real interest in where it's at and where it's going. I congratulate him for that.

It's a moment that we in the Legislature have been looking for for a long time. I hope that it is genuine. I hope it's more than window-dressing. I am sure it is.

I am not quite sure of the meaning of the minister's statement. I am not quite sure whether we are taking a turn to the right or to the left or making a U-turn, but it's interesting that we are re-evaluating our system, probably pretty toughly and pretty sincerely. About three years ago I think I once characterized education in this province as a vehicle à la Marshall McLuhan, which was speeding toward the future with eyes firmly fixed on the rear view mirror.

Over the past year, I haven't been sure we knew even what highway we were on, this in spite of the goodwill and the good intentions of almost everybody connected with education from the minister on down through the educational administration here, down through the boards to the teachers and to the custodians, pupils and parents. I suppose it is fair to characterize education in 1975 in Ontario as the house that the Premier (Mr. Davis) built in the 1960s; it was sublet to the present Minister of Culture and Recreation (Mr. Welch) who, more quickly than any speculator, turned it over on a long-term lease to this minister. His lease has lasted longer than anyone expected; he has survived and survived handsomely. He has handled his ministry skilfully, and I personally believe with integrity. I think the statement this morning confirms that.

I was particularly struck by the humane and sensible quality of his definition of quality and standards as they apply to our school system. Far too often, in the past year and a half in particular, have those two words been defined in a reactionary and blind way which does not cope with realities of education in the 1970s.

It is not a bad system which we have. Often it rises above mediocrity—in many cases to excellence—through the efforts of trustees, teachers and educational administrators. Yet, in spite of that, as I was trying to put some thoughts together last night, I think there is a sense of unease throughout the province.

I cannot be wholly sanguine, and as I have travelled across the province in the last few months and years, I detect a note—a strong and sometimes strident note—of dissatisfaction. Maybe that's part of the malaise of society as a whole which Ontario faces today but I have encountered a mood of frustration bursting into anger and, tragically, occasionally into violence as we have seen in very tragic incidents last spring in Brampton and more recently in Ottawa. That's symbolic of something, not necessarily our school system but our society and its inter-relation to that school system.

It's easy to say that those incidents and that kind of frustration is nobody's fault but as a democratic socialist I believe in collective responsibility. I believe it to be more applicable to education than to almost any other area of our social endeavours and we, as a society, are responsible for what happens in our educational system.

The minister and I have debated legislation and estimates now for four years. I think one of the things which came across to me most strongly during our debate on the collective bargaining Act between teachers and boards was the frustration which faces trustees. That frustration arises to some extent because of

their desire to serve and to accomplish something within their local authority which, somehow, on their part, doesn't seem to have been satisfied. They don't seem to have been able to serve in the way they would have liked to. I think we should pay some attention to that in the coming years and in the coming review of education, because I think it is extremely important that the trustees be made to feel a vital and contributing part of our education system.

[11:30]

Over the last seven months—in checking my calendar—I have spoken on education to 19 different groups throughout the province. I suppose the strongest sense that I had at those meetings was one of unfocused frustration on the part of trustees, on the part of teachers, on the part of educational administrators. Why does it emerge, and why has it emerged? I think this is one of the fundamental questions we must address ourselves to. It has emerged over the last two years in a particularly non-productive way.

We know there is concern and compassion in our school system. There is insensitivity, too. But somehow I get the very strong sense that there is no sense of joy in our educational system. I don't mean fun in the superficial sense. I mean the sense of joy as it's created because of curiosity being exploited and challenged, so that there is a very real explorative learning and educational experience taking place.

I think we must address ourselves to one of the things that has been lost. Somehow we have forgotten to look at education through children's eyes and through adolescent's eyes. Somehow most of the theory and most of the administration of that theory is seen through educator's eyes.

There's a very marvellous record that I'm playing fairly frequently these days for my three-year-old son. It's by the Limelighters and called "Through Children's Eyes." I recommend it to the minister, and I recommend it to some of his staff. It reawakens you, because as adults we narrow our vision. That kind of thing occasionally reawakens you to the perceptions of children. We must, if we are to get a handle on education sensibly, begin to look through children's eyes .

It is more difficult to administer and to carry out our education system now in 1975 than it was a mere 10 or 20 years ago. There is just the very simple fact that secondary school enrolments, say in 1950, were approximately 40 per cent of the eligible age group; and now in the 1970s the eligible age group that attends secondary schools is between 80 per cent and 85 per cent.

I suggest, however, that's not an achievement of our educational system; that's a simple fact of life that we must live with. And it provides us with the challenge that the minister mentioned earlier, not only in absolute numbers—which the Premier and his building programme responded to—but it provides us with a challenge in the spectrum of students the educational system must serve —and which, frankly, has not been responded to.

One of the reasons I have found most of the debates on education unsatisfactory over the last few years is that most of those debates are centred around individual crises—responding to them, reacting to them—rather than looking ahead to see what we should be doing with our system. I just quickly want to itemize three or four of those particular issues or concerns, because out of them, I believe, comes part of the reason for the malaise, part of the reason why in very real terms we should start emphasizing, as we have said in this House before, the human element in education.

Of course, as we all know, there was the regionalization of school boards; and I think it's fair to say that resulted in a depersonalization of the school system in terms of larger units, larger schools, larger groups of teachers having to deal with larger groups of administrators farther away. Secondly, the very simple thing that the secondary school system depersonalized in education to an incredible degree was the whole question of ribbon timetabling, which provided an apparent choice in taking subjects but in reality simply provided supermarket education without consumer protection.

The minister this morning talked a bit about guiding people to take the choices in the core curriculum that are necessary if they are going on to university. But we cannot do that unless we supply the supportive personnel in terms of guidance and other types of counselling for it to take place.

Debates in the past four to six years have also centred on ceilings, which somehow or other got teachers and trustees both channelled into thinking that if only we had enough money, everything would be all right. That is simply not so, and one of the hopeful things about the minister's statement this morning is the growing awareness and recognition of that.

Debates have also centred on teacher-board negotiation procedures. I suppose we

are into a present crisis in Metropolitan Toronto, where it will be hard to avoid debate on that topic over the next few weeks. Unfortunately, it will prevent us from talking about some of the essentials of the educational system. I want to make a slight excursus in my remarks to talk about the Metropolitan Toronto situation.

The minister and his government sweated for two years to bring forth quite a good piece of legislation—

An hon. member: Excursus?

Mr. Foulds: Yes, excursus. I'll have to upgrade the educational level of some of my colleagues.

Mr. Laughren: We came through the Ontario educational system, you know.

Mr. Foulds: In spite of bringing in quite a good piece of collective bargaining legislation regarding governing teacher-board negotiations, we now have the spectre of a possible strike in Metropolitan Toronto secondary schools. I do not know how the minister can be as sanguine as he apparently is, or certainly as he has appeared over the past few days. Perhaps he is just putting on a front, thinking the ship will go sailing along and that there are not the two dangers of Scylla and Charybdis that the ship must avoid.

My contacts and the contacts we have had with both sides of that unfortunate dispute in the past few days and weeks lead me to believe that the forces are almost inexorable; that unless there is a personal initiative on the part of the minister, either through the Education Relations Commission or directly, to get some pretty serious mediation efforts going in the next couple of days, we are going to be forced with either a strike or lockout or combination of both.

I think we understand that the minister's efforts and those of the Education Relations Commission must be towards the avoidance of a strike. Certainly that has been the thrust of our party's contacts and conversations with some representatives from both sides over the last few days and weeks. I think if it is handled with authority over the next few days we can avoid the kind of York county situation. It's easier to avoid that before the fact than after the fact. We can avoid the frame of mind that set in in York county after the strike began.

The Education Relations Commission seems to have been caught, frankly, without procedures for taking the two votes, the acceptance or rejection vote on the last board offer and the strike vote. I know that has caused some acrimony and some frustration on the part of both parties. To some teachers I have talked to it is seen as almost a deliberate delaying tactic, and that can only lead to acrimony.

The most unfortunate part of that situation has been, I think, the minister's statement of two or three days ago that it might take 18 months to determine the ultimate outcome. I think that was an unfortunate statement; I think he realizes that. It was seen, rightly or wrongly, as thoughtless and provocatice and it did not help to bring the two sides together.

What is even more amazing, frankly, is that this government seems ready to abdicate its responsibility. It seems almost delighted to have the federal government subvert the integrity of Bill 100, its own legislation governing teacher-board negotiations. The federal wage controls, for that is exactly what they are, have thrown an unwelcome confusion over collective bargaining procedures in Ontario and the most crucial of those right now are the negotiations between the Metro Toronto School Board and its secondary teachers.

I think one of the things the minister could do is to give his assurance to both sides that he is prepared to go with the board and the teachers to Ottawa, seeing that this government has taken a policy decision to surrender that authority to Ottawa. I think he should go with the board and the teachers to seek approval by the anti-inflation board for whatever agreement is hammered out by both sides.

I think an early announcement of the factors and the level of the per pupil grants for next year would also speed up and assist the collective bargaining process, not only in this agreement but in the many agreements which are not yet signed across the province.

The time to avoid a teacher walkout or a board lockout is now and the minister's efforts must be toward that direction, not to abrogate Bill 100 but to assist it. Government policy at the present time—not merely in education but its economic policy as announced by the Treasurer (Mr. McKeough) in the last day or two—is to abrogate Bill 100 and its integrity.

I would like to turn now and briefly restate a few of the basic principles which we believe should be governing education in Ontario. Both Conservatives and Liberals, I think fairly from their point of view, view

education simply as a way to reinforce the status quo. We, as democratic socialists, see education as an instrument and means of social change. We see education as a way for individuals to free themselves, their intelligence and their spirits, in order to help not only themselves but to help their fellow students and their fellow men to do likewise. In economic terms, the Liberals and Conservatives are reluctantly committed to making poverty endurable. We in the New Democratic Party are committed to the eradication of poverty. In educational terms, we are committed—

[11:45]

Interjection.

Mr. Martel: Have we got another guru of grunts over there?

Mr. Foulds: I think so.

Mr. Martel: He took Ed Havrot's place, that's why.

Mr. Foulds: In educational terms, we are committed to the eradication of ignorance and prejudice. Because of our view of society, we feel the provincial government's spending priorities must be on services to people and we count education as one of those primary services to people. We view education as a partnership between those who serve and those who are served by our educational system, and therefore we would welcome the participation of the community, of parents, of students, of teachers, in the formulation of educational aims and objectives as well as in the formulation of educational policy. I want to give you one of two small examples, and I am sure that my colleague from Oakwood will elaborate on this one during the course of these debates. We believe that any student who speaks any language as his mother tongue has the right to contribute fully to our society. Therefore, for non-English and non-French speaking students, academic instruction at the elementary level should be provided in their own language with a proportion of English and/or French being phased in and increased over a period of years so as to maintain their academic confidence and their cultural integrity. We should do that not merely at the early levels of education but at the point that person enters the educational system of this province.

As well, we believe that where there is a sufficiently large ethnic minority, that language and its grammar should be taught along with culture and history of that group as optional subjects for study later on in the curriculum, say at the secondary level. We also believe—and I think that this is most important — that competent translators and counsellors should be made available through the school system to facilitate teacher-parent-child consultation where the parents do not speak the same language as the teacher.

In that area and in many other areas, we believe that it is important and vital and necessary that the alternatives be provided within our educational system. That's why we believe in the emphasis that must be placed on the elementary and the pre-elementary levels. What the minister has said this morning will not work—

An hon. member: That's right.

Mr. Foulds: —unless we start very early on in the school system and we redress the balance and increase the amount of support staff and help through the per-pupil grant at the elementary—

Mr. Martel: At the bottom.

Mr. Foulds: —and pre-elementary levels. I would like for once to see us in Ontario really tackle in a wholehearted way the problems of education for the handicapped and for those in special education institutions throughout this province. I would like to see us really take a vital look at teacher education in this province, because if any area is the key to the revitalization of our school system, it is that area.

Mr. Martel: The minister could have been doing something about the deaf children's problem in northern Ontario since he became minister. Yes, and he has done nothing.

Mr. Chairman: Order, please.

Mr. Foulds: I believe that we need to take and make as part of the centre of attention of the Ministry of Education, education for those alternate students we neglect at the present time; from the northern core schools dealing with native people to the language programmes and the cultural programmes that are necessary in Metropolitan Toronto.

I want to conclude by saying it's a pretty good system—but for almost $2 billion, it should be a hell of a lot better.

Interjections.

Mr. Chairman: Order, please.

Mr. Ferris: Mr. Chairman, I add my congratulations to the others on your appointment. I'm sure you'll do an excellent job. As the Liberal education critic, I will attempt to limit my opening general remarks to a

short comment on a few of the more obvious concerns as they relate to the general area, and reserve more specific comments and questions to individual items as they are voted. I am sure my colleagues will have a few concerns they wish to bring to the minister's attention as well.

We are taking this position in view of the limited amount of time, probably about eight or ten hours, to discuss expenditures in the area of $1.7 billion. Without question, we are in a time of greater uncertainty and uneasiness than has ever existed in the Province of Ontario in the field of education. We are in a position where with each succeeding day the competence of our system to deliver good, basic education is being questioned.

But perhaps even more important in the situation that surrounds us is the question of whether, in fact, we will have schools open to which to send our children. The fact is that of the 34,000 secondary school teachers in this province, approximately 20,000 are either working without a contract or are engaged in negotiations for contracts beginning Jan. 1, 1976. This creates a great deal of uncertainty. In this area, the province has unquestionably abdicated to the federal government the responsibility for dealing with this purely provincial matter. Who would not be uneasy? Then to add to this unease, we are told by the minister that even if settlements are reached it may be a year and a half before the final pay settlement is agreed to, and then there may be rollbacks.

I feel this was a very bad statement that the minister made. I'm sure it has created a great deal of uneasiness in the teaching profession.

I think it is rather strange that the minister can stand and act so cool in the face of what I believe is an obvious strike situation, and not be prepared to intervene or take action himself in the matter.

On another matter, the Liberal Party has brought to the minister's attention its concern wih ceilings. At this point I would like to quote a few sentences from the comments of Stanley Hartt, the mediator and fact-finder appointed by the Education Relations Commission in the Metro Toronto dispute with the OSSTF:

> I believe the ceilings are incompatible with collective bargaining with the adoption of the Act, Bill 100, and the formal recognition of the teachers' rights to negotiate cost items without any restrictions in the Act. As to the limits of negotiating power or the use of the right to strike, it would be hypocritical to limit these newly-introduced rights to teachers by the enforcement of ceilings. Not only that, it may indeed be counter-productive.
>
> Ceilings, far from acting as insulation for the boards from salary demands by giving them a ground for refusing the demands larger than a predetermined figure, have become targets and in that manner become goals in themselves rather than limits.
>
> Furthermore, the policy of continuing those labour agreements on a school year basis, which have been traditionally negotiated on that basis, is inconsistent with the policy of setting ceilings on a calendar year basis. Since the school boards, as prudent budgeters, cannot make offers predicated on assumed or estimated increases in the ceilings but must deal with what is known, the teachers are thus faced with a final offer which is less than the ceilings will probably allow in the following year.
>
> The situation where both teachers and boards are asked to plan, as it were, in a vacuum or in anticipation of what a situation will be is a classic study in bad management.

Surely, even the minister must agree that ceilings have changed their whole purpose over these few years and as restraining forces have become ineffective due to being pierced or the ceilings themselves being increased in eleventh hour situations.

In a discussion of the estimates in November, 1974, the minister made mention of evaluation at the student level and of the educational system as a whole. Again today much has been said about that evaluation process. I sincerely hope that the minister is sincere when he says there will be a great deal of attention spent in the next few months on this matter. It is apparent there are many groups concerned with what they feel are diminishing levels of competence in the basic skills.

As a very small example of concern, I draw to your attention of a survey conducted by the Canadian Chamber of Commerce. Because they were concerned, they solicited opinions from colleges and universities across Canada.

Interjection.

Mr. Ferris: I will only dwell on the Ontario results which show that, in reply to the statement that high school students are lacking in basic skills, 14 out of 21 Ontario universities agreed; 66 per cent, if you will,

said yes, the students did lack in basic skills, and in fact only one Ontario university disagreed. To that same statement, 18 of 25 community colleges in Ontario agreed there was a lack of basic skills. That is almost 75 per cent of that group.

Hon. Mr. Davis: It was the same in 1948.

Mr. MacDonald: Most of the people who are making the criticism may be in the same category. They likely couldn't spell right then.

Mr. Ferris: It proves we haven't changed much. The minister will state that they have acted to strengthen the secondary school programme by making courses in English studies and Canadian studies compulsory.

Mr. Kerrio: The government wasn't spending the money then.

Hon. Mr. Davis: The member didn't have as many children then and I didn't.

Mr. Ferris: Those statements in themselves might be the worst offence of all because we are trying to appear to have what the community wants. In reality, because the course guidelines are so broad in general, the end results may bear no relationship to what the majority of society would class as a basic skill. The elementary levels are subject to the same sort of guidelines. I believe this is even a worse situation because this is the foundation on which we are building. In the formative years education in the primary and junior divisions still does not provide the solution. We must, at both levels develop a minimal level of basic skills that can be measured and be achieved as well.

The other areas I would touch on briefly today are the increasing of grants at the elementary level. Much has been said about this subject and it is difficult to see any significant adjustments that have been made by the ministry in any recent times. In light of the higher teacher costs due to a more qualified staff complement, it would seem an area that requires action.

While funds for special education have been increased, that area of the educational system deserves immediate further attention. In all boards there are children who are waiting for placement in special education areas as well as situations where some educational opportunities are not even available in Ontario.

The funding of special education for Metro Toronto is a very serious matter and needs even closer review in this area. In the area of community schools and the use of these facilities, there is much work still to be done to ensure maximum utilization of our resources.

We must enlarge our view to cover uses such as daycare centres within or attached to schools and through the complete range to developing evening and community activities more fully. While doing this, we must recognize the added burden and operational costs involved to local boards and develop additional methods of financing over and above the fixed dollar grants, such as the $10,000 grant for community schools so that in the long term the operational costs do not escalate to the point where money would be diverted from the primary educational areas to facilitate maintenance. Our first concern must always be the development of our greatest natural resource, our children. Mr. Chairman, my further comments will be made during the individual votes.

[12:00]

Mr. Chairman: Does the minister wish to reply to the opening remarks of the critics?

Hon. Mr. Wells: First of all, I would like to thank my friend, the education critic for the official Opposition, for his kind words. I would like to reciprocate by saying that one thing I have always enjoyed in the past few years that I have been minister has been debating with him about educational matters. While we don't agree on everything, I think we have very stimulating debates and we get down to some of the real nitty-gritty issues that should be debated in this Legislature in so far as education is concerned.

Mr. Laughren: He'd make a fine minister, wouldn't he?

Hon. Mr. Wells: While I welcome the educational critic for the Liberal Party and congratulate him on his election and presence in this House, I must say to him with some regret that he has perpetuated the Liberal's traditional position of straying away from the philosophic issues and getting into the usual rhetoric. In fact, I thought he perhaps was using speech No. 3 from the election campaign. It's all very well to say that the curriculum guideline for the primary years is unsatisfactory; if he says that, why doesn't he get up and tell us exactly what kind of a curriculum guideline the Liberal Party would put out in the elementary schools?

Mr. Good: We didn't lose 23 seats.

Mr. Reid: Oh, come on. You are spending $2 billion, you have all those experts and you can't do any better than you are now.

Hon. Mr. Davis: We're not doing so badly.

Hon. Mr. Wells: I would also like to say that while perhaps we heard speech No. 3 on education—the same kind of thing that we heard in the campaign—I just made a quick note of what he said; it was something like: "We should do away with educational ceilings. We should spend more money on special education. We should spend more money on community schools. We should spend more money, period."

Mr. Good: Still smarting, eh? Still smarting.

Hon. Mr. Wells: Where is speech No. 4 that all the Liberal candidates used to make about reducing the provincial debt in this province and coming to grips with government spending? They can't have it both ways.

I would also like to comment—I say this with great respect, but I said it during the campaign—that if the hon. member is going to use some of the statements that were made during the campaign, I said during the campaign in a speech, because education was being made such an important issue and one that was brought to the fore, that I would challenge and love the opportunity to debate it with the then Leader of the Official Opposition. He didn't see fit to debate it with me, nor has he seen fit to debate it with me yet; I regret that he is not even present here today for these estimates.

Mr. Reid: Oh, that's a cheap shot.

Hon. Mr. Wells: I think that is perhaps typical, because he has never debated education in this House in any meaningful way during the years that I have been minister. Yet he goes around this province talking about what we have done in education and makes personal slurs on the Premier of this province in regard to the educational system. This was perhaps one of the most regrettable things of the election campaign.

I am sure the present education critic of the Liberal Party doesn't agree with that kind of attitude. I am sure that as a member of the London Board of Education and the former director of education for the Roman Catholic Separate School Board in Waterloo county, he wouldn't agree with those statements either. Those kinds of ads and campaigns and personal attacks and personal connection of what is happening in the educational system with the Premier of this province were one of the most disgusting things that happened in the last election campaign. I hope the hon. member doesn't associate himself with them.

Mr. Good: Oh, come on, what kind of nonsense is that? He was the architect of the system.

Hon. Mr. Wells: I am sure that the hon. member for Waterloo North wouldn't want to be associated with those campaigns. Let's allow that campaign to vanish—

Mr. Good: Yes, because you lost 23 seats with it, you want to forget about it.

Hon. Mr. Wells: Let's allow that campaign to vanish into obscurity and admit that the Liberals let some advertising agency talk them into a thoroughly disgusting approach towards education in this province.

Mr. Martel: It almost reminds me of that fellow from Detroit in 1971—

Mr. Reid: You used to have a majority over there. What happened to it?

Hon. Mr. Kerr: You used to be in second place too.

Hon. Mr. Davis: It was more fun being the Official Opposition, wasn't it?

Mr. Reid: A little.

Hon. Mr. Wells: The fact of the matter is that we are still over here governing this province and governing it to the best of our ability.

Mr. Good: Not for long. You will not be there for very long.

Hon. Mr. Wells: The fact of the matter is that you with your advertising agency programme are sitting in third place.

Mr. Reid: Well, it worked so well for you in 1971 we thought we would try it in 1975.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Oh, you copied it; you admit it.

Hon. Mr. Wells: I think that with those remarks, and given the fact that we do not have unlimited time as we usually do in estimates in this House—we only have something like 30 hours left—perhaps we can continue with the vote by vote discussion.

On vote 2801:

Mr. Chairman: I assume we will take the vote in its entirety, not item by item.

Mr. Foulds: It would probably be quicker to do it item by item.

Mr. Chairman: Item by item? Is that the way the committee wants it?

Mr. Foulds: I do not know how the other spokesmen feel.

Mr. Chairman: Item 1, vote 2801 agreed to. On item 2, general administration.

Mr. Foulds: I was intrigued by the minister's claim that a mere four per cent of the money spent on education is spent on administration. I believe that he included in his statement that that was not merely the ministry administration but the administrative costs of school boards and the regional offices as well. Is that correct?

Hon. Mr. Wells: Yes, the four per cent included not only the general administrative costs but also the costs associated with the schools that we run directly as a ministry and the Ontario Teacher Education College.

Mr. Martel: And the school for the deaf?

Mr. Foulds: Did it include the costs for the ministry regional offices—

Hon. Mr. Wells: Yes.

Mr. Foulds: —and the regional school boards administration?

Hon. Mr. Wells: Which regional school boards do you mean?

Mr. Foulds: The county boards, the boards of education as opposed to the ministry's.

Hon. Mr. Wells: No. Their administrative costs of operation are in the general legislative grants.

Mr. Foulds: I do not know then whether this is the proper place to try to seek the information, but I wonder, during the next three and a half hours of debate in terms of education which will have to be sufficient this year, if we can find out if there is a rough ballpark figure that the ministry has of the percentage the boards across the province spend on administration as opposed to operational costs and teaching costs.

Hon. Mr. Wells: That would rightly come under the general legislative grant vote, because it is part of that money. We do a computer printout of the percentage of the budget that is spent on teaching salaries and non-teaching salaries, and I think we have a figure. I do not know that it will be that completely definitive, but it could be assigned to the general area of administration. We will get that for you.

Mr. Foulds: I would appreciate that, if that is not too difficult.

Hon. Mr. Wells: I do not think it is too difficult. I do not know how up to date it will be. It may be a couple of years behind but we will get you one.

Mr. Foulds: Fine.

Mr. Ferris: Could the minister give me some explanation as to the large increase in salaries and wages in general administration, as to the number of bodies for the ranges in there?

Hon. Mr. Wells: In general administration, which is item 2 that we are talking about now, there has been an increase of three positions.

Mr. Ferris: Is the amount correct, an increase of about $700,000?

Hon. Mr. Wells: Yes, that's right. The increases have been caused by salary and benefits revisions to employees who are there; they are normal increases. There are some increases in grants and in the Experience 75 programme. There is an increase of about $300,000 in there for the Experience 75 programme which is the summer programme for young people.

Mr. Ferris: In salaries and wages? I felt the $700,000 was rather high for three people.

Hon. Mr. Wells: That $700,000 is for the whole vote of general administration.

Mr. Ferris: The Experience 75 programme has approximately how much money?

Hon. Mr. Wells: It has $322,000.

Mr. Godfrey: Mr. Chairman, could the Minister of Education tell me—possibly I am in the wrong place here—if any of those grants are toward other areas of special instruction for children with learning disabilities?

Hon. Mr. Wells: Would my friend have an example of what he is talking about?

Mr. Godfrey: Yes, sir, I am concerned—you did mention in your original discussion the fact that you were aware of learning handicaps and children with learning disabilities. You put that down as reversing the

"p"s and "b"s but I am sure it was not your intention to simplify the issue.

As we well know, children with learning handicaps are a very serious problem in our school system at present. At present that is being funded from the general budget of schools and I feel that in many cases they are confined and unable to provide the necessary backup and research personnel in order to get into this question. To put it frankly, much of our cost in education later in the elementary school system is because of failure to identify these high-risk children in their early ages, at the age of 4 and 5. My question is directed to know whether any of these special grants are concerned with identifying or setting up some sort of a team which would work to this end?

Hon. Mr. Wells: Mr. Chairman, the grants in this vote are not directly concerned with the area my friend has indicated. These grants are paid mainly to organizations. Among the organizations to which the grants are paid will be organizations for children with learning disabilities—the Ontario Association for the Mentally Retarded and others —for special projects and special things they are doing; but these grants are not for the direct operational programmes in the schools. Those are funded through the general funds.

Mr. Godfrey: Thank you. Then, sir, if I may give notice, I will be asking further questions when that section comes up.

Hon. Mr. Wells: Yes, I think that's good. I certainly don't disagree with your comments about the importance of this particular area and I certainly wouldn't want anything in my speech to have suggested that we view that area lightly because we do not.

Mr. Martel: A brief question of the minister. There has been some discussion with respect to the transfer of grants and funding from the Ministry of Community and Social Services to the Ministry of Education for handicapped children who are not able to attend regular classrooms. This is the result of a court ruling last May or June and I understand there has been considerable discussion between the two ministries.

Has the decision been made on whether the Ministry of Education will be responsible for the funding of youngsters under 16 or will it remain with the Ministry of Community and Social Services which, apparently, is trying to put it where it rightly belongs and that's in the Ministry of Education?

Hon. Mr. Wells: Perhaps that question might more rightly be dealt with when we get into the special education vote. I don't have any special education people here. We are discussing it. I don't think we have come to any conclusion yet.

It is not quite as simple as what you are saying. The Community and Social Services people are, in fact, paying the fees for these children to go to schools, a lot of them outside this province. The question that really arises is should that be happening or should the schools in this province be providing the programmes to take the place of those programmes provided in schools outside?

I must point out there is a great difference of opinion. I have talked, as you have I am sure, to parents whose children are going to schools in Connecticut and New Hampshire and places like that. They feel very doubtful that there ever would be programmes in Ontario to take the place of those schools. I disagree with that and I think we have to develop those. Maybe under the special education vote we could deal in more detail with that.

[12:15]

Mr. Sweeney: Mr. Chairman, before I ask my question, may I say to the Minister of Education that I almost completely agree with the statement which he made this morning, in terms of what he hopes education in this province can be, and there will be no quarrel from this particular side of the House if in fact that is what we are truly working toward. I believe, however, that we will try to draw your attention from time to time in these estimates that there are places where you feel things are being done or should be done but where, in fact, they are not.

The second point I would make in response to another remark of yours is this: It is not the intention of the Liberal Party to add hundreds of thousands or millions more dollars to the educational budget of this province, but rather to question your ministry as to whether or not the dollars which are presently being spent are being spent in the best ways and under the correct set of priorities. I would hope that that would at least partially set the record straight.

I have a specific question: With respect to general administration, I note that there is a grant to the James Bay Education Centre of $580,000. Would the minister please advise me if that is the total cost of operating that particular education centre?

Hon. Mr. Wells: It is not the total cost. It's certainly a large portion of the cost.

Mr. Sweeney: What other sources of income does this education centre have?

Hon. Mr. Wells: Their sources of income are: The government of Ontario, which is the grant that we are talking about; the government of Canada; other individuals, which is a very small amount; and other revenue which they haven't defined. Those are the areas of revenue.

Mr. Sweeney: Would it be proper to say then that by far the greatest amount of the cost of operating that particular institution is borne by the provincial government? A very high percentage?

Hon. Mr. Wells: Yes, that would be right.

Mr. Sweeney: Would it logically follow then that the policies and the educational philosophies that occur in that particular institution are those of the provincial government? Is that a logical sequence?

Hon. Mr. Wells: No. No, that isn't a logical sequence. As my friend may know, that centre is set up as a corporation, a non-profit corporation, I guess, incorporated under the statutes of this province. It isn't a school board. It isn't an elected body. It is set up with certain goals and objectives, and the board of governors of that institution has shaped to a large degree the kind of programmes that have developed in that institution. That is, those programmes except for, say, the ones concerning elementary-secondary school, which are in conformity with our programmes. The things that have gone on there do not necessarily represent the direction that has been given from the Ministry of Education.

Mr. Sweeney: Excuse me for belabouring this issue, but in your estimation who would you say is primarily responsible for making the policy decisions for that institution? Is it the board?

Hon. Mr. Wells: The board of governors of what is officially known as the Moosonee Education Centre. Just so that you won't be confused about this, maybe I should give you a bit of the history that has been going on over the last six months. There have been very extensive reviews of what has been happening at the James Bay Education Centre. There was an external team sent in by us that prepared a report, there was an internal review of the centre and its operation by the board of governors, and there has then been a process of melding those two together with discussions between the two, somewhat akin to a co-operative evaluation review of the school system. There is now a report, which I am ready to make public in the next week or two—a compilation of all these various recommendations.

I think the only thing which is holding up my making that report public is the determination of how and what we are going to do with those recommendations. I think that's very vital to the publication of that report. For instance one of the things in that report is that the centre has spent over the amount of money we have allotted for them and somebody is going to have to find that money for them. At this present time we are discussing with them how that can be handled. As I've indicated to you now they have only certain sources of revenue and we are the biggest source of that revenue.

Mr. Sweeney: Mr. Chairman, I would finish by saying I can see by the minister's final remarks that he realizes where my questions are leading. I'll wait until that report is available to finish them.

Hon. Mr. Wells: Thank you.

Mr. McClellan: I wanted to follow up very briefly on the issue raised by the previous speaker. I'm going to have to apologize right off the bat that I'm not as well prepared this time as, I assure you, I will be next time. Is the board of governors of the Moosonee Education Centre an elected body or an appointed body?

Hon. Mr. Wells: It is an appointed body.

Mr. McClellan: I'm aware of some of the history around the Moosonee Education Centre dating back to 1968 and 1969 although I've lost track a bit in the last two years. I'm still curious as to why the ministry feels it's necessary to appoint a board of governors to the Moosonee Education Centre rather than to allow the community to elect its own representatives to control its own education facility?

Hon. Mr. Wells: That very point is dealt with in the report. There are recommendations, not necessarily unanimous recommendations, from all the people who contributed to the report. There are recommendations and I think I would have to say at this point that I agree with you. I think we should be moving toward an elected body to govern that centre in some way.

There is a little more connected with it than simply that. There is the determination of who will handle the elementary and secondary school programmes; maybe we should have an elected board of education there. Then the question arises as to whether that whole programme should come under the board; or perhaps the education centre, in the context of being taken away from the elementary and secondary programmes, should be an adjunct to community colleges or something like that. These things have to be answered.

Mr. McClellan: When will the report be available?

Hon. Mr. Wells: It should be available within a week or so. It is being printed.

Mr. Ferris: My question was the same, the availability of the report.

Mr. Warner: To the Minister of Education—my community neighbour—I take it from the amount shown under the grant to OISE, in excess of $2 million, that the concept of research within the educational field is still left to the ivory tower syndrome and is not to be extended to those who are actually in the field and practising?

I take it this government is not yet considering some sort of support, both philosophic and in real dollar terms, to the opportunity for teachers and other educational personnel to be actively involved in research within the classroom and without the classroom during their tenure of the school year. Research must be kept within the confines of that OISE tower and it cannot extend into the practical circumstance of the classroom.

I would appreciate hearing from the minister if there have been any thoughts in this direction? If and when are we going to see a change of attitude reflected through the government so that research can be done on a more practical basis and so that educators do have the opportunity to do research within the classroom setting? Could the minister comment?

Hon. Mr. Wells: Yes. First of all, it certainly is not the government's attitude, opinion or indeed action that research should be done in an ivory tower unrelated to the school system, because research done that way would be useless. I think that certainly three or four years ago we determined that the idea of esoteric research done somewhere off in an ivory tower that never related to the school system and never got back to the school system—we just couldn't afford that luxury to a great extent. I am sure there is some of that still done.

So the first point I think that has to be made is that I think it is unfair to say that all the research done at the Ontario Institute for Studies in Education is ivory tower research unrelated to the school system.

I guess I thought that the opening speeches would be in the nature of past debates and would perhaps last a little longer than I had anticipated this morning, but I had hoped to bring over here today—and just pile them up here so you could see them—copies of the research reports that have been coming out from OISE. I don't know whether you have seen them recently.

Mr. Laughren: You wouldn't distribute them to us anyway.

Hon. Mr. Wells: But they don't all deal with in-basket programmes, or whatever they are.

Mr. Foulds: In-basket stimulation exercises.

Hon. Mr. Wells: The in-basket stimulation programme, incidently, is not a bad programme. But there are some very good research reports that have come out on class size and on special education and a whole variety of topics—and they are available. Here they are. My staff is very efficient.

Mr. Foulds: That is what I call efficient staff.

Hon. Mr. Wells: That's right. This is just a sample of some of them. I had hoped that you would get them, because the idea is that the OISE reports are all produced in this manner. They are not made public in the sense that someone calls a press conference and releases them to the press, but they are all public in the sense that they are released to school boards, and to libraries and so forth, and they are here.

There is one on the class size question, which was done by Doris Ryan and T. Barr Greenfield. There is one on open-concept programmes and open-area schools. There is a junior kindergarten study; occupational graduates in the labour force; evaluation of the student guidance information service; moral values clarification; teacher computer studies—and so forth.

Mr. Foulds: Now tell us what is in the reports.

Hon. Mr. Wells: I will save that for Monday.

Then, of course, there is a series of five on the individualized system, on the HS-1 credit system in the high schools, and these were headed up by the late Gerry Fleming as a co-ordinator. I don't know whether the House was aware that he passed away around Sept. 24. Certainly, it is a great loss to education in this province. As you know, he was the author of that very large volume, "Education in Ontario." He was a very prolific writer and had developed many of these reports. He had sort of headed up this one that was done by quite a group of different people, but there are five volumes here on the HS-1 system, which make very interesting and stimulating reading.

These are the kinds of things that OISE has been doing. As you know, they also have a field office operation charged with the responsibility of getting these things out to the schools. It is no good just having these reports; they have got to be disseminated to the schools.

That deals with OISE, and we now come to grips with the other matter that my friend has raised. There is also in these estimates contractual research, I think to the tune of about $2 million, and then there are grants in aid of research. They are apart and above this $2.52 million for the Ontario Institute for Studies in Education. That money goes to them in a block grant for them to plan their own research programme.

The contractual research money, which is above this amount of money and is in a later vote, is open for anyone to apply for—that is, I shouldn't say anyone—but different groups, including teacher groups, school boards, universities, and OISE. They can again apply for one of these contract research projects, so that some of that $2 million will go back to OISE because it won the bid to do certain research. But it also goes to various other groups, so that it does give the opportunity for other groups to carry on research.

[12:30]

Then you move down to the grants in aid of research, which are small grants to individuals in this province who have a research project that they think is useful and they submit that project. There is a committee that does the judging and then they grant up to $80,000 to assist individuals in research that it is believed should be supported.

I can give you a list of those later on in the estimates when we come to that, but that is roughly how the research works.

Mr. Ferris: Could you tell me how much of the educational research grants is going to OISE?

Hon. Mr. Wells: About $800,000 of the $2 million.

Mr. Warner: I would not quarrel with the minister on the volume of print material which has been produced by OISE. I am well aware of the amount of material which comes out to the schools. What I take exception to is this philosophy that everything must flow in one direction. It must start at OISE and flow out to every educational area in the province. What I am suggesting is that the government look at a two-way system of communication, that the government actually look at the prospect of a classroom teacher, for example, being able to spend part of his or her time during a year to be doing some research that is based on practical experience, some research that can be done within the classroom setting as well as within the school setting and the community setting and that that person can work with someone from OISE.

It seems to be a very practical kind of solution and no doubt the minister is aware, as he has travelled around this province in a very earnest and forthright way to obtain information on the educational climate, that one of the frustrations of the 105,000 teachers in this province is the inability to participate in a meaningful way to further the educational process. By that I mean that there is an overriding feeling among many teachers that we teach for the most part as we are taught, and that somehow we would like to escape that kind of feeling.

I am suggesting to the government that in part that can be dealt with by providing a two-way communication with OISE. Give teachers, principals and vice-principals, trustees and community leaders the opportunity to partake in educational research and let's stop this one-way flow from OISE as the tower out to the rest of this province.

I am wondering if the minister could suggest that at some point in time his ministry would consider that proposal, and at some point in time during this Legislature come back and comment on its feasibility?

Hon. Mr. Wells: I would be happy to. I certainly don't disagree with that position. It has got to be a two-way street and if people feel that they have some research that is really practical and can be helpful and would like to do that I think they should have ways of having that supported. We had hoped our

grants in aid of research would do that but it may be that they are too officially research-oriented to really let the classroom teacher get at it.

There is a programme run among ourselves, OTF and I think the trustees council for educational research available to teachers. I think it is $750 a project, but I am sure while this is there that there is a limited number of these available, but that is a small programme that is available.

Mr. Laughren: While we are on the vote for OISE, I want to say a couple of things about a seminar which I believe they sponsored in the Sudbury area recently.

I don't think OISE deserves to be the whipping boy that it has been over the years, I might add. I think they have done some good research. I wish those reports were circulated as a matter of course to the members of the Legislature, particularly those who have an interest in the educational portfolio, because I don't get those reports.

OISE sponsored a seminar on community schools and involvement of the community in the schools in the Sudbury area. When you went through the brochure which went out it was very interesting about how you encouraged volunteers in the schools and how, if the community was involved in the educational process, you had a better educational system and so forth, as though it was something that everybody should be a part of. Then at the very last it said, "Registration fee, $40."

How in the name of heaven are you going to get the community involved, the housewives involved, in an area like Sudbury—or any area for that matter—if you have a registration fee of $40? Do you know what those seminars end up being? They end up being—what's the word?—incestuous. They end up talking to each other. Surely that is not the purpose? I think that is what my colleague from Scarborough-Ellesmere was saying when he said the direction should not be one way.

I suspect there wasn't very much input from other than the professional educators and social workers in the Sudbury area at that seminar. I didn't attend; I can't afford it. I am broke since the election, I might add. It was my view that there were a lot of other people in the same position. Of course, the strike in the area doesn't help matters, either.

But that aside, surely that is not the kind of involvement we are seeking to improve the involvement of the community in our schools. I hope that, somehow, the word will go back to OISE that is not the kind of community involvement we require when, indeed, they end up talking to themselves.

Hon. Mr. Wells: I will be glad to pass that on. We have nothing to do with setting those fees. I guess my friend felt a little the way I did when I opened up a letter from the federal Conservative leadership convention and found it is going to cost $150 to register as a delegate. Some people assume that all Conservatives are rich, and that is not so.

Mr. Laughren: Who are you talking about?

Mr. Ferris: Would the minister give some breakdown on the miscellaneous grants to be paid by the minister, which increased in excess of 20 per cent, as to where they are directed?

Hon. Mr. Wells: Would you like me to read the list of them to you?

Mr. Ferris: Yes, I would.

Hon. Mr. Wells: The basic reason—or one of the major reasons for increases in these grants this year, incidentally, was the very large grant to the Army Cadet League of Canada as a founding grant to sustain its activities. It will not be an ongoing grant because a grant was made to them of $125,000.

There are grants to the Air Cadet League $3,000; Association Canadienne d'Education de Langue Francaise $7,500; Association Francaise du Conseil Scolaire de l'Ontario $1,000; Association Canadienne-Francaise de l'Ontario $14,000; Boy Scouts of Canada $17,500; Bramalea Majorettes and Drum Corps $1,500; Cadet Organization Pre-School $5,000.

Mr. Foulds: That is the one we want.

Mr. Ferris: I wished to hear the major adjustments for the increase.

Hon. Mr. Wells: I should say it is very difficult to tell you what the major adjustments are. The major adjustment over the year before was that blanket grant to the Army Cadet League as a founding grant. There is about a page and a half of grants to various bands, organizations, associations and so forth which write to the government, the ministry or to the members' direct attention, and ask for assistance. Various groups come to talk to us for assistance in the various programmes. Maybe it would be better if I sent you the list.

Mr. Ferris: It would be better for all of us.

Mr. Moffatt: Mr. Minister, could you give me the difference between this year's grant to OISE and last year's grant to OISE?

Hon. Mr. Wells: There has been no change. The block grant to OISE is the same.

Mr. Moffatt: Thank you, Mr. Minister. I wasn't sure whether there was an increase there. I'm having some difficulty sorting out, because of the novelty of my position—

Mr. Foulds: It is just the kind of bookkeeping they do.

Mr. Moffatt: —some of the items that are carried one under the other.

I wanted to say that it seems to me that the minister expressed a sentiment that I support earlier in his remarks when he indicated that the problems that seem to be evident and which were referred to in educational terms in the election were the result of communication problems. I would suggest that the communication between OISE and its clientele is the biggest problem.

I have been a teacher for 15 years and one of the biggest problems that I and my colleagues in that profession had was finding access to the kinds of documents which you presented in the House this morning. It seems to me if you are going to talk about communication between schools and their clientele in the community as being the problem source, then it seems reasonable to assume that you'll start in the place where that solution should be found, that is, in the research part of the ministry and OISE should be the leading example of delivering its product to its clientele rather than the recipient of criticism because people don't understand it.

Mr. Chairman: Any further comment on item 2?

Mr. Foulds: On what basis do you make a judgment on the miscellaneous grants? It it simply on a first come, first served basis for separate areas?

Hon. Mr. Wells: There is a special list of criteria for organizations connected with education. You can pretty well connect any organization with education for most groups fulfil some kind of educational rule for assistance. There are some people who have some particular problem—some particular purpose they need the grant for.

It's very hard to define any set of criteria, but we try to make them, first and foremost, relevant in some way to the educational system and to serve the concerns of young people.

Mr. Foulds: The second question I have is on the grant to the Council of Ministers of Education and interprovincial programmes. Do you make public, or does the council make public, an annual report?

Hon. Mr. Wells: Yes, as far as I know they do; I think they make that public. Would you like one?

Mr. Foulds: Yes. That's something that your ministry has not done to my knowledge. I must say to my colleagues that I get stuff from OISE and they are welcome to relieve me of half the books in my office but I don't get that and I would appreciate a copy.

Hon. Mr. Wells: This appears to be my copy; there is nothing incriminating in it, but I have a few marginal notes. I will see that a copy is sent over to the hon. member. [12:45]

Mr. Foulds: You are the chairman.

Hon. Mr. Wells: I was the chairman. The chairman this year is probably a friend of yours, the Minister of Education of British Columbia.

Mr. Laughren: Oh yes, a fine fellow.

Hon. Mr. Wells: Oh? Who said that? We got you on that one because the minister is a very fine woman.

Mr. Foulds: Sexist.

Mr. Laughren: You caught me on that one.

Mr. Chairman: Item 2 carried? Carried.

Item 3, communications services.

Mr. Ferris: Could the minister explain the increase of $133,000 in salaries and wages and how many bodies it represents?

Mr. Foulds: Better yet, how many minds?

Hon. Mr. Wells: In the communications services branch there are 50 people, and the increase there is mainly due to salary and benefit revisions and some increases in order to facilitate our translation and editing in the French language.

Mr. Ferris: Are there any additional people?

Hon. Mr. Wells: No, there are no additional people. In fact, we have to remember

we are looking at the figures in the estimates that were presented last March and prior to the constraint programmes that we are going through. There are areas that are being looked at, and this is one of them. There will be certain changes here.

Mr. Sweeney: I just caught the tail-end of the minister's last statement; it was something about editing in the French language. Would he please explain?

Hon. Mr. Wells: Some of our increase in the moneys in this vote was for increases in French-language translating and editing. We are committed to a programme to make more and more documents and books of the Ministry of Education available in the French language.

Mr. Sweeney: I guess I didn't understand the choice of the word "editing".

Hon. Mr. Wells: Editing is a perfectly acceptable word to use.

Mr. Chairman: Item 3 carried?

Item 4, budget services. Carried?

Item 5, education data processing.

Mr. Moffat: There appears to be an increase here in the neighbourhood of $3.5 million; I have looked through the attached explanatory notes and to my mind they don't explain anything. My confusion is now based on printed confusion, rather than just ephemeral confusion. I wonder if the minister could explain what the difference is.

Mr. Ferris: He's confused all the time.

Hon. Mr. Wells: The increase that is shown here concerns the fact that we switched over from operating the hardware and the data processing operation as a ministry to the Ministry of Government Services, and in so doing there was a division of costs and so forth. The division, as I understand it, was not the right one and necessitated changes in moneys in the amount that we had to have in our budget in order to reimburse Government Services for the service that they provide for us in the data processing field.

Mr. Shore: Who saved the money as a result of this redirection?

Hon. Mr. Wells: Who saved the money?

Mr. Shore: Yes. Which ministry has got a reduction now as a result of that?

Mr. Sweeney: The $3 million had to go some place.

Hon. Mr. Wells: In this particular area—and we are just going through about our first year of this change—I think the hon. member would have to ask the Minister of Government Services (Mrs. Scrivener) about this, because it was a major change in philosophy towards educational data processing. I think it is going to take a while to know whether this was a cost-saving mechanism or not. It should have been; it should have saved money and it should have made the whole operation more efficient. That is certainly what all the experts said.

In other words, instead of us operating a data processing organization and a couple of other ministries, Government Services now operates all the hardware and the data processing service for all the ministries of the government. On paper and certainly in everyone's mind that should save money but I think you will have to ask Government Services about that.

Mr. Sweeney: Mr. Minister, that sounds strangely like the remarks of your colleague with respect to regional government.

Mr. Shore: Wouldn't it be advisable, sir, if you could have your ministry people check that out and report back to this committee?

Hon. Mr. Wells: I think we can do that but not in the light of these estimates we are doing. I think it is going to take a little more experience with the whole programme; perhaps another six months. When we come to the estimates in the spring—I am assuming we will all be here ready to go to these estimates again—we could have a full report on the comparisons of the operation then.

Mr. Shore: At this time, I'd like an accountability of the mathematics. I would be satisfied with that.

Hon. Mr. Wells: The mathematics of which?

Mr. Shore: Apparently there is $3 million here out of Government Services for the transition. Where did the other reduction come from, if it did?

Hon. Mr. Wells: Okay. I should say there is a large sum in here which has nothing to do with the matter I was just discussing. It is a new initiative and that was in the student guidance information service, for terminals in the schools.

I think you are aware of the student guidance information service which connects with the central terminals here to provide, I think, a very useful and good service. In order to make it more effective and more available to the schools you need to have terminals in the schools. We have proposed a programme which has been cut down slightly from when these estimates were introduced and it is going forward on a smaller scale. There is a large sum of money for that in here, something like $1 million.

Mr. Moffatt: I still find this rather confusing. Apparently your ministry has picked up educational data processing which was previously carried by another ministry—

Hon. Mr. Wells: It's the other way around. We originally had the data processing and Government Services has now taken the function over.

Mr. Moffatt: What you don't do now somebody else is doing and it is costing you more. Is that correct?

Hon. Mr. Wells: No, I don't think that's correct.

Mr. Moffatt: I am glad I asked.

Hon. Mr. Wells: What we have in these figures are amounts to allow us to pay for the services we are getting from Government Services. We are not sure at this time whether or not it will cost us more. It probably won't but we need this extra money in order to compensate for what was thought would be needed, which wasn't in last year's estimates. We need more money this year.

Mr. Moffatt: I still think you said what I said.

Mr. Laughren: I think so.

Mr. Moffatt: You are no longer picking up part of this operation. Another ministry is doing it and it is going to cost you more. I think we deserve some better explanation than that.

I also would like to mention that what is happening here, it seems to me, with the transfer to data processing on a much larger scale, is the kind of misguided priorities which a number of school boards have engaged in over the past several years. What I think does happen is that the people who are in charge of providing services to the schools wind up being the dictators as far as what the whole process is about. It becomes more important to school board administrators to have an efficient-looking system than to have the kind of educational programme which will benefit the children in the classrooms.

I think the explanation you gave sir, with respect, is not the kind of explanation we deserve. It seems to me to be the same kind of explanation I have had given me by various business administrators when I have found that a budget to provide additional materials needed in a classroom was subtracted because the budget was tight. What happened was the budget priorities were altered. I would suspect that at this point budget priorities are being altered in favour of data processing and away from the delivery of educational programmes to students.

Mr. Ferris: Would it be reasonable that in making an adjustment of this size and in this kind of facility and as well as in the student guidance information for $1 million, that there would have been a feasibility study or cost justification of some nature carried out and could that be provided to the members?

Hon. Mr. Wells: That question would have to be asked of the Ministry of Government Services. They carried out all the feasibility studies and presented all the reports. Government Services and the Management Board of Cabinet did all the work in that regard.

Mr. Ferris: Is the minister telling me he picked up an additional $2 million expenses and didn't know why he had it?

Hon. Mr. Wells: No. And I apologize if I have left you with the impression that there was an extra $2 million that was concerned completely with that switchover, because that is not right. As I indicated, there is about $1 million in here that is that new initiative for the student guidance information service. And that has nothing to do with the switchover. There is a certain amount of money in there, nearly $300,000, that deals only with the salary revisions and changes and benefits for the employees. It's really not the whole sum of money that is concerned with this matter. We are talking about the switchover between government services and ourselves.

Mr. Ferris: In the student guidance information—and I ask because I would assume that it is in your jurisdiction—there must be some long-range plan, or is there additional funding that will be required in an ongoing manner in this? And do you have access to those kinds of reports?

Hon. Mr. Wells: You should read the report on planning for student guidance information service. It will tell you something about the programme. The programme, of course, if carried to its logical conclusion, would be completed when we had a terminal in every school—unless someone decided that there should be two terminals—and I certainly don't think we have the financial resources to even contemplate that kind of a programme. This programme provides a number of new terminals for secondary schools, and there are now actually very few in secondary schools. Most of the schools using the service send in their request for information. It is compiled and then the reports are sent back in computer forms. It would be far better if it could be done in each individual school.

Mr. Ferris: That's my question. It relates to what the other member was saying—if it's re-directing money into computers rather than to school affairs, I would like to know what that is going to be.

Items 5 to 10, inclusive, agreed to.

Mr. Chairman: Item 11, Languages of Instruction Commission.

Mr. Foulds: I wonder if the minister could give us an up to date report on the activities of that commission; what initiatives are they taking in terms of advancing the French language in the province's schools?

Hon. Mr. Wells: I think that the Languages of Instruction Commission has been doing an excellent job. As you know, they were appointed as a result of the amendments we made a while ago in this House in order to provide a place where people with legitimate complaints or concerns about what was happening in the area of minority language programmes could appeal if no other means of settling a matter was arrived at.

The commission has met and handled many cases over the past year. Many of the matters that they have dealt with have been handled, I think, very satisfactorily.

I think it would be quite fair to say that perhaps it appeared in the beginning that the commission was not going to be able to fulfill its proper function. As you will recall when I brought this change into the House, I said that we weren't going to make the decision of the commission binding on any school board or French language committee, but that the weight of their power would help redress whatever situation happened to be occurring.

It looked at first that perhaps this wasn't going to happen, but I am happy to say that, perhaps in some cases with the assistance of the minister and some of our people working with areas after the Language of Instruction Commission had brought in its report, many very touchy areas in this province had been brought to, I think, a very satisfactory conclusion. We have areas such as Essex county where the French language secondary school is proceeding and other areas where thorny issues have been settled and conditions are better.

[1:00]

Mr. Foulds: One further question: Do those hot-spot areas that have been cooled out include Elliot Lake, in your estimation?

Hon. Mr. Wells: Yes, as a matter of fact I think that the Elliot Lake situation has been taken care of. I think the last word I had from the Languages of Instruction Commission and from some of our people who have been meeting with the Elliot Lake people was that a solution has been arrived at, and as far as I know it has been accepted by all.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Scarborough-Ellesmere. Are your remarks going to be very brief?

Mr. Warner: Yes.

Hon. Mr. Wells: Perhaps I could just add to that that I think the solution was that a homogeneous French language secondary school is going to be constructed for September, 1977, up there. That is the final resolution.

Mr. Foulds: Homogeneous?

Hon. Mr. Wells: That is one where all the people are French speaking.

Hon. Mr. Welch: Better than two per cent anyway.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Scarborough-Ellesmere.

Mr. Warner: Is it within the parameters of that commission, the Languages of Instruction Commission, to consider languages other than the two official languages of this country—in fact, to include the native people's native language and languages of other cultural groups, particularly those that as we know are concentrated within the large urban centres of this province?

Hon. Mr. Wells: No, that is not one of the purposes for this body, and that is why it has that very particular name, the Languages of Instruction Commission. It is to deal with the official languages of instruction, English and French, and the official rights that are guaranteed in the legislation for people to have full instruction in those languages in the schools. It is not to deal with the other very important problem. That is not to say the other problem or the concerns of people in that area aren't important, but this particular body is there for a specific purpose concerning languages of instruction, English and French.

Mr. Warner: I must comment then that I am deeply concerned that the Ministry of Education is not, I would take it from your remarks—and if I have misconstrued them I stand corrected—taking seriously enough the remarks made by my colleague, our critic, that languages of instruction in this province have to be taken care of in terms of more than just the two official languages. We have the possibility of some very serious problems, not only within our school system but within our whole social system, unless we offer a language of instruction more than just English and French. I would plead with the ministry to consider that very seriously if it wishes to stave off some very serious problems from the ethnic communities.

Hon. Mr. Wells: I would be happy to deal with that. I am sure we will come to it in one of the future votes, because it really has nothing to do with this area. I would be happy to deal with it later on. I really don't think that my friend, the critic, said exactly what you have just said. I don't think he said he wanted language other than English and French to be official languages of instruction in the school system of this province.

Mr. Warner: Neither did I.

Mr. Chairman: Is there going to be further discussion on item 11?

Mr. Foulds: I think there will be, yes. I don't think we should carry it.

Hon. Mr. Welch moved the committee rise and report.

Motion agreed to.

The House resumed, Mr. Speaker in the chair.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Speaker, the committee of supply begs to report progress and asks for leave to sit again.

Report agreed to.

Hon. Mr. Welch: Mr. Speaker, before moving the adjournment of the House, may I quickly go over what would appear to be the order of business for next week so the members can be prepared.

On Monday we will have the Leader of the Official Opposition make his contribution to the debate with respect to the loyal address. In order to accommodate that, the standing committee on estimates will not sit Monday afternoon so that members may be here for that contribution. There will be no session on Monday evening.

On Tuesday the leader of the Liberal Party will make his contribution; there will be no meeting of the standing committee on estimates that afternoon, but the standing committee on estimates will meet Tuesday night as will the House.

Wednesday, of course, will be committee day. There will be no meeting of the House but we will be in committee.

On Thursday we will start with the legislative programme which is now on the order paper and in the order that it appears on the order paper, unless the mail interruption is still operative and we have to deal with the legislation proposed by the Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations, which makes some provisions for that.

A week from today, Friday, we will have Throne Speech debate in the House.

I have no record yet as to whether the select committees have come to some agreement among themselves as to when they will meet next week, but I assume their members will be advised once arrangements, including the timetable, have been made.

If there are no questions about House business next week—or are there any questions?

Mr. Foulds: I have one question. I take it that on Tuesday evening we will return to committee of the whole in the House to consider these estimates. Is that correct?

Hon. Mr. Welch: I'm glad the hon. member has raised that. The committee of supply will in fact convene at the conclusion of the speeches on Monday and Tuesday; there would be no reason for the committee of supply not carrying on on Monday afternoon,

if there were time, on Tuesday afternoon after Mr. Nixon, and on Tuesday evening. Indeed, if the legislative programme were wound up quickly, the committee might even sit on on Thursday, but I think that's not too much of a possibility.

The private members' hour provided for in the standing orders for Monday afternoon will not be an item on Monday because of the speech of the Leader of the Opposition.

Hon. Mr. Welch moved the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to.

The House adjourned at 1:05 p.m.

CONTENTS

Friday, October 31, 1975

Spending revisions, statement by Mr. Auld 123

Anti-inflation programme, statement by Mr. McKeough 124

Toronto teachers' negotiations, questions of Mr. Wells: Mr. Lewis, Mr. Nixon, Mr. Bullbrook 124

Farm income stabilization programme, question of Mr. W. Newman: Mr. Lewis 126

Housing situation at Red Lake, questions of Mr. Rhodes: Mr. Lewis, Mr. Nixon 127

Advertising of rent review, question of Mr. Irvine: Mr. Nixon 128

Ontario Northland railway staffing, question of Mr. Snow: Mr. Bain 129

Payment for cattle purchases, question of Mr. W. Newman: Mr. Worton 129

Rent review, question of Mr. Rhodes: Mr. Williams 129

Metro Toronto Children's Aid Society budget, question of Mr. Taylor: Mr. McClellan 130

North Pickering development, question of Mr. Rhodes: Mr. Eakins 130

Artificial insemination subsidy, question of Mr. W. Newman: Mr. Wildman 131

Krauss-Maffei system, question of Mr. Snow: Mr. Singer 131

Retail gas operations, question of Mr. Davis and Mr. Timbrell: Mr. Philip 132

Ham radio operators, question of Mr. Snow: Mr. B. Newman 132

Highway paving contracts, question of Mr. Snow: Mr. Grossman 133

Anti-inflation programme, question of Mr. McKeough: Mr. Warner 133

Election campaign promises, question of Mr. Davis: Mr. Sargent 133

Anti-inflation programme, question of Mr. McKeough: Mrs. Bryden 134

Supplementary budget, question of Mr. McKeough: Mr. Shore 134

Niagara grape crop, question of Mr. W. Newman: Mr. Swart 135

Report, Ontario Northland Transportation Commission, Mr. Snow 135

Report, Ontario Telephone Services Commission, Mr. Snow 135

Report, Ontario Energy Board, Mr. Timbrell 135

Report, Ministry of Energy, Mr. Timbrell 135

Report, Ontario Hydro, Mr. Timbrell 135

Estimates, Ministry of Education, Mr. Wells 135

Motion to adjourn, Mr. Welch, agreed to 158

SPEAKERS IN THIS ISSUE

Auld, Hon. J. A. C. Chairman, Management Board of Cabinet (Leeds PC)
Bain, R. (Timiskaming NDP)
Bernier, Hon. L. Natural Resources (Kenora PC)
Breaugh, M. (Oshawa NDP)
Bullbrook, J. E. (Sarnia L)
Bryden, M. (Beaches-Woodbine NDP)
Campbell, M. (St. George L)
Conway, S. (Renfrew North L)
Cunningham, E. (Wentworth North L)
Davis, Hon. W. G. Premier (Brampton PC)
Eakins, J. (Victoria-Haliburton L)
Ferris, J. P. (London South L)
Foulds, J. F. (Port Arthur NDP)
Gigantes, E. (Carleton East NDP)
Godfrey, C. (Durham West NDP)
Good, E. R. (Waterloo North L)
Grossman, L. (St. Andrew-St. Patrick PC)
Henderson, Hon. L. C. Minister without Portfolio (Lambton PC)
Hodgson, W. (York North PC)
Irvine, Hon. D. R. Provincial Secretary for Resources Development (Carleton-Grenville PC)
Kennedy, R. D. (Mississauga South PC)
Kerr, Hon. G. A. Environment (Burlington South PC)
Kerrio, V. (Niagara Falls L)
Laughren, F. (Nickel Belt NDP)
Lewis, S. Leader of the Opposition (Scarborough West NDP)
MacDonald, D. C. (York South NDP)
Martel, E. W. (Sudbury East NDP)
McClellan, R. (Bellwoods NDP)
McKeough, Hon. W. D. Treasurer, Minister of Economics and Intergovernmental Affairs (Chatham-Kent PC)
Moffat, D. (Durham East NDP)
Newman, B. (Windsor-Walkerville L)
Newman, Hon. W. Agriculture and Food (Durham North PC)
Nixon, R. F. (Brant-Oxford-Norfolk L)
Philip, E. (Etobicoke NDP)
Reid, T. P. (Rainy River L)
Renwick, J. A. (Riverdale NDP)
Rhodes, Hon. J. R. Housing (Sault Ste. Marie PC)
Ruston, R. F. (Essex North L)
Samis, G. (Cornwall NDP)
Sargent, E. (Grey-Bruce L)
Shore, M. (London North L)
Singer, V. M. (Wilson Heights L)
Smith, Hon. J. R. Correctional Services (Hamilton Mountain PC)
Smith, S. (Hamilton West L)
Snow, Hon. J. W. Transportation and Communications (Oakville PC)
Stephenson, Hon. B. Labour (York Mills PC)
Stokes, J. E. (Lake Nipigon NDP)
Swart, M. (Welland NDP)
Sweeney, J. (Kitchener-Wilmot L)
Taylor, Hon. J. A. Minister of Community and Social Services (Prince Edward-Lennox PC)
Timbrell, Hon. D. R. Energy (Don Mills PC)
Warner, D. (Scarborough-Ellesmere NDP)
Welch, Hon. R. Culture and Recreation (Brock PC)
Wells, Hon. T. L. Education (Scarborough North PC)
Wildman, B. (Algoma NDP)
Williams, J. (Oriole PC)
Worton, H. (Wellington South L)
Yakabuski, P. J. (Renfrew South PC)

No. 5



Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT — DAILY EDITION

First Session of the Thirtieth Legislature

Monday, November 3, 1975

Speaker: Honourable Russell Daniel Rowe
Clerk: Roderick Lewis, QC

THE QUEEN'S PRINTER
PARLIAMENT BUILDINGS, TORONTO
1975



CONTENTS

A list of the speakers taking part in the debates in this issue of Hansard appears, in alphabetical order, at the back of this issue.

Daily contents of proceedings also appears at the back of this issue. Reference to a cumulative index of previous issues can be obtained by calling the Hansard Reporting Service indexing staff. (Phone 965-2159).

Hansard subscription price is $15.00 per session, from: Sessional Subscription Service, MGS, 9th Floor, Ferguson Block, Parliament Bldgs., Toronto, M7A 1N3. Phone 965-2238.

LEGISLATURE OF ONTARIO

MONDAY, NOVEMBER 3, 1975

The House met at 2 p.m.

Prayers.

Mr. Leluk: Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to introduce to the House this afternoon 64 grade 8 students from John G. Althouse Public School in York West riding. They are seated in the west gallery.

Mr. Philip: Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the members of the House to welcome the pupils of grade 7, from The Elms Middle School in the riding of Etobicoke, accompanied by their teacher, Mr. Michael Luedicke.

Mr. Evans: I would like to introduce to the members of the House, grade 12 students of the Barrie Eastview Secondary School, sitting in the west gallery, and ask them to join with me in giving them a warm welcome.

Mr. Speaker: Statements by the ministry.

Oral questions.

CONDITIONS IN CORRECTIONAL INSTITUTIONS

Mr. Lewis: A question of the Minister of Correctional Services: What is his ministry going to do about the alleged problems within the jails and correctional institutions of Ontario other than involve the Ombudsman, whose domain I would have thought to be secondary rather than primary?

Hon. J. R. Smith: This has been very apparent to me since I assumed the responsibilities of the Minister of Correctional Services. I have visited a number of the centres in the province—such as Brampton and Sault Ste. Marie, as well as here in Toronto—where there is severe overcrowding. We are trying to speed up the new facility at Maplehurst and increase the accommodation facilities from 100 to 400 within a few weeks. These and the House of Concord north of Toronto and new detention centres are going to provide some relief from the overcrowding in certain of these municipal jails.

Mrs. Sandeman: Supplementary: What steps is the minister prepared to take in the meantime while the overcrowding exists in the present jails, to make sure that the staffing levels in those jails and reformatories are sufficient to deal with the very high number of inmates?

Hon. J. R. Smith: Staffing has been increased in the Don Jail this year to 35 correctional officers; five in Brampton and 16 at Mimico. We are doing our very best. I recognize that the correctional officers in these centres are under a great deal of pressure because of the overcrowding, but we are up to complement.

Mr. Nixon: Supplementary: Does the minister recall that his predecessor spent over $2 million in upgrading Burwash in the last year and then closed it, also in the last year? Why doesn't he reactivate Burwash if he needs room? It is all there, with all of the facilities and the people who want it in the community.

Hon. J. R. Smith: The immediate problem is accommodation for remand inmates who have to appear in court almost on a daily basis. They have to be near their legal counsel. The population that was previously at Burwash was primarily from southern Ontario. Only 10 per cent of the inmates were from northern Ontario centres. One gets into the problems of transportation—

Mr. Reid: We don't have those problems up there.

Hon. J. R. Smith: —proximity to legal counsel and family and rehabilitative services. It is hoped that these new facilities such as Maplehurst, Mimico and House of Concord will alleviate that problem.

Mr. Nixon: You don't put remands in the reformatories.

Mr. Lewis: A supplementary if I may: Do I take it from the tenor of his answers that the minister largely agrees, or at least implies that the intimations of a blowup, as expressed by the Civil Service Association on behalf of its personnel, are apparently real and that things have been allowed to de-

teriorate to a point where they need the rescue of an outside agency like the Ombudsman? What does the minister intend to do as the crisis develops before his eyes?

Hon. J. R. Smith: I beg to disagree with the statement of Mr. Cooper that there is a crisis situation and a fear of riots in the institutions. This is ever present in this form of correctional work, either at our institutions or those of the federal government. It is ever present.

Our main concern is to see that we are satisfied that enough precautions have been taken with regard to the staff and their training and that there is security, but when we reach a certain overload in institutions such as Brampton, where we have facilities for an average of 30 beds and we have 68 inmates —such as the day I was there—they replace the single cot beds with bunks and then they have 60 places and an overflow of eight. That means they would have to sleep in the corridor at night and that's when the security problems arise.

Mr. Lewis: That's right.

Hon. J. R. Smith: I have a great deal of concern for the correctional officers when they have to enter those corridors in that kind of situation. We are moving as quickly as possible to try to open these other facilities and I welcome full co-operation with the Ombudsman. The CSAO requested this and it did not, as the member has intimated, come as a request from this ministry. We are willing to co-operate fully with him, in every way we can.

Mr. Speaker: This will be the final supplementary on this question.

Mr. Young: Could I ask the minister a supplementary regarding the timing of this tremendous upsurge of inmates in the correctional institutions? Over the past two or three years, we were led to believe that things were going very well and now suddenly we get the crisis. What is the reason for the sudden crisis?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. We are now straying into a debating session. The original question had to do with the Ombudsman's participation. In fairness, I feel we should allow a final supplementary to the leader of the—not the leader, the member for Sarnia.

Mr. Foulds: The undeclared candidate.

Mr. Nixon: It is a very natural error, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Bullbrook: Would it be the feeling of the minister that perhaps an undue backlash to the Bail Reform Act is causing part of the overcrowding at the present time?

Hon. J. R. Smith: There are many factors behind the overcrowding. That could be a contributing factor, yes. It is also related to the fact that the populations are basically very young, 18- to 25-year-old males, and to the end of the baby boom; there are many things such as the member suggested. In Metropolitan Toronto there has been an increase of 30 per cent this year in admissions to the Toronto jails.

Mr. Bullbrook: Are any representations being made by the hon. minister to his colleague, the Attorney General, (Mr. McMurtry) in connection—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I think that was the final supplementary. I tried to draw that to your attention a moment ago.

TORONTO TEACHERS' NEGOTIATIONS

Mr. Lewis: A question of the Premier—I hope he will understand my addressing it to him in the absence of the Minister of Education (Mr. Wells).

Now that the high school teachers in Metropolitan Toronto have seemed to indicate quite specifically that they intend to exercise their right to strike when the secret ballot comes this week, is there an intention on the part of his government to intervene at the highest levels to bring the parties together in the last-ditch effort we would all support since there are now only about nine days left before the walk-out begins?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I expect the Minister of Education will be here, perhaps even before the question period is over, and I think that question should be properly directed to him. I think he does have something to say in this regard.

AUTOMOBILE INSURANCE RATES

Mr. Lewis: A question of the Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations, if I may: In this period of constraint on all fronts, is the government now prepared to consider requiring of the automobile insurance companies in Ontario that they justify any future premium increase applications that they may bring and that the now minister provide a

public explanation for the 63 per cent rise in cumulative premium increases since 1972?

Hon. Mr. Handleman: Mr. Speaker, as the hon. Leader of the Opposition well knows, we have always required them to justify premium increases, but I think the complaint he has is that we haven't required them to justify them publicly. The restraint programme which the federal government has now embarked on, obviously will have an effect on future rate increases. I have been talking to the people in the insurance industry, and there is still some confusion as to whether or not they are all going to be required to go to Ottawa and justify their rate increases. In the meantime, I can assure the hon. Leader of the Opposition that we will carry out our responsibilities to the public.

Mr. Lewis: Supplementary: What exactly does that mean? Many of the automobile insurance companies have increased rates in three installments in 1975 alone at 30 to 35 per cent of the premium levels as they existed in December, 1974. What intervention will his ministry make, in good faith with the guidelines, to make certain that no future increases occur without public scrutiny by this government?

Hon. Mr. Handleman: Mr. Speaker, I can't assure the hon. Leader of the Opposition that there will be public scrutiny. There certainly will be scrutiny within the ministry. If there is any public scrutiny, it may very well be by the Anti-Inflation Review Board in Ottawa.

Mr. Singer: Would the minister not believe now is the time to proclaim the unproclaimed sections in the Act which would give him power to control those rates?

Hon. Mr. Handleman: No, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Makarchuk: Supplementary: Would the minister consider looking into the increases that were imposed on the taxi drivers in Brantford last week where the rates went up anywhere from 60 to 300 per cent? Would he examine them and report publicly as to the reason why the increases were introduced at a time when we are supposed to be practising restraints and this government preaches these restraints?

Mrs. Campbell: That is not supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. Was that an increase in the insurance rates that the hon. member was talking about?

Mr. Makarchuk: Yes.

Hon. Mr. Handleman: Mr. Speaker, there have been some instances of increases in insurance rates on taxis and other public vehicles. I would be prepared to look at any specific instance that the hon. member would like to bring to my attention, as I have been doing for the past two weeks.

ASBESTOS EMISSIONS AT JOHNS-MANVILLE OPERATION

Mr. Lewis: One last question, if I may: Can the Minister of Health undertake to table in the Legislature the readings for asbestos emissions in the Johns-Manville mine and plant in Reeves township near Timmins during the course of the eight years that that mine and mill were in operation?

[2:15]

Hon. F. S. Miller: I'll check into it, Mr. Speaker, and see whether I can.

Mr. Lewis: Supplementary: Is the minister personally aware whether or not readings were taken systematically during the course of that eight-year period, or were the readings confined just to the last year?

Hon. F. S. Miller: I can't say.

PAYMENT FOR CATTLE PURCHASES

Mr. Nixon: I would like to put a question to the Minister of Agriculture and Food regarding the situation pertaining to Essex Packers, that was raised by my colleague, the member for Guelph (Mr. Worton), in the House on Friday. Can the minister explain to the House how the taxpayers of the province involved themselves to the extent of close to $1 million in making available the facilities at the Guelph Reformatory to Essex Packers? Have we in fact lost that $1 million in this circumstance, and was there ever an application by Essex Packers for assistance from the government so that they could maintain their operation?

Hon. W. Newman: To the first part of the question, I can't really give the member a full answer on that. On the second part of the question, yes, there was a meeting some time ago and it was pointed out to Essex Packers by the ministry that they must themselves raise $1 million in capital before we would have a look at it. We are under the understanding that they would have raised

this, but as of last week they had not. My prime concern here is the payment to the farmers prior to Oct. 17 and the outstanding balance to the farmers.

As far as the amount of money owing to Essex Packers by the Ontario government through the Ministry of Correctional Services is concerned, there was a cheque to be issued for $185,000, which I have today asked for a hold to be put on, to see what we can legally do about taking some of those funds to make sure that the farmers receive their payments, which I believe are outstanding to the tune of approximately $160,000. The OBIA are meeting today and I expect to meet with them myself later this week.

Mr. Nixon: Supplementary: Since Essex Packers is, I believe, the last in the smaller group of packers offering any competition to the major packers in this province, wouldn't the Minister of Agriculture and Food have a broader concern to see that this organization is kept functioning for the good of the agricultural community and also for the good of the consumers?

Mr. Speaker, it's a bit of a problem directing the question, since it might at least be directed in part to the Minister of Correctional Services (Mr. J. R. Smith), since the correctional facilities in Guelph have been in partnership for this period of time with the commitment of $1 million in our funds. But I would direct it to the Minister of Agriculture and Food, since it certainly falls within his more general responsibility to serve not only the agricultural community but the consumers.

Hon. W. Newman: The receivers moved in last Friday afternoon. I'm not convinced in my own mind at this point in time that, unless it was a very large amount of capital, even an infusion of money would keep this company going. We want to wait until we get back some further information later this week before a decision is made on that.

We did make it very clear before that they must infuse some of their own capital. After all, it's owned, I think, primarily by two people. They were to infuse their own capital into this situation before we would look at it. From the way their statement is beginning to look at this point in time, I'm not sure the infusion of large amounts of capital would really help the situation at the moment.

Mr. Nixon: They've already got $1 million.

Mr. Gaunt: Supplementary: Since time is of the essence, when does the minister anticipate having this legal opinion as to whether some of this money from Correctional Services could be made available to the farmers for payment?

Hon. W. Newman: As of this morning I've asked the legal people from Management Board to look into it to see what our legal status is and to see what we can do. My prime concern is for those farmers who got a lot of NSF cheques prior to Oct. 17. I will do all I can in my power to try to see that they get paid.

Mr. Worton: Mr. Speaker, I have a supplementary: What plans does the government have for using the plant now? I understand it's coming to a halt. Does Correctional Services plan to keep it going under its own staff, or what plans does the Government have?

Hon. W. Newman: At this point there are conflicting views whether it is still buying or not buying. But where any buying has been going on, the cheques, in processing, are being certified by the bank at this time to guarantee payments to the individuals. They have to give at least 37½ hours notice to the employees, so they'll have to operate this week. I can't tell you at this moment exactly what the outcome will be of the plant at the Guelph Reformatory until we've got more facts and figures on it.

ADVERTISING OF RENT REVIEW

Mr. Nixon: A question of the Premier: Is the Premier now in receipt of a letter from the election expenses commission indicating the opinion of the commission that the Minister of Housing has been in violation of the intent of the Election Expenses Reform Act in the publication of advertisements in the election campaign?

Hon. Mr. Davis: I think I am in possession of a copy of a letter sent to the Minister of Housing.

Mr. Nixon: A supplementary: What does the Premier intend to do about it since, when the statute was proclaimed he himself indicated, I thought rather gratuitously, that his party intended to support not only the words in the regulations and the law itself but also the intent? This, of course, was the indicated intention of all sides. What is he going to do about it? Is the Premier

going to arrange for payment into the consolidated revenue fund of those moneys that the ads cost?

Hon. Mr. Davis: I think the commission really will have to make some decision, other than just passing some form of opinion, which is really what I understand from the resolution.

Mr. Nixon: It was a motion of the election expenses commission.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I don't want to be provocative, because if I became provocative I might say the only mistake we made in the Election Finances Reform Act was that we didn't provide in the legislation that it be compulsory for advertising in election campaigns to be reasonably truthful, which would have then obliterated the Liberals' total campaign. That was the only mistake we made. But I won't become provocative today, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Ruston: You wouldn't have got a word in.

Hon. Mr. Davis: I can only say, as I said to the press, that I think it is something that you can have a difference of opinion on.

Mr. R. S. Smith: We have no money for advertising.

Hon. Mr. Davis: I mean there was public funding going into your advertising; don't forget that.

Mr. Reid: And yours.

Hon. Mr. Davis: That's right, but I tell you, at least ours was truthful.

Mr. Nixon: Go ahead.

Mr. Reid: You used the government's money to run your campaign. That is the whole point of the question.

Hon. Mr. Davis: As I said to the press—and I don't intend to prolong this—

Mr. Nixon: You don't intend to prolong this, but you are.

Hon. Mr. Davis: —I disagree; what do you mean, I don't intend to prolong it?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The question has been asked and the answer is being given.

Mr. Nixon: The Premier is totally at fault in this regard. Is he going to make restitution or not?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I am not totally at fault at all.

Mr. Nixon: You are. The election expenses commission says you are.

Hon. Mr. Davis: I would have thought the former Leader of the Opposition would have learned something from the last campaign, but quite obviously he has not.

Mr. Nixon: Yes, I learned that I cannot trust your statements.

Hon. Mr. Davis: I am not directly involved in this at all. There is a letter expressing an opinion from the commission. Fine. If the commission wishes to make a ruling, as I have said to the press, this government and this party will abide by any ruling that that commission makes.

Mr. Nixon: That is the weakest answer I have heard in this House.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Mr. Nixon: A supplementary question: Does the Premier then mean that the motion of the election expenses commission saying that his party, and in fact his government, is in violation of the intent of the Act is nothing more than a personal opinion and that he refuses to take action?

Hon. Mr. Davis: I think it means this: The commission will have to make some determination. If they make a determination as to what they believe should be done, this party and this government will abide by it.

Mr. Singer: They have no such power.

Mr. Nixon: You are not prepared to act—

Mr. Reid: So much for the spirit of the Act.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Hon. Mr. Davis: What I am saying right now, Mr. Speaker, is that I haven't read the detailed, unofficial commission minutes. Listen, you people should talk about the spirit of the Act—

Mr. Nixon: What are you talking about?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. I am on my feet.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Mr. Nixon: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. I refuse to sit here and listen to cheap innuendo from the leader of the Conservative Party when he is trying a weak defence of a position which he knows himself to be completely impossible and indefensible. Is the Premier going to make restitution to the treasury or not?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. That is not a point of order. Is there a further answer to the question?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I can only say this, if the former Leader of the Opposition is suggesting that I am making innuendoes—and I am not—I can only say that there is one man in this House who should know what that is all about.

Mr. Speaker: Supplementary? The hon. Leader of the Opposition?

Mr. Lewis: The present leader of the present opposition is what you call it, I think. May I ask the Premier—

Mr. Nixon: It's a total abdication of the Premier's responsibility. The intent of that legislation has been smeared.

Mr. Deans: Why don't you two get together on television and debate this?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The hon. Leader of the Opposition wishes the opportunity to ask a supplementary.

Mr. Lewis: Could I ask the Premier if he would consider directing the commission to make public and to post regularly, perhaps with all members of the Legislature or perhaps in some other public function, the minutes of the commission as they are arrived at and the time at which it is intended to make a determination based on a motion passed by the commission?

Hon. Mr. Davis: I think I would be presumptuous to direct the commission. I certainly would be quite prepared to discuss it with the chairman of the commission.

Mr. Nixon: He may be foolish to listen to you.

Mr. Reid: Just ignore them, that's all.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, while I am on my feet, if I might interrupt the proceedings of the House, I would like to introduce to the members of the House the Prime Minister of St. Vincent, who is in your gallery watching these proceedings here this afternoon.

Mr. Lewis: In St. Vincent, they demand restitution.

Hon. Mr. Davis: They don't have a Liberal Party in St. Vincent.

HOME WARRANTY PROGRAMME

Mr. Deans: Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations. Does the minister recall two years ago informing me in this House that there would be, within six months, a warranty on new homes? Does he recall, about 18 months ago, my being informed in this House that that warranty was being drafted? Does he recall about a year ago my being informed it was simply a matter of getting a little bit of agreement with the federal government? Could the minister tell me where the warranty is?

Hon. Mr. Handleman: I am glad to hear the member correct his question in the second phase because I didn't inform him. As he recalls, it was my predecessor in this portfolio who made the two statements. During the examination of my estimates in the last session, I told the hon. member that we were working on a warranty plan and I hoped to have it in place this fall. This fall is not completed yet and I'm working on it.

Mr. Deans: Not quite.

Mrs. Campbell: Christmas is coming.

Hon. Mr. Handleman: We have reached the point where we are almost in a position to announce the plan but I can't tell him the exact date.

Mr. Deans: A supplementary question: The minister can forgive me for being a little bit worried about it because we seemed to be at the same point a year ago. Could he tell me whether we'll have this during this session?

Hon. Mr. Handleman: It may not require legislation so I would be presumptuous if I told the hon. member we would be introducing something in this House this session. We are working toward the implementation of a plan completely apart from the federal government but also we would like to be in a position to integrate a plan with a national plan in the event the federal government does arrive at some consensus with the industry across the country. But we are proceeding on our own.

Mr. Deans: One final supplementary, if I may. How can a warranty be put in place,

which would be legally binding across the province, without some Act of the Legislature?

Hon. Mr. Handleman: There was no suggestion on my part that it would require legislation at all. We would probably be adopting a warranty plan in the very near future. We may not require legislation to do it and until such time as we've arrived at a final plan, I think it would be a little bit premature of me to make any further statement.

KRAUSS-MAFFEI SYSTEM

Mr. Singer: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Transportation and Communications. Has he, in his search for the information supposedly tabled by his predecessor, had occasion to look at Hansard of April 18, 1975, page 968—when he can see the first time the question was answered—or at Hansard of June 20, 1975, at page 3200—when he can see another time the question was answered—or at the words of his predecessor who said on June 20, "I have said to the member, and I have made the statement in this House as late as my estimates, that these figures will be tabled in this House." If his investigations have led him that far, when are we going to see the Krauss-Maffei cost figures?

Hon. Mr. Snow: Since the hon. member asked that question Friday morning, I have not had an opportunity to search all those copies of Hansard. I gave him my word on Friday that the figures would be available and they will be. I understand they've already been tabled but I have to confirm that.

Mr. Singer: Come on; that was the whole point of this. Neither you nor your leader have figured that one out yet.

MUSTARD REPORT ON HEALTH SERVICES

Mr. Williams: Mr. Speaker, a question of the Minister of Health: Could the minister advise this House as to what the current status is of the Mustard report pertaining to delivery of health services in this province?

Mr. Nixon: He is after your job.

Hon. F. S. Miller: I am not really used to having voices come from behind me. Somtimes it's a sign of an ailing mind.

Mr. Lewis: That would be fair.

Hon. F. S. Miller: The enemy I can see before me is always one I can trust.

Mr. Foulds: True enough.

Mrs. Campbell: You are right.

Mr. MacDonald: Let's get back to question period.

Mr. Speaker: Could we get to the answer, please?

Hon. F. S. Miller: I was trying to think of one.

Mr. MacDonald: That's what I thought.

Hon. F. S. Miller: During the last session of the last Parliament, I did have a chance to report on the reaction of this government to the Mustard report. As a matter of fact, during the summer months a booklet was prepared called, I think, "Report, Reaction, Response." This is a fairly concise summary of the response of this government to the many recommendations of Mustard and the responses of the people who studied it. It could take a long time to go over them and since it is a matter of record I'll take it upon myself to send the member a copy so that he'll have them.

[2:30]

HIGHWAY EXTENSIONS

Mr. Dukszta: Mr. Speaker, a question to the Minister of Transportation and Communications: Does the minister intend to meet with three groups which have requested a meeting to discuss the extension of Highway 400 south to St. Clair Ave. and the paving of the Spadina Expressway from Lawrence Ave. to Eglinton Ave? These three groups are: the Citizens Transportation Coalition, which requested a meeting on Oct. 6, 1975; the borough of York council, on Oct. 1, 1975, and again on Oct. 27, 1975; and the city of Toronto, on Oct. 15, 1975. If the minister does intend to meet them, can he tell me when?

Hon. Mr. Snow: Mr. Speaker, I am somewhat concerned, because I cannot say I have not received any of those requests, but I certainly have not received them all. In my office on Friday, I was going over requests for such meetings, and I have had some requests that we have not been able to fit in, but those were not among them.

Mr. Dukszta: Supplementary: I asked the minister, but maybe the question should have been directed to the Premier, since the requests were sent to the cabinet. I assumed that in the meantime those would have been directed to the minister to deal with.

Hon. Mr. Snow: No, I have not seen those requests.

Mr. Dukszta: Another supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The last one was not really a supplementary. I thought it was more of a statement. Is this a supplementary?

Mr. Dukszta: Can the minister make sure he gets copies of those requests?

Hon. Mr. Snow: Yes.

PURCHASE OF RAILWAY LAND IN ERIEAU

Mr. Spence: Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the Minister of Natural Resources. Could the minister clear up the confusion of the ownership of the land that has been owned by the Chesapeake and Ohio, Railway in the community of Erieau, Kent county? We've heard rumours that a private businessman has bought this property, and then we read in the Windsor Star on Oct. 11, 1974, that the Province of Ontario owns some of this property that was owned by the Chesapeake and Ohio Railway. Could the minister clear up this confusion over the ownership of this property, and does he intend to buy this property when possible?

Hon. Mr. Bernier: Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the hon. member's interest in this particular area. In fact, it is an area that the hon. member and I personally examined. We did express some real interest in developing this particular area as a provincial park to serve that part of Ontario. We indicated our interest in purchasing this particular property.

However, in the interim I am told that a certain gentleman by the name of Drake from London, Ont., moved in and negotiated with the C and O Railway before Government Services could do any negotiating on our behalf. We have no ownership of any land there at this present time. I understand that Mr. Drake is having financial difficulties in finalizing the arrangements, but I am not sure of that.

To the second part of the hon. member's question, if we are still interested: I would have to say we are still interested, but I would have to point out as strongly as I can that because of budgetary constraints, and cutting back in land acquisition for provincial parks specifically, this does not have a high priority on our list at the present time.

ONTARIO'S CREDIT RATING

Mr. MacDonald: I have a question of the provincial Treasurer. In view of Moody's action in the United States recently in reducing Ontario's credit rating from a triple A to a double A, would the minister give the House an explanation as to what he ascribes this downgrading; and second, what difficulties, if any, is it going to create for the government and Ontario Hydro in terms of capital needs over the coming year?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Mr. Speaker, I may have missed this, but I am not aware that they have done so.

Mr. Lewis: What? The minister did not hear of this cataclysmic decline in Ontario's credit rating on foreign markets?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Mr. MacDonald: Supplementary: Would the provincial Treasurer investigate this—because I have every reason to believe that what I have been told is correct—and reply to my question at his earliest convenience?

Mr. Nixon: Supplementary on that—because it is a very interesting subject that we've heard about frequently from the Treasurer's predecessor: Did the representatives of that American firm call on either the Treasurer or representatives of the treasury during the last four months to discuss this credit rating? Has this been a matter of more concern than the Treasurer is evincing at the present time?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: They did not call on me, Mr. Speaker. I believe there was to have been a meeting with the deputy minister and some officials about 1½ or two months ago and it was cancelled.

Mr. Nixon: The deputy was called back on a matter of urgent importance—was that the story at the time?

Mr. Speaker: The member for Windsor-Walkerville.

HUMAN RIGHTS CODE

Mr. B. Newman: I have a question of the Minister of Labour. Does she intend to amend the Human Rights Code so that discrimination because of a physical handicap will no longer deny an individual with a handicap, who can perform the services of being given an opportunity of employment?

Hon. B. Stephenson: Mr. Speaker, the question raised by my hon. colleague is a very pertinent one. The Human Rights Code of the Province of Ontario is to undergo a complete study and revision within the next 12 months. I would be certain that aspect of human rights will be included in that study and will be taken into consideration.

MINIMUM WAGE

Mr. Makarchuk: I have a question of the Minister of Labour. In view of the harsh restrictions imposed by the guidelines on people at the lower income levels, is the minister prepared at this time to raise the minimum wage?

Hon. B. Stephenson: Mr. Speaker, as my hon. colleague knows, the minimum wage is under constant scrutiny within this province. It is being studied at the moment and there will be proposals made, I am sure, within the next two months regarding movement of the minimum wage in the Province of Ontario.

Mr. Lewis: The government is learning.

Hon. B. Stephenson: It will be recognized, I am sure, that the statement made by the Minister of Finance of Canada was not that the federal minimum wage was to be raised, but that in fact any wage under the level of $3.50 an hour could be elevated to that level without any penalty under the AIB.

Mr. Lewis: They are nothing but generous.

DEFINITION OF DISABILITY

Mrs. Campbell: Mr. Speaker, my question is of the Minister of Community and Social Services. I must first quote an incident in order to make my question clear. In the case of a person who had been denied eligibility under the GAINS programme administered by the Ministry of Community and Social Services, the eligibility finally came through during the month of September. I was rather gratified because at the point at which she had died, previous to the eligibility — I thought she died of unemployability.

My question is has the minister given any consideration to redefining disability for purposes of GAINS? Secondly, in line with the constraints of the Treasurer (Mr. McKeough), would he not now think it would be advisable to disband the medical review board, which sits at the rate of $25,000 a year per person, for four persons for part-time service, in view of the fact that they never see a patient and their decisions may be overruled by a lay board, namely, the appeal review board

Hon. Mr. Taylor: Yes.

Mr. Reid: Stop right there.

Hon. Mr. Taylor: In connection with the first part of the member's question, I certainly have given a great deal of consideration to that problem. As the member knows, it has been a difficult problem because of the criteria that must be involved. I am giving consideration to that. There is supposedly a difference, as the hon. member knows, between the permanently unemployable and those who are permanently disabled. That's a difficult situation.

Mrs. Campbell: That's what I am talking about.

Hon. Mr. Taylor: We've reviewed that. That has been an ongoing review. We've reviewed every case from 60 to 65 years of age. As a matter of fact, there have been quite massive transfers from the permanently unemployable to the permanently disabled. That has gone on.

In regard to the medical review board, I would want to give that further consideration before I gave an answer.

Mr. Deans: Is the minister telling us he reviewed them all?

Mr. Speaker: Is there a further question from the New Democratic Party?

Mr. Shore: Mr. Speaker, could I ask a question?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The member for Beaches-Woodbine.

Mr. Bullbrook: The member for London North has a question.

Mr. Speaker: I thought there was a question there a moment ago but I think we caught them by surprise, so we have to give them the benefit of the doubt.

SPENDING REVISIONS

Mrs. Bryden: Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the Chairman of Management Board. In the House on Friday he gave us a statement in which he claimed that the government was expecting to achieve a four per cent reduction in something known as the civil service complement by the end of the fiscal year. Will the minister provide us with the two missing pieces in the jigsaw puzzle, which will enable us to determine if actual savings are being made?

The two pieces of information requested are: First, the number of civil service jobs existing prior to Apr. 1, 1974, which have been contracted out to other workers? Secondly, whether those called "contract employees" are included in the figures of civil service complement? If not, how many contract employees were there a year ago and how many are there now?

Hon. Mr. Auld: Mr. Speaker, as far as the second question is concerned, if one assumes that the definition of a contract employee is anybody who is working for the province who is not on the classified staff or the civil service staff, then as of this date in time, Nov. 3, I would estimate there would be about 16,500 people in that category.

I hasten to point out that figure includes a great many part-time people, like Crown employees, people who work in the jails, psychiatrists, dentists, and so on. It also includes roughly 500 teachers who work in places like the schools for the blind, the schools for the deaf and the Science Centre—a variety of places.

Mr. Reid: There are 100 of them in the Premier's office.

Hon. Mr. Auld: In the Ministry of Transportation and Communications, it includes snowplough operators and winter maintenance people. In the summertime it includes roughly another 10,000 students and all the people who work part-time in the parks. There are a great many part-time people and it is virtually impossible, I'm informed by my own staff, to say that there are so many contract people in one year, it will vary seasonably.

I might be able to give the hon. member the answer to the first part of the question, as to the number of civil servants who have been dropped from complement who might now be found under the guise of contract employees. I can say that it would be very few, because the way Management Board plugged that loophole was to reduce direct operating expenses, including all salaries, by 10 per cent, so that in the event someone tries to replace a permanent civil servant by contract employee they still have to have the money to do it, and that we are watching very closely.

However, if it is possible, I will try to give the hon. member a further answer to the first part of the question.

Mr. Reid: I wonder if I could ask—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. Has the original questioner a point of clarification?

Mrs. Bryden: Yes; do I take it that the minister says contract employees are not included in the civil service complement? Secondly, all I'm asking for on contract employees is the number as of, say Nov. 3, 1975, versus Nov. 3, 1974, which would cut out all the problems about seasonable and part-time? Is that possible?

Hon. Mr. Auld: I'm afraid it isn't quite that simple, but I will try, and—

Mr. Foulds: No, it certainly isn't.

Hon. Mr. Auld: —give the hon. member an answer. You see for instance—

Mr. Lewis: Never mind the for instance, just give the answer.

Hon. Mr. Auld: —in the government there are positions—not a great many of them, I understand—which have always been filled—

Mr. Lewis: The minister is the greatest fudger in this Legislature.

Hon. Mr. Auld: I am sure there are others who don't want the answer, but the hon. member might.

Mr. Bullbrook: He means the minister is sweet when he calls him a fudger.

Hon. Mr. Auld: There are positions that have always been filled by unclassified and contract people. For instance, in what we might call the foreign service in industry and tourism.

Mr. Lewis: The foreign service? This is Ontario.

Mr. Foulds: Where do they work—northern Ontario?

Mr. Speaker: Order please, we are wasting time.

Hon. Mr. Auld: I have a great answer, but I'll restrain myself.

Mr. Deans: Go ahead.

Mrs. Campbell: Just give us the answer.

Interjections.

Hon. Mr. Auld: We can get together—

Mr. Bullbrook: Yes, that would be great. [2:45]

Hon. Mr. Auld: —you be Mr. Interlocutor and I can give you a lot of definitions.

The people who work for Industry and Tourism in the United States and in other countries have always been unclassified non-civil servants. For one thing, they can't take the oath of allegiance and there are always local conditions, so it is not quite as simple as it appears on the surface to try to get these definitions.

Mr. Lewis: That is certainly germane.

Hon. Mr. Auld: The hon. member may find some more illumination in the special programme review committee, which I understand has been taking a look at this problem along with others. I will endeavour to clarify things further for the member.

Interjections.

Mr. Speaker: Did the member for Rainy River have a supplementary? One final supplementary.

Mr. Reid: Mr. Speaker, at the risk of taking on the Paul Martin of the Ontario Legislature once again, I would like to draw to his attention that there is a question in my name and that of the member for Kitchener (Mr. Breithaupt) on this very thing. My question was on the order paper for four months in the last session. Is it not possible for the Management Board to come up with these figures and, if you like, categorize them as contract people and others as opposed to permanent civil servants? Quit playing games with the people of Ontario.

Hon. Mr. Auld: If the hon. member will indicate how long he means—if he would like to have delineated every person who has been on contract, including those for a month and those for six months, it is going to take another four months. I've tried to explain the complexities of this—

Mr. Reid: It's taken you six months to answer that question.

Hon. Mr. Auld: I suppose the answer may have been just about ready and then there was a whole different group of unclassified employees—

Mr. Singer: Then you had to tear it up.

Mr. Reid: Give me the old answer. I will take the old answer.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The answers are getting quite lengthy.

Really, I believe if there is further discussion, this should be between the two people. The member for London North.

ANTI-INFLATION PROGRAMME

Mr. Shore: I have a very simple question. It seems we are having difficulty reconciling what I consider simple questions so I'll ask this question in a more simplified form.

Mr. Speaker: Could we have the question please?

Mr. Shore: Could the minister, the hon. Treasurer, reconcile this: He is said to have stated in the Globe and Mail the other day that about 120 civil servants, who are in the salary range of between $30,000 and $50,000, have been told they have a freeze. I've been informed that public accounts have stated that there are over 375 people in this category. Could he please reconcile these two numbers?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Mr. Speaker, what we referred to in the statement was the senior compensation list which is about 120 or 130 people. Their range would be—I think $30,000 would probably be a little bit on the low side; $49,000, I think, would be the top. There are people who are certainly earning over $30,000 who are not on the senior compensation list. Provincial judges come immediately to mind; and there are also Crown attorneys and a number of others who are not on the senior compensation list. There is a cross-over point there.

Mr. Shore: Could I ask a supplementary? How was the decision made as to who was frozen and who wasn't?

Mr. Lewis: By law.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: The ones on the senior compensation list.

Mr. Foulds: The Celsius scale.

HOLIDAY CLOSING FOR RETAIL BUSINESSES

Mr. Bounsall: A question of the Solicitor General (Mr. MacBeth), Mr. Speaker: With reference to his newly introduced Act to regulate holiday closings for retail business will he consider exempting the downtown core of the city of Windsor on the same basis and for the same reasons as he is considering exempting Muskoka and Niagara Falls?

Mr. Bullbrook: It is out of order, Mr. Speaker, you know it. The legislation is before us. My goodness gracious, who has to do your job for you?

Mr. Speaker: I think that question—order, please. This bill will be discussed very briefly; I think there will be an appropriate time then.

Another question; who have we? The member for—

Mr. Sweeney: Kitchener-Wilmot, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Yes.

FAMILY PLANNING CLINICS

Mr. Sweeney: A question of the Minister of Health: The various county and regional health units have been advised to set up family planning clinics. It is my understanding that a community advisory group is supposed to determine some of the rules of the game. Those groups are presently—

Mr. Speaker: Your question please.

Mr. Sweeney: The question is does the Minister of Health or his ministry advise those groups as to what age level—I would have to use the term children—they are to receive family planning material, shall we say? There seems to be a great deal of conflict as to —

Mr. Speaker: Order, please, the question only. No debate or discussion.

Mr. Sweeney: At what age does the Ministry of Health recommend—

Mr. Speaker: The question has been asked.

Mr. Sweeney: At what age does the Ministry of Health recommend, through its family planning clinics, that people would get family planning material or devices?

Hon. F. S. Miller: Mr. Speaker, as far as I know we don't advise an age.

Mr. Speaker: The oral question period has expired.

Mr. Lewis: Let the supplementary go on; I want to hear the supplementary.

Mr. Speaker: Petitions.

Presenting reports.

Motions.

Hon. Mr. Welch moved that Mrs. Campbell be substituted for Mr. Good on the select committee appointed to consider the fourth and fifth reports of the commission on the Legislature.

Motion agreed to.

Hon. B. Stephenson: I beg leave to table the 56th annual report of the—

Interjections.

Mr. Speaker: Order please. I believe I may have missed the order for reports. You may continue.

Hon. B. Stephenson: Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to table the 56th annual report of the Ministry of Labour for the fiscal year ended March 31, 1975; and explanatory materials for the 1975-1976 estimates of the Ministry of Labour.

Mr. Speaker: Any further motions?

Introduction of bills.

Mr. Lewis: Where's the rent bill?

Mr. Speaker: Orders of the day.

Clerk of the House: The first order, resuming the adjourned debate on the motion for an address in reply to the speech of the Hon. the Lieutenant Governor at the opening of the session.

THRONE SPEECH DEBATE

Mr. Speaker: The hon. Leader of the Opposition.

Mr. Lewis: I am not at all sure I can cope with both the Premier (Mr. Davis) and the Treasurer (Mr. McKeough) and the entire entourage in the House at the same time.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: We can leave.

Hon. Mr. Handleman: Does the member want us to leave?

Mr. Lewis: What wonders doth minority government perform.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased and delighted to begin the response to the Speech from the Throne for our party. I don't intend to dwell on or savour or relish in unseemly ways the election results. I don't want to fight those battles all over again, although I judge from time to time that's going to happen anyway. I wanted to make only one reference to the election campaign which struck me as symptomatic or symbolic of some of the problems which the government faced, the conclusions to which I didn't know, frankly, until today.

Right at the end of the campaign, Mr. Speaker, with about a week or 10 days to go, we had a public contretemps, I suppose that's the way it could be described, over the increase to the GAINS programme and the minimum monthly income which the government was going to provide. The Premier had made an announcement of $6.02 per month to bring everybody up to $250 a month, as I recall, and we said that $5.99 of that would be the cost of living increase provided by the federal government on Oct. 1, and that was much disputed. The Premier said they would go ahead anyway. I learned today that the increase provided on Oct. 1 under the federal cost of living adjustment was, lo and behold, $5.99, and that in fact the government really did, during the campaign, increase the amount by only three cents a month and endeavoured to get away with it at that time.

I had a feeling, in retrospect as I looked at the figures, that that was part of the malaise of the Tory campaign, that there was a continuing inconsistency and lack of public credibility in much of what was said. Now, of course, fortunately, happily, the senior citizens of Ontario are receiving $255.99 a month as a result of the various adjustments. It's not as much as they should have, I presume, but it is rather more than they would have received had the matter not been reconciled during the campaign.

I am not going to deal with all of the issues which emerged, Mr. Speaker, although I want to deal with some of them in their aftermath. I presume, as I look across the floor, that the mere shift in the physical array within the Legislature is enough to disconcert the Conservative Party. I guess the presence of the socialist hordes is trauma enough to unsettle some of them.

Hon. Mr. Davis: I don't think hordes is quite the term.

Mr. Lewis: I thought perhaps I would pre-empt it in advance of the next campaign, if you will allow me to do that.

Interjections.

Mr. Lewis: The Tory rump has become the Liberal rump, which is an interesting shift in proportions, as it were. The monolithic juggernaut that we once knew has become the fragile remnants that we now see. That, as well, indicates to all of those who wish to judge the House what remarkable shifts there have been in the Province of Ontario.

I don't want to indulge myself in merriment over things which occurred—that will happen regularly during the session—nor do I want to raise a whole wealth—

Mr. Yakabuski: Go ahead.

Mr. Lewis: No, I will do that later, I would say to the member—is he from Renfrew North or Renfrew South?

Mr. Yakabuski: Renfrew South.

Mr. Lewis: Renfrew South. I will do that later. Nor do I want to range over a list of new issues. That will be provided during the estimates in the new year, if we reach the new year intact.

The election is over; the Premier remains the Premier; bloody but as yet unbowed. My felicitations to him. The Treasurer, I notice, still runs the government; that too is reassuring. The Liberals anticipate their leadership ruckus as soon as they draw lots to see who will run; and we, Mr. Speaker, I hasten to add, are indeed Her Majesty's Loyal Opposition. If I may say, as ambiguously as possible in the hope of satisfying everyone, we don't intend to be in the opposition forever.

Interjections.

Mr. Lewis: I said "as ambiguously as possible." What more would members wish?

Interjections.

Mr. Riddell: The leader of the NDP will enjoy it for the short time that he has it.

Mr. Lewis: We will enjoy it for as long as it is conferred upon us. Maybe we will ascend —who knows? In any event, so much for the pleasantries; I want to get down to business.

Our view of politics in Ontario at the moment is one of the continuing shifting sands of the election campaign itself and of the period which preceded. Our view, I think, is that much remains the same in On-

tario as was characteristic of the election campaign and the events which preceded it.

If I can identify on behalf of my colleagues in the New Democratic caucus—and there are happily many of them—I think that what persists now, which was in fact the Achilles heel of the Tory party prior to its partial defeat—more than partial some would say—is a continuing failure of political leadership. I don't mean that in the context—I think the Premier understands—of an individual. I mean it in the context of the government as a whole. Its political leadership was wanting before the campaign. Its political leadership was wanting during the campaign and the failure of political leadership persists now.

All of the patterns which were clearly evident in the Province of Ontario before, continue. They harass the government; they haunt the government; they demonstrate a government at once inconsistent and confused, government which hasn't yet been able to reconcile what authority it should exercise.

On those issues which were germane and central to the life of the election campaign itself, nothing very much has changed. No sooner was the election over, the last 10 days or two weeks of which were fought on the question of rents in large measure, than there emerged a succession of reversals and pirouettes by the government on the question of rent control, rent review, tenant security, whatever you wish, all of which successive reversals were unlovely in the extreme. From the day the election was over until this day, this government, this cabinet, has still not been able to define in its own mind what it is going to do about an issue which was absolutely central to the life of the electorate.

That suggests to me a continuing failure of political leadership.

[3:00]

The election, Mr. Speaker, was fought in large measure on matters of energy. No sooner was the election campaign over than the Minister of Energy tabled, a little later perhaps, the first Isbister commission report and announced, characteristic of the Conservative Party, that prices for a gallon of gasoline at the pump and a gallon of home heating fuel would go up by 5.4 cents in the first case, by 4.8 cents in the second place, effective Nov. 16 next.

That is a default on political leadership. That is a practical and current demonstration of the things which brought the government into disrepute prior to this climactic election campaign of ours.

The Isbister report simply said that the inventories had run out for 1975. It made no pretence at recapturing the extra days of inventory which resulted in windfall profits for the oil companies in 1974—some 48 days of inventory and some $52 million of unanticipated windfall profit. The Isbister report didn't say to you: "Raise the price on Nov. 16;" but you did it, willingly, voluntarily, gratuitously.

You did it, even though to this day you have no statistical documentation from the oil companies which you provided to the Legislature or Ontario. You did it even though to this day you have no knowledge of whether the current base price is valid and legitimate or invalid and illegitimate. You did it although you know that the increases in profits to the oil companies continue to be unconscionable, even though they claim they are losing money.

Can I just refresh the Premier's mind that in 1970 the net profit of Imperial Oil was $105 million and by 1974 had risen to $290 million; that the rate of return on investment in that same period of time jumped from 11 per cent to 22 per cent?

Can I refresh the Premier's mind that Gulf Canada jumped from $39 million profit in 1970 to $161 million profit in 1974, an increase of 313 per cent, and the rate of return on investment went from six per cent to 20 per cent?

Can I remind the Premier of Ontario and his colleagues that Shell Canada's profit went up from $51 million net in 1970 to $142 million in 1974, an increase of 178 per cent, and the rate of return went from seven per cent to 16 per cent during that time?

Can I remind the Premier that the profits of the oil companies and the improved rates of return continue apace through 1975, never once justified in the public marketplace; and yet this government, without the slightest whimsy or hesitation, increases the price per gallon yet another 5.4 cents effective Nov. 16 next?

These oil companies, you know, they never lose. They never lose. What they don't get from Peter Lougheed, they get from William Davis. What they are not provided with from Pierre Trudeau, they are provided with by Darcy McKeough. Every way they turn, every government acts as a supplicant to the oil companies.

It makes life very difficult for people in northern Ontario, many of whom my colleagues represent in this caucus. It makes life intolerable for wage-earners and con-

sumers across the Province of Ontario who face the spectre of restraints on all sides while you free the price for the oil companies. You want to lock horns on the question of energy? We'll lock horns with you on the question of the profits you are providing for the oil companies.

Do you remember that memorable quote which was provided from the hearings before the Nova Scotia Public Utilities Commission by the comptroller of Imperial Oil when he said: "I think I have to preface my remarks by suggesting to you that prices are not entirely related to cost. I think there is considerable judgement in the numbers which are picked out of the jumble of numbers in order to put the price into the market as best we see it."

They charge what the market will bear. They charge what governments allow them to get away with and you have forced the consumers of Ontario to pay more than a quarter of a billion dollars in additional prices to the oil companies—no questions asked; no answers provided—and it was done in the wake of an election campaign which clearly marks this government with a failure of political leadership. So it persists.

It persists as well in the field of Ontario Hydro. There the failure of political leadership is also a failure of political courage. Either the government believed that the 27 per cent increase guaranteed or allowed by the Ontario Energy Board should be passed on to the consumer or it didn't. Either it felt it was too high in the context of the federal guidelines or it didn't. But collectively, this government didn't have the courage to make the decision itself. It never does. That is also the failure of political leadership.

We don't begrudge the government turning it over to a select committee of this Legislature, because I suspect that the opposition parties combined will give Ontario Hydro the kind of public scrutiny which has not occurred in a political context for so many years. It will doubtless result in a reduced rate of increase, despite Ontario Hydro's insatiable growth fetishes. But it had to be done by the collective apparatus of the Legislature. The government, across the way, did not have the political strength and credentials to do it itself; a failure of political leadership.

Even when the government introduces something so relatively lesser on the scale of human needs as Sunday legislation in the retail industry, to prevent the openings on Sundays, it could not bring itself to respond to the clear and evident pressure all over the Province of Ontario for uniform store hours during the week as well. Again, the government succumbed to the effective lobby of the corporate monolith—sure it did—to the large corporations, and refused to accept what PUSH said to it, what the Federation of Canadian Independent Business—

Hon. Mr. Davis: No, that is silly.

Mr. Lewis: The Premier thinks it's silly? He doesn't know how silly I feel finding myself in agreement with John Bulloch, rather than with others. I resent that bedfellow relationship, I'll tell you. It's more than I can bear.

Hon. Mr. Davis: I don't think he considered it that kind of relationship.

Mr. Lewis: As a matter of fact, I questioned it closely, and I have to grant the Premier he is as uncomfortable as I am.

Nonetheless, political leadership, some sense of what was at work in the Province of Ontario, would have allowed the government and should have allowed the government to do both things simultaneously. But again it falls short.

On matters which were central to the election campaign, on matters which revealed the problems of the Tory government, problems that appear never to be recoverable, problems that appear somehow never to be alterable, those things are reinforced in the day-to-day work of this short legislative session. We're not going to call the government down because of that—I don't mean that in terms of a vote of non-confidence—I understand what it is wrestling with. It may be that at some point the government will mobilize itself and pull itself together.

I want to deal a little more thoroughly—albeit not in as great length as I've dealt in previous Throne speeches—with the latest issue in the life of the Ontario Legislature, which creates for the government and for the province an enormous problem, and for the Legislature an enormous tension. And that is the statement by the federal Prime Minister on Thanksgiving last. We are ready as a caucus to deal with this subject in minute detail—particularly in response to the Treasurer's statement of Thursday—but I want to deal with it in general terms first, because it so clearly underlies everything we're going to do in this House. It raises a fundamental difference which, at some point either, has to be resolved or will be evidenced in legislative votes and proceedings.

It would be possible for me, obviously, on behalf of my party, to take the time to challenge the fundamental premises on which that whole apparatus of wage and price guidelines was based. It would be possible for me to quote the Statistics Canada figures which show that while real wages have increased 36.3 per cent between 1961 and 1974, the gross national product has increased more than 2.5 times that and profits have increased more than six times that. It would be possible for me to quote chapter and verse from Statistics Canada that the value of real wages actually fell in dollars and cents terms compared to the increase in the consumer price index over the latter part of 1973 and 1974.

It is possible to show how dramatically the poor become poorer and the rich become richer in Canada generally and in the Province of Ontario because the lowest quintile of earners in Canada now take about 2.5 to 3.5 per cent of total income, while the highest quintile now occupies between 45 and 50 per cent of total income. In other words, income distribution in this country and this province continues to be entirely inequitable. Clearly wages have not yet, in many sectors of the economy, particularly those which are most vulnerable, have not yet caught up with inflation; and clearly prices and profits are still very much out of control. But I don't want to challenge it on fundamental premises, I want to deal with it in the context of the provincial government, if I may.

I think that the Province of Ontario embraced those wage-price guidelines with indecent haste and that it did so not out of patriotic motivations but out of simply unadorned political motivations. This government was exceptionally relieved at the apparent initiatives which the federal government would take, particularly in the wage sector.

The people over there love to control wages. It is so easy. The employer does it for them. Every employer is a policeman over wages. There are no great problems in control. It strikes this government as a very fashionable attack in the marketplace. It embraces the possibility of having the federal government solve for it all kinds of collective bargaining settlements which may have been uneasy or awkward. This government embraced it very quickly. I suspect that ministers sat down at cabinet and chuckled over the fact that Pierre Elliott Trudeau, irony of ironies, had come to their rescue at a time when the government felt itself profoundly vulnerable.

I have no doubt this government was also seeking an issue and, Tory intuition at play, it felt that some demonstration of austerity, it felt that hard-lining it and it felt that statements, which in their way were even more extreme than the statements made by the federal cabinet ministers, might set the basis, the groundwork for the next election campaign. That I sense also.

We can understand that over here. Those things are obviously matters of discussion, but the simple fact is that the government's embracing of the federal guidelines, as we saw it, stemmed from those motivations. It never had the candour to say anything about it. The Premier and the Treasurer clutched the national interest to their bosoms when just three months ago they were prepared to revile every federal initiative and did so shamelessly on every occasion they could muster. The instant conversion is hardly very persuasive.

On the other hand, the government has done it. It has gone head over heels for the guidelines and now we have to cope with the consequences. The New Democratic Party admits willingly that the federal guidelines are a watershed in the history of politics in this province and country. We concede there had to be a careful provincial response, because I am prepared to admit that the question of inflation is, and was, truly grievous and truly difficult.

[3:15]

There isn't a political party in this House that doesn't want to face inflation frontally. I am perfectly willing to admit that even our sister New Democratic provinces in western Canada are at sixes and sevens about the extent to which they should encourage the guidelines or respond to the guidelines. It's entirely possible that British Columbia, Saskatchewan and Manitoba, while expressing more profound reservations than Ontario will ever express, will not resist the federal application of the federal law in a frontal fashion because they understand the political realities as well. I concede that. The political reality is that everyone in this country wants some response to the question on inflation.

But only Ontario, as far as I was able to judge, opted in—uncritically, almost mindlessly. It didn't know anything about the rules or the regulations of the anti-inflation board; didn't have any of the details; didn't express anything other than the most ritual and trivial reservations—indeed not just ritual and trivial but simply fashionable reservations—and just moved to embrace the guidelines. This government, I think, abdicated in the process a whole range of provincial initiatives to strengthen the guidelines where they are weak

and to ameliorate them where they are wrong; to strengthen them where they are weak and to ameliorate them where they are wrong.

That again, I suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, indicates the failure of political leadership. Abdication is not leadership. To surrender everything to the federal government is not leadership. The provincial Treasurer's statement of last Thursday was not leadership.

You know what social democratic parties believe. We have, for a very long time, all of us, believed—does that bother the Premier? Would he prefer me to say democratic socialist or the New Democratic Party?

Hon. Mr. Davis: I am wondering about the difference.

Mr. Lewis: There was a time when he called us the socialist group. Maybe that would be fashionable for him now.

You know what parties like ours believe. We have always believed as an article of faith that it is legitimate for the state to intervene fundamentally in the economy. That used to be a basic difference of opinion across the floor of this Legislature as the Tories protected the private sector from government intrusion.

We have always believed, as a tenet of our social philosophy, that it is legitimate to intervene in the socio-economic apparatus of Canada or of Ontario, to defend the citizenry or to make major alterations in economic distribution; or indeed in prices, profits or wages. No one who is a socialist has ever hesitated on that score, and I put it to you as simply as that.

On the other hand, I think we have understood what perhaps the Conservatives in Ontario have not understood. That is that the power of the state is so awesome you don't intervene lightly. You don't intervene in the fashion which Pierre Trudeau is now entertaining. If you're going to intervene in the economy at all, you do it with one underlying rationale and that underlying rationale must be fairness.

The government across the way has abdicated fairness, that's what they have done. They've accepted the guidelines with all of their inequities and they've made no effort whatsoever, as a political government showing some sense of political leadership, to institute fairness.

We're going to oppose the guidelines in every way which strikes us as unfair, unworkable and inappropriate because we think that's the job of an opposition and of a government. We're also going to ask the government to move in and do something for the people of Ontario which it has clearly refused to do. Let me simply remind the House of what that consists.

When the Treasurer of Ontario made his speech the first area of four which strike us as a total abdication of government responsibility was the question of prices. He said,

> A lot has been said about prices by those who oppose the programme and who have apparently not read or understood the proposals for limiting the price increases and net profit margins of large corporations.

I want to tell the Premier and the Treasurer, as directly as I can, that we understand exactly what the price proposals of Pierre Elliott Trudeau consist of. Every federal cabinet minister who has spoken is falling all over himself to explain that prices will continue to rise. Jean-Luc Pepin has made it clear that prices will continue to rise. Pierre Trudeau asks us to show patience because prices will continue to rise for a year, or two, or more.

The major companies do not have to give advance intention of raising prices and have them approved, they only have to give notice of intention to raise prices, without approval being required. The system to establish monitoring is not yet set up, the number of employees attached to the anti-inflation board is pathetic in the context of the job. There is absolutely no mechanism built into the federal legislation which will deal with illegitimate price increases.

So if the government is willing to show political leadership; if it is willing to give the people of Ontario some sense that the guidelines are fair—that coming down like the guillotin on wages will have a corresponding consequence on prices—then either it sets up a provincial review board in Ontario, which scrupulously and relentlessly monitors every single price increase and rolls it backward if illegitimate, or it does what they had the courage to do in the province of British Columbia, and that is to institute a price freeze, and it does it today for a minimum period of two months until things sort themselves out.

Mr. Yakabuski: Until the election is over.

Mr. Lewis: No sir, not at all. The election is in fact continuing, but that is not what I am talking to. I am talking to a very important issue.

You wouldn't consider the price freeze. The Treasurer (Mr. McKeough) made some

reference to it in his speech. The fact of the matter is that the price freeze in British Columbia is one of the most remarkable successes that government has ever undertaken.

Do you know that one retail company after another has fallen into line? Do you know that one supermarket after another has agreed to follow the price freeze of the government? Do you know that there are supermarkets and retailers in British Columbia who now have signs over their marquees which read: "We co-operate with the Province of British Columbia"?

Do you know that the business community has not openly, since the freeze, attacked the government of British Columbia for what it has done? Do you know that at least in that province the wage-earners and consumers have some sense that the government is serious about prices rather than simply being serious about wages?

But there is no such political leadership in the Province of Ontario at all; no such political leadership whatsoever. Your only interventions in the marketplace are ad hoc and self-serving. If you intervene in the marketplace it is only because an election is coming and you have to do something with the oil company increases. That is all. That is the only time you ever raise a finger. I will come to that in a few minutes.

The one area of provincial initiative which was entirely open to you, that of prices, you have defaulted on, and you can understand why working men and women across Ontario will feel jaundiced and sceptical about their government while prices continue to go up irresistibly without any interference on your part whatsoever to protect the consumers of this province. That is called the failure of political leadership.

The second area with which the Treasurer dealt in his speech on behalf of the Premier (Mr. Davis) and his government was the question of profits. Nowhere was the Treasurer prepared to concede how easy it is for major corporations to manipulate profits, or to write them off, or to calculate them in ways which no army of accountants could possibly decipher. Nowhere did the Treasurer of Ontario blanch at the prospect that profits could be maintained at 95 per cent of the level of the best profit margins of the last five years.

Have you looked at any of the profit margins of those companies for the last five years? Have you looked at International Nickel? Have you looked at Denison? Have you looked at Rio Algom? Have you looked at Ford? Have you looked at Canada Packers? Have you looked at George Weston?

We have looked at all of them. All of them provide for profit increases of between 45 and 100 per cent over and above what existed in 1970, even at the 95 per cent level.

In other words, the Treasurer will bring down his fists on wages but he will do absolutely nothing to intervene in profits, although he did say something. The Treasurer said this:

> Our concern is that these proposals should be reinforced if necessary by a corporate surtax. Such a tax would be levied against corporate profits in excess of the guidelines where these profits are not reinvested.

I read that as an open invitation to the corporations of Ontario to soak the consumers of Ontario, to accumulate as much by way of profit as they can, and if the appropriate portion of it is reinvested, they are exempt from the corporate surtax. That's the way the government's corporate surtax would work. It is an open-ended policy for the corporations to behave as they wish. If the government is going to tie price increases to that kind of open-ended corporation profit, then what the devil is the use of this whole masquerade anyway? The government has failed on prices, it fails on profits and yet it talks about political leadership. Although the government laughs it off now and tends by and large to be benignly indifferent about the public's view of the Tory party at the moment, it's the failures in these areas which I think will come back to haunt the government.

The same attitude, incidentally, just by way of passing, is shown toward professional incomes. When the government dismisses fee for service as a basis leading to the guidelines and their enforcement, and it talks about professional income being subject to a surtax, what the government is saying to the consumers of Ontario or the recipients of professional services is simply: "You will pay the increase and if we catch it later as an excess profit in some professional income, we may retrieve it." But along the way the consumer and working people continue to pay the additional amount. That's what the government is granting to the corporations, and that is apparently what it is willing to grant by way of professional incomes; that again is a complete abdication of political leadership. It's classic Toryism all over again.

The third area, and the one which I admit is most contentious and controversial, is the whole question of the public sector. Here again we part company in pretty fundamental ways and speak again to the question of

political leadership. I believe, this party believes, that the option clause provided under the federal legislation to the Province of Ontario isn't just some constitutional quibble; it's real.

I am not going to get into constitutional arguments, although I think Ontario's case could be much stronger than the government has made it out to be; but I am going to concede that if the government accepts the guidelines, it has to accept the federal law and try to deal with it.

The option clause gives to the province an alternative worthy of very serious consideration, and it's a political alternative the government chooses not to exercise. Not every province, despite what the Treasurer (Mr. McKeough) has said, intends to turn its entire public sector over to the anti-inflation board—by no means every province. Quebec is clearly going to operate separately. It looks as though Newfoundland will operate separately. It looks as though New Brunswick may operate separately. Saskatchewan and Alberta have not yet indicated how they intend to proceed.

All of those provinces are looking carefully and clearly at the option which is open to us under the federal guidelines; and none of the motives which lie behind the careful appraisal of the option proceeds from the assumption that they would undermine the federal scheme if the province exercised its own authority.

Mr. Bullbrook: It wouldn't be there if it undermined it.

Mr. Lewis: Precisely.

Mr. Bullbrook: It wouldn't be there; it wouldn't have the option.

[3:30]

Mr. Lewis: The Treasurer says on page 13 of his statement:

> As the programme develops, I am confident that all responsible individuals, whatever their particular economic interest, will work for the success of the programme and not for its erosion. For this reason, we accept the intent of the federal legislation for full inclusion of the province and its emanations. At this critical stage of development of what must be admittedly a very complex and yet often arbitrary programme, we cannot afford to behave in an obstructive manner. It is the national interest we are all involved in now and not the limited interests of any one level of government or its agencies.

What he is really saying in that statement is that the course he had determined on is the only course. Our response to that is: "Nuts." There are alternative courses available to him. What is good for the Progressive Conservative Party of Ontario is not necessarily good for Canada.

I want to remind them of that and simply to cast it in these stark terms doesn't validate the position they have chosen. I don't deny the present predicament of inflation in Canada. But I do differ with the government profoundly in its method of dealing with it.

The provincial Treasurer said a little earlier:

> Picture what would happen if all provinces set up separate review and enforcement bodies. Each would make an unconnected string of decisions concerning exemptions and apply different standards of enforcement. This could only lead to a tangled web of disarray, a serious erosion of the national effort and, as a consequence, a higher rate of inflation in this country. This government does not endorse that kind of approach.

That, frankly, is fatuous. That's not what is involved. It is rhetorical absurdity.

Who is to say what would be undermined? If it was the decision of the Province of Ontario to adhere to the guidelines in any way which was consistent with the federal proposals, what would be undermined in any manner? Why does it necessarily undermine it to allow the province to exercise its authority in areas which are traditional to it?

What the province might do—which the federal government will probably never do—is introduce a powerful component of fairness to the way in which the guidelines are applied. If he is serious about the guidelines he will recognize the implications which exist within them. He doesn't surrender his responsibilities. If he talks about the public disarray which would flow if he didn't give the public sector to Ottawa, let me suggest to him the public disarray and non-confidence that will flow, the disrepute into which the guidelines will fall, if people sense the unfairness of what is now afoot. The Treasurer went on:

> In one way or another the government has a special relationship with virtually every member of the work force in Ontario. Trade unions, small incorporated businesses, businesses requiring licences, tradesmen, small construction companies, real estate brokers, credit unions and other provincially-incorporated bodies.

These and many others are covered under a variety of provincial statutes. Public servants are by no means the only groups who have a special provincial relationship.

What kind of silliness is that? He understands the difference between the public sector and the rest of these chartered statutes. He understands that in the public sector the government is directly or indirectly the employer of all these people and therefore has an absolutely central responsibility. How can it be denied?

Let me suggest the inconsistency which emerges and I'll do it again in greater detail. It is all right for him to surrender to the Legislature of Ontario the setting of Hydro rate increases but he quite happily turns over the wages of the Hydro workers to the anti-inflation board. That's the kind of inconsistency in, and abdication of provincial authority which will ultimately get him into a great deal of difficulty.

Let me put it this way. If the guidelines were lasting only three to six months we might say to him, "By all means deal with it as you are dealing with it." But the guidelines are lasting for three years. He is opting in for two years. That's a long time for people's wages to be constrained and therefore the provincial jurisdiction has to be exercised.

Let me put it another way. If it was an absolute freeze, if there was no variation, we might say to him, "Fair enough, do it this way." But the anti-inflation board has been given the specific right to vary settlements up and down and once variation is permitted, those variations should be exercised by that jurisdiction which is most sensitive to the settlements that are involved and that, again, is clearly the provincial jurisdiction in this area. I'm not suggesting to the government that it is going to vary them away up. It may not vary them at all. It may vary them by only one or two per cent but it would be done in the area of provincial jurisdiction where it clearly belongs.

If, as most of us believe, there are inequities in the private sector in Pierre Trudeau's guidelines, why should they be imported into the public sector? What rationale is there to maintain inequities in both sectors? Why is the government so willing to compound injustice? And if it doesn't think injustice exists, then it could exercise its authority accordingly and maintain the guidelines at their exact level. There is no great virtue in identifying wrong in one sector of the economy and duplicating it in another sector of the economy.

If the government is so all fired up about enforcing the guidelines, then it could obviously still do so. It could obviously give to the Province of Ontario the kind of authority and power which would deal with the guidelines on terms which make it happy or which it finds manageable and satisfactory. If that means descending with both feet on the public sector, the government is clearly able to do that; or with some sensitivity, diplomacy and careful political response, it could deal with some of the individual applications in a way which exercised fairness. There is something terribly inconsistent and, I suggest to the government, wrong in the way we are abdicating our authority in this area constitutionally for a considerable period of time and it will visit unnecessary aggravation and resentment on large numbers of people.

I'm going to admit a very special concern on the part of this caucus with the public sector. I am concerned about the way in which they have emerged to full collective bargaining rights only over the last three or four years. I'm concerned about the potential explosiveness. I'm concerned about the sense of grievance that exists. I'm concerned about the very low income earners who lie at the bottom of the scale, among the hospital workers, for example, or the lower echelons of the public service, for example. I'm concerned that the government should play fair and should keep the faith with all of these people.

I'm not suggesting to the government that it break the guidelines indiscriminately because as a government, it never would. I understand that. But if the government is going to vary it one or two or three per cent, up and down, let it at least be done by the authority to whom the workers feel beholden.

Let me digress for just a moment; let me mention the teachers. I hold no special brief for teachers. The only thing in my life I've ever done other than being a politician is to teach.

Mr. Hodgson: There are a lot of them over there.

Mr. Lewis: It's a nice profession. There are a lot of teachers over here. There is no vested privilege. I've said before—to much abuse from the teachers, I may say—that many of their demands were exorbitant and silly. Where they are exorbitant and silly, we should say so because that's obviously disruptive, and everyone understands that.

I want to come back to the Minister of Education (Mr. Wells) and to the Premier

(Mr. Davis)—the man who fashioned this educational model—to remind them of something. We've worked for three to four years in this Legislature to fashion a bill for collective bargaining for the teachers of Ontario. For a year or two, the minister hedged in the way it was emerging. We were confronted with that major demonstration in December, 1973. He changed his mind between 1973 and 1975, and all that we did in response was to applaud him for the change. He brought down a bill on collective bargaining for teachers which is one of the most enlightened bills in the field, and I concede it happily.

Then the teachers of Ontario and the boards of Ontario started to bargain within the confines of that legislation, Bill 100. They bargained scrupulously on both sides. They bargained in good faith on both sides. In the case, for example, of the Metropolitan Toronto high school teachers, they went to a fact-finder, a man whom the Minister of Education acknowledges is one of the most objective and excellent arbiters in the business. Stanley Hartt came down with a fact-finder report. I feel a little chagrined about it myself because this party argued so hard and so long for a fact-finder method which would give the public a sense of what might be an objective settlement. The fact-finder's report, while acceptable to the teachers, is totally unacceptable to the boards of education.

The possibility of a settlement, even though that is the case, has now, I think, been lost because of the guidelines. The possibility of a strike on Nov. 12 looms very large, partly because of the guidelines.

Mr. Speaker, I want to say to you that if this strike occurs it will be unlike any other teachers' strike in Ontario's recent history. It is not going to be like Windsor and it is not going to be like Thunder Bay and it is not going to be like Ottawa. It's going to be long, it is possible to predict. It's going to be terribly bitter, it is possible to predict. It is going to do some serious damage to the educational system despite the fact the teachers and the boards wish that didn't have to happen.

I am amazed, through the Speaker to the Minister of Education, how the moderates in the teaching profession feel aggrieved and angry. I am amazed how the rank-and-file teachers feel they should carry placards for as long as it takes to win their point. I worry greatly—as he does, I admit fully—about the consequences for the educational system in Ontario if and when this strike should occur. I don't understand why, in God's name, he has been taking such a long time to intervene at the highest level to see if it could be coped with.

But it's the guidelines in some measure which are bringing these groups to this frontal confrontation. It's the sense that somehow they are responsible not to the minister any longer, not to the Premier any longer, but to Jean-Luc Pepin, absurdly enough, which is creating even greater tensions than now exist.

Look at the Ontario English Catholic Teachers' Association in the Toronto area, 4,000 of them. They are coming off a three-year contract which gave them 2.7 per cent in the first year; 3.5 per cent in the second year—sorry, 4.7 per cent in the second year; seven per cent in the third year and no cost of living arrangements in the latter part of the contract. Now they are subject to the guidelines.

I am not asking the minister to give them extravagant wages but any reasonable human being will admit there's something profoundly unfair about that group of public sector workers facing the crunch they are now facing. I gather that 2,000 or 3,000 of them intend to come down to the Legislature tomorrow night to give voice to their protest.

Teachers aren't popular. Does the minister want to clobber them? It's the most fashionable game in town. We understand that. The public will be with him. We understand that. The point being made is that the guidelines are often unfair or, where they are perhaps fair, to surrender the entire public sector to Ottawa is going to work lasting damage and hardship on a whole range of provincial employees, working men and women in this province, who should not be thus subjected.

I really think that on those grounds, partially if not totally, the minister should reexamine his position. If they are to be dealt with unfairly—in their minds—at least let them feel they are being shafted by an adversary rather than by some surrogate in Ottawa. At least in terms of their own hostilities and anger, they will be able to identify the group responsible.

What happens four, six, eight, 10 weeks down the road when we all come together in this Legislature to bring in compulsory arbitration for the Metro high school teachers' situation? What happens then? What is the minister going to have them settle at? At the guidelines? At the last board offer? At the offer of the fact-finder? How is it all going to sort out? What are the consequences for the school system? We are saying to the Premier, as strongly as we can, that we don't need any federal intervention, gratuitous or

otherwise, to foul up a situation that is already perilous and difficult.

[3:45]

I think the problem lies on balance, in the philosophic rationale. I will use the last quotes I intend to use from the Treasurer (Mr. McKeough), who couldn't have written this himself:

> I am frankly somewhat dismayed by the number of groups who have already rushed forward with demands for exemptions. A year from now, these same groups will be arguing for cost-of-living increases and will probably not admit to any connection between their earlier income demands and the rise in living costs for the general public. This, in my view, is a distressing form of economic isolationism.

He goes on to say:

> I said in Ottawa last week that we must be prepared to live for a time with inequities and to draw the line now. I do not believe that there is any other way of proceeding if we mean this programme to work. It is a tough decision, but the times demand it.

The people over there on that side of the House, are so easy with their inequities. They are so ready to tolerate inequity. In my book inequity means injustice, and I want to know what re-definition of the political process they are about.

When a government sees injustice, it moves to strike it out; that's what a government does and it doesn't sit back. It doesn't sit back in that sanguine, self-indulgent way of the provincial Treasurer and say with a flip of the wrist, "We will have to abide the inequities."

How easy it is for politicians to render sacrifice on to others. It is always that way, isn't it? That's the way of the political process and that is what the Pierre Trudeaus and Darcy McKeoughs and William Davises are now saying to the public of Ontario.

I must say that's where we part company, because time and time again it doesn't take the illustrious Treasurer to dislocate the facts and to skewer them in the process. There are others who have done it. The federal Minister of Labour, John Munro—may I apologize for quoting him on this one occasion, but it serves my purpose. I will use anyone when it serves my particular purpose.

Mr. Reid: We will go for that. Right on. It is the only true thing he has said so far.

Mr. Lewis: I know, the member for Rainy River will take that out of Hansard and spread it across the front—

Mr. Singer: Stop right there.

Interjections.

Mr. Lewis: I will now descend to John Munro, who said this on Oct. 28, to the Newfoundland Federation of Labour:

> I have consistently argued over the last few years both inside and outside Parliament, that wage and salary gains have been a result of inflation, not its cause. Much of the public hysteria over wage levels has been generated by some who, intentionally or unintentionally, have distorted statistical data. Some settlements, admittedly, have been excessive by any standard, but taken as a whole the increase in wages and salaries in the last couple of years has reflected an attempt to offset real and apprehended inflation.

The federal Liberals are good—they apprehended inflation and apprehended insurrection. They also understand the meaning of real inflation, and that is what sticks in the craw about the Treasurer's entire statement.

Day in and day out in this Legislature for four years and more, non-stop, we asked the government about price increases in everything from supermarkets through to automobile insurance premiums, and not once did it lift a finger to defend the consumers of Ontario. Not once in that entire period of time! Week in and week out, month in and month out, we chronicled for the government the profits of the corporations, and not once did it lift a finger to defend the consumers of Ontario from the excessive and outrageous corporate profits which exist.

Now, the Premier (Mr. Davis) asks us to live with it. At the end of the economic cycle, when the workers of Ontario try to catch up with the prices and the profits, the guillotine descends and the government says it will live with the inequities and it elevates it to the position of a principle. That's what's wrong with the Tory party. It has never understood how profoundly unfair is the way in which this economic order works. And it is now prepared to reinforce all of the unfairness that is consummate in the guidelines presented by Pierre Elliott Trudeau. It is not a government any longer. It is a fascimile. That's the problem of political leadership. This leads me to the last point I want to make.

There isn't a thing in that entire statement from the provincial Treasurer worthy even of talking about as it relates to jobs—not a thing. It is as though unemployment barely existed in the Province of Ontario. He makes a quick and facile bow in the direction of unemployment figures but he indicates not a single proposition in response to it—not a one. The reality of course is that in a position of inflation and recession the question of job creation is every bit as important as the question of wage, price and profit control.

There isn't a thing in this statement of the Treasurer, and therefore in government policy, relating to the building of houses in the Province of Ontario—nothing. All of the things that were said about the housing crisis during the campaign have obviously had no impact on this government whatsoever. The announcement which Barney Danson made, just a couple of hours ago as I understand it, in the federal House of Commons will alleviate the situation hardly one jot. So the fact of the matter remains that the provincial initiative which his government could have exercised in the area of jobs, it refuses to exercise. As a matter of fact, the only initiative it really took was to say that next year it will contain its provincial spending to a limit of 10 per cent over this year.

That's admirable in itself, but we know in this caucus where those cuts will come. They will come where they always come. They will come in services to people. That's the way it works with the Conservative government. When it cuts back, it cuts back not in hardware but in services to people. When it cuts back in services to people all over the province, from jails to treatment centres, it means that it creates further unemployment and further social and economic dislocation. What has really emerged from the paper of the Treasurer is the worst of all worlds.

If the government wants to accept the federal law, accept it as we would do. The law is the law. I have said to trade union groups and I will say it anywhere that I am not interested in confrontation; I am not interested in general strikes; I am not interested in civil disobedience. It has never commended itself, or on occasion so exceptional that one can chronicle it in an itemized way, but not in this case. If we don't like the law, then we have the option of changing the government. That's clearly there too for us over a period of time. But it would be right for a provincial government to summon its courage about it and to take a number of important initiatives, to move on prices through price freeze and price control, to move on profits in a way which made an impact, to maintain to some extent a provincial authority over the public sector so that inequity did not spread from one group to another and so that all option as a province would clearly be exercised and, above all, to create jobs.

All of those routes which we would have exercised and which would give the government as a government some sense of political leadership in the community as a whole, the government has chosen to default upon. It has simply surrendered everything to another jurisdiction with the beads of sweat of relief upon its brow as it retreats from making the kinds of political decisions which others make easily and which it always finds terribly, terribly difficult to do. It will not do anything that requires either initiative or exertion. That has become characteristic of the Tories in this province. They are walking a tightrope in Ontario and I don't know how long they can maintain their balance or their equilibrium.

We think that the government is a very long way from pulling itself together. Our impression is that there is still a large quotient of public weariness, scepticism and even suspicion generally about the Conservatives and that they are making a very serious error on the guidelines.

I don't deny for a moment that all over Canada there are individuals and groups who have heaved a sigh of relief at some expression of federal initiative. All over Canada there are individuals and groups and political parties who are glad that the fight against inflation has begun. But we believe this is the wrong way to conduct the war. If it must be conducted in Pierre Trudeau's trenches, then the Premier of Ontario can at least intervene to make it fair, equitable and workable, where that is humanly possible to achieve. For whatever reason the Premier has opted out of that obligation entirely.

The lessons of the campaign? They seem never to be learned. The political leadership, whether it's in rents, energy, housing or guidelines, is clearly wanting. The political leadership on human issues is clearly wanting —and that hasn't changed either. I listened to the Minister of Community and Social Services (Mr. Taylor) give a reply today to the member for St. George (Mrs. Campbell) about a case involving the difference between those who are permanently unemployable and those who are physically disabled and the absurd distinction we make in the lives of people and the differing amounts of money that we ascribe to one condition but not to

the others. He implied that all of the cases have been re-examined.

Mr. Deans: Nonsense.

Mr. Lewis: My colleague from Wentworth says it's nonsense. I remember, during the course of the campaign, raising the case of a Mrs. A in Stratford who was so clearly physically disabled that only a medical nitwit would be able to describe her otherwise, and to this day she remains categorized as permanently unemployable rather than physically disabled, as we attempt to get one statement after another from medical personnel to somehow persuade the board of review that this woman deserves the slightly increased amount of money which she should receive from the state.

It was a day or two ago that we asked the Minister of Agriculture and Food (Mr. W. Newman) about the question of the farm income security plan. During the course of the campaign we raised questions about cow-calf operators and farmers in agricultural distress because of the government's agricultural programmes.

During the course of the campaign I raised the case of a man named Barnie Evans, who is a cow-calf operator—a one-time Tory, I want you to know; he is lucid, articulate and bright, and has become ever increasingly so as he deserts his Tory origins. He lives not very far from Embro. In the course of the campaign we set out how this terribly earnest and dedicated cow-calf operator found his whole farm operation going down the drain because of the absurd subsidy programme which the government had provided him.

After the election, Barnie Evans sold over 80 of his 140 cows. As a matter of fact, he took seven cows to market in Kitchener just a couple of weeks ago and got $872.81 for all seven of them. The government should calculate that when it is looking at the subsidy it has provided for the cow-calf operators and think of it in terms of the farm income subsidy plan that we discussed generally in this Legislature; then it will know that its loss of so much of the agricultural community in the last election leads directly from its refusal to listen to the cries and pleas for help from individual farmers.

I asked the Minister of Health (Hon. F. S. Miller) today at question period whether or not he has readings for the asbestos workers in the Reeves mine of Johns-Manville up near Timmins. I got a letter back from him which shows that in the three-, four- or five-year period before the mine and mill closed down, they took some scattered readings in one of the working environments which was the single most hazardous environment that I've discovered on the North American continent.

[4:00]

While we talk about that in the Legislature today, the Workmen's Compensation Board of Ontario is still procrastinating and stalling on the cases presented to it for compensation as a result of Johns-Manville in Scarborough, for asbestosis, lung cancer, and mesothelioma—proscrastinating and delaying in individual human circumstances—

Hon. B. Stephenson: That's hogwash!

Mr. Lewis: —which makes the behaviour of the board intolerable, and I would like to hear—and I will be glad to hear it from the Minister of Labour—

Hon. B. Stephenson: You will.

Mr. Lewis: —when you are going to provide the compensation for the cases that have been brought to your attention—not just from Johns-Manville, wait until you hear it from Elliot Lake—over the last several months I would like to know when the Workmen's Compensation Board will make decisions on some of these areas so that we don't forever have to deal in fields where there is a clear and explicit failure of political leadership. There never seems to be a satisfactory resolution.

All right, Mr. Speaker. Let me provide summation this way. The new mandate which the New Democratic Party has in this Legislature we hope to exercise as carefully and thoughtfully as we can, with as many alternatives to government policy as we can muster during the course of the session. We don't seek ritual confrontations with the government on issues or on votes. Where we will divide, we will divide, and it will be on serious and substantive matters.

I am not going to move an amendment today to the Throne Speech debate, partly in good faith, partly because that amendment avenue is open to us at any point over the next four or five weeks, and the vote coming, as I expect it is, in December, we would like to contain in our amendment those issues which are more clearly divisive depending on the course of debate over the next one or two or three weeks. The confrontations will not be ritual; they will, in fact, be real, and I want the Premier to know that.

I also want the Premier and the government to know that we have no illusions

about the past or about the future, where we are concerned. We know that the campaign was a nice amalgam of hard work and good fortune and we noted the fortuitous vote splits; we noted that as well.

I also find it occasionally worthy of a smile to see the irritation in parts of the media that somehow the NDP was not dealt with toughly enough in the campaign; we were ignored too easily; we came up the middle illegitimately. You want to deal with us anyway—

Hon. Mr. Davis: I never heard the word illegitimate used.

Mr. Lewis: —you want, we will be happy to respond to that challenge. But we are, however unexpectedly to anyone, Her Majesty's loyal opposition. You will notice how easily those words trip from the tongue, how nicely they are savoured.

Hon. Mr. Davis: One of these days your tongue will trip you up.

Interjections.

Mr. Lewis: You cannot imagine how many toasts to the Queen I have indulged in since this election was over—

Interjections.

Hon. Mr. Davis: I think you started about four weeks ago.

Mr. Lewis: —with every variety of intoxicant.

We have a voice and a role and an audience which we never had before and we intend to exercise it. It will not be exercised, let me say to the Premier, in political ways which are either abusively or stridently personal. I think he knows that.

As a matter of fact I noted in that article in the Toronto Star about the Leader of the Opposition, the one which had the very gracious pictures of my childhood, that the Premier found it hard to say publicly that he liked the Leader of the Opposition. I think the quote was "I can't say that publicly" or something to that effect.

Well, even if it drives you to distraction I am going to tell you right in the House now I think you are just fine. I am really quite fond of you. I know it scars your political honour and I know it causes a great deterioration in the credit with which you are held by your colleagues, but I think you are a nice person and I am not going to conduct a battle with you in personal terms—under no circumstance. Nor do I think we will be obsessed with power and considerations of power as we watch the session emerge over the next few weeks and perhaps the next few months because the New Democratic Party has always been cautious about the exercise of power understanding that it usually comes at the end of a pretty long road for us.

On the other hand, were we to form a government at some point after an election we would today cope just as we indicated at the outset of the election campaign we would attempt to cope. As you look at some of my colleagues in the New Democratic opposition benches I think you see and will increasingly see that we have the capacity to fill a cabinet as well.

It may just be, therefore, after we've dealt with the issues of this session and perhaps a Throne Speech and a budget and we're out on the hustings again, that this election, quaintly enough, will be fought on matters of political philosophy, on matters of political programme, on matters of political issues. I want you to know in advance that nothing would please the New Democratic Party more than that kind of election campaign when it occurs. Frankly, Mr. Speaker, whenever that happens, we look forward to it.

Mr. Nixon moved adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. Speaker: Orders of the day.

Clerk of the House: The 13th order; House in committee of supply.

ESTIMATES, MINISTRY OF EDUCATION

(continued)

On vote 2801:

Mr. Foulds: Mr. Chairman, I believe we're on item 11 of vote 2801 and I believe one or two of my colleagues wish to make contributions on that item, the Languages of Instruction Commission.

Mrs. Gigantes: Mr. Chairman, I'd like to ask the minister to explain, if he could, his understanding of the situation in London where the board has apparently done away with the French language advisory committee. I am also informed by people who seem to know the situation that the submissions made by the French language advisory committee to you to investigate that situation have not been answered; and that Alexandra elementary school is going to be turned by the board from a French language into a bilingual school for English students.

Hon. Mr. Wells: First of all, there was no legal obligation for there to be a French language advisory committee in London because they don't operate classes at the secondary school level. They can, if they wish, establish a French language advisory committee as an option, which I understand was done in London. However, they don't have to have one. I'm emphasizing that the legislation only says you have to have one if you have programmes in the secondary school panel.

They did have one and then I think the board, for various reasons, decided to disband that committee. I'm not saying I agree with their decisions to disband it, but they did disband the committee. We had some correspondence, I can recall, about that action and we really felt there was nothing we could add to what the board had done. We felt the board could, if it wished, do away with the committee. They have not submitted that particular dispute to the Languages of Instruction Commission at the present time, as I understand it.

Mrs. Gigantes: Who has to make the submission to the Languages of Instruction Commission?

Hon. Mr. Wells: The submission to the Languages of Instruction Commission can be made by the French language advisory committee, or by a group of parents or a group of ratepayers concerned in a matter between themselves and the board. In other words, there does not have to be the existence of a French language advisory committee in order to have access to the good offices of the Languages of Instruction Commission. In the case of elementary school disputes—and as the hon. member knows, there are many elementary French language schools in the province run by boards where there are no French language advisory committees—if there is a disupte in these particular areas the citizens concerned, in most case the parents of the students at the French language school, or the French language parents, will submit the dispute to the Languages Instruction Commission.

Mrs. Gigantes: I understand that it was the Languages of Instruction Commission which advised the setting up of the French language advisory committee in London. I am wondering what the minister's position will be if that commission, appealed to by the committee or parents now not in a committee, because the committee has been disbanded, is faced by the committee with the need to reassert the existence of the French language advisory committee in London? Will the minister back up the commission?

Hon. Mr. Wells: Will I back up the Languages of Instruction Commission?

Mrs. Gigantes: Will you back up the commission? The commission last year called for the establishment of the advisory committee in London; that advisory committee has been disbanded by the board; the minister is saying that the parents who were on the committee should now appeal to the commission again. Presumably the commission would still feel that there should be a French language advisory committee in London. Would you back up the commission if it decided once again there should be such a committee?

Hon. Mr. Wells: It is very difficult to speculate on exactly what I would do if the commission made certain determinations in the future. I can just tell you that, based on what I have seen and heard and recall from the London situation, I would probably back up the commission, yes.

Mr. Foulds: Did the original commission report, from which you set up the Languages of Instruction Commission, not recommend that the committee at the elementary level be set up in a compulsory manner, rather than the optional manner in which you have set them up in your legislation?

Hon. Mr. Wells: It was not recommended by the Symons report that these committees be set up for the elementary panels. I think the rationale for that was that most of those schools are operated by school boards which had a preponderance of French language trustees already sitting as full trustees. At the particular time when we were drafting the legislation we were discussing the matter with the separate school boards of the province, who, by and large, have under their aegis most of the French language elementary schools, and they felt there wasn't need for French language advisory committees for their particular boards.

Mr. Foulds: Obviously this case that my colleague from Carleton East has brought up points out a weakness in the way that we are dealing with French language instruction at an elementary level. How do you deal effectively with the situation in Ontario where you have—as in London, and I believe it's in Halton county, is it not?—a substantial number of French-speaking elementary pupils who do not have access to French language instruction? How do you deal with that? I think it is Halton or Burlington—somewhere

in that area—where there has been a large influx of workers from Quebec, with students at the elementary level who have had a terrible difficulty with their board in getting instruction in French.

[4:15 p.m.]

Hon. Mr. Wells: As I recall from memory, the Halton situation involved the Halton Roman Catholic Separate School Board and a large group of francophone parents who were attempting to get instruction for their children in a particular area or school. There has been quite a dispute over the past few years as to whether there should be a separate school built or whether classes should be carried on in two or three different locations in Halton, rather than one central location.

About a year and a half ago, I think, we worked with them and developed a programme that was acceptable in Halton. It wasn't easy. I think the Languages of Instruction Commission worked on that, and people from our Council on French Language Schools. The solution appeared to be there and was moving down the road to being implemented but, as you are probably aware, most recently a group of English-language parents have not been agreeable to the kind of changes that had to be made in order to accommodate the solution to the French-language problem. That is now being worked out.

Mr. Lewis: They have also got the Renaissance movement, God help them.

Hon. Mr. Wells: The London situation I think is different, though. The London situation is a combination of many factors, I suppose. Far be it for me to explain the London situation to you when the immediate past chairman of the London Board of Education is sitting in this Legislature and probably could explain it to us all in a much better fashion than any of us. I am referring, of course, to the education critic of the Liberal Party, who I am sure could give us at least the London Board of Education's version of this particular situation.

I simply believe that there are a number of factors all tied together in the problem in London and it has been a difficult one to try to sort out in any way to make all sides happy. I think that as much as anything else, there have been conflicts of personality that have made it a very difficult thing to be able to sort out. But the Languages of Instruction Commission has been trying to do this and will continue to try to do this.

Mr. Foulds: Let me take this a step further and shift the discussion slightly but still on the same topic.

I have had some correspondence from across the province from parents who would like their particular board to take stronger initiatives in terms of instruction in French at the elementary level. Is it the job of this commission to expedite that? Is it under another vote?

What I want to put to you pretty strongly is that I think Ontario is not moving adequately and fully enough towards a bilingual policy and towards adequate teaching of French to us unilinguals; and this might be the only opportunity we get in these estimates to debate that, because it may be the only opportunity we get to debate it where it's important, at the elementary level.

Hon. Mr. Wells: The role of this commission applies only where we are talking about French-to-French or English-to-English for the minority group. It does not concern itself with those matters where parents are attempting to have immersion programmes or programmes of instruction in French for anglophones. It doesn't enter into that particular situation. That would come under the regular curriculum discussion; that's part of the regular curriculum in the schools. As you will recall, this is a commission that was set up to guarantee and protect the rights of minority groups to have instruction in their own language; that is, of the official languages.

Mr. Chairman: Shall item 11 carry? Carried.

Item 12?

Mr. Foulds: I want to start with this item and I'll get back to it after a few of my colleagues have undoubtedly piled in.

Mr. Minister, you gave us a commitment in the last debate on this item in the estimates in 1974 to bring the superannuation commission members before a committee of the Legislature in order to sort out some of the allegations, if you like, which have been levelled against the commission in terms of the inequities created by the present superannuation fund. I wonder if we could have that commitment carried out this session?

Hon. Mr. Wells: Absolutely, Mr. Chairman. I fully intended that the commitment be carried out and I guess the only reason we didn't get down to carrying it out in the latter half of the session, in the spring and early summer, was our lengthy discussion of Bill 100 which occupied all our time. It didn't give

us a chance even to get a committee we could take this matter to.

The commission and Mr. Causley are ready. I think what we need is an opportunity to spend some time down there with them discussing the various impressions, things that are said about the commission, the way they operate, the feelings held by people about the commission and perhaps what are the facts as to how the commission operates. There is a degree of misunderstanding.

Mr. Foulds: When you say you intend to carry out that commitment before the end of the session, does that mean before we wrap up in December or are you thinking of going into the spring?

Hon. Mr. Wells: I'd be prepared to do it before the end of December but I understand we don't have any of the regular committees organized. We have one or two committees and I'm not sure that would serve the purpose we wish. I would say if we could do it before the end of December I would be agreeable. If not, I guess we should do it as soon as we organize in the spring—all of us being here—and we get the regular committees. It could be one of the first jobs of the social development committee to have meetings with the commission.

Mr. Foulds: My own feeling is that the sooner we can get that, the sooner we can clear away some of the clouds, misconceptions and what have you. Certainly that's going to be our thrust in that committee when we meet.

I can very easily be confused, as I'm sure most people can, by actuarial figures and there are certain principles I think we need to debate and we need to come to a firm understanding of before we can discuss the item intelligently. I would urge that the sooner we can get that the better. If it is possible even to organize the social development committee for this short session, say for the second week in December if we should sit so long, that should be aimed for.

Hon. Mr. Wells: I'll speak to the House leader about that.

Mr. Warner: Mr. Minister, I'm interested to know whether the scope of that committee would include items such as an escalating clause for those members who have already been superannuated. There seems to be a great deal of discrepancy in that area. Would it include also public knowledge for those who pay into the fund as to where their money is being invested and the return they are getting for that investment? Would it also include information as to when the commission should be required to put money into the fund, as stop and start dates for those deposits?

Hon. Mr. Wells: Yes, I think that's the kind of thing we could get into in detail.

I'm a little confused about your comments about escalation for those already on superannuation. I think this bill was passed by this House before our summer recess. It does guarantee escalation for those already on superannuation at the time the bill was passed and it builds into the plan an escalation feature for those who will go on superannuation from this time henceforth. It's all laid out in there. There has been an increase in contributions from teachers and the government to cover that programme. If that isn't clear to everyone out there who is contributing to the fund, then I do think we have a communications problem and we should communicate better because that has been done.

Mr. Warner: I stand corrected on the information, but you are correct in assuming there is a communication problem.

Hon. Mr. Wells: Yes, and I think it would be helpful to discuss the investment programme and the way that it has been handled. As you know, the only investment of the fund is in government bonds. The government buys the bonds back. As I understand it, the new batch that will be bought will bear an interest rate of just a little over 10 per cent.

Again I think there is a communications problem because there are a lot of teachers out in the province who think the government buys the bonds and pays three or four per cent or five per cent interest. In fact this batch of bonds will be bought at a little over 10 per cent interest.

Mr. Warner: But the conception out there, so to speak, is that after the bonds have been purchased the interest accrued from those bonds is what the government's share of the superannuation is. Whereas the teacher is paying his percentage from his salary, the government is in fact using the interest from the investment, not ever having really to put in its own money, so to speak, so that the government can operate a superannuation commission without it really costing them any money whatsoever. That kind of feeling from out there has been with every teacher group I've ever spoken to.

Hon. Mr. Wells: I think that my friend can see, if he looks down those figures in this particular section of the vote, that we are in fact putting in our money, if you will. There are about $70 million going in there; at the bottom of that section entitled teachers' superannuation fund under the Act — $70,771,000. That's the matching contributions. There is a further item for interest that goes into the fund, and that money goes in and the government buys the bonds back out.

The government puts in the money, the teachers' money goes in, and then the interest that is paid goes into the fund and so forth. It all builds up. The government doesn't reduce the share that it puts in by the amount of interest that it has to pay on its bonds. In other words, it is all there and it is in the fund. I'm told that even taking all that money and all the interest and everything that's there and taking the kind of plan that we have—the pay-outs—if everybody was to get his total entitlement out of the fund we would still be short; and therefore we have to build up the unfunded deficit each year in order to keep the fund sound, even though we all know that everyone isn't going to take all the money out at one time and therefore there never will be that kind of a draw on the fund.

Mr. Reed: Is it safe to say then that the borrowing by the government from the superannuation commission is done on an open market basis? Are the interest rates offered competitive with the open market?

Hon. Mr. Wells: The interest rate is arrived at and it is in the legislation. We don't have any option. We can't change that unless this Legislature changed the legislation. It's the open rate that is paid by the government in the preceding year; not the current year but the preceding year. In other words, we are now operating on the interest rate the government paid in the open market last year. That works both ways. When the interest rates are going up, it seems that you're just trailing a little behind. When they start to go down, you get the benefit the other way.

Mr. Moffatt: There are two questions I would like to pursue with regard to the teachers' superannuation fund. I think the first point is one which should be considered very carefully. In the light of the kinds of settlements which teachers have managed to achieve with their school boards over the last 10 to 15 years, and in light of the inflationary trends in the economy, the fact that the superannuation fund still uses a best-of-seven years as a base rate upon which to calculate pensions, it seems to me it works a pretty severe hardship upon the teachers. The kind of salary increases which have taken place mean that over a seven-year period, a best-of-seven calculation will tend to be significantly lower, so that the pension determined by that calculation will also be significantly lower.

I wonder what sort of time period the minister can give me with regard to the implementation of a best-of-five years calculation? It appears to me, from talking to teacher groups, that there have been a number of suggestions, and apparently within the ministry itself there has been at least some hint that we will go to a best-of-five years. Now, maybe that hint has been rather veiled or maybe it has been misread, but I think it would be beneficial if the minister could give me any kind of indication about that kind of change.

Hon. Mr. Wells: In December, 1974, the government set up a committee which included Mr. Causley, Mr. McIntyre from the Treasury division of TEIGA, and two people from the Ministry of Education, Mr. Kinlin, the Assistant Deputy Minister, and Mr. Glen Bonham. We set this group up with a group from the Ontario Teachers' Federation, which was made up of Miss Ward, Mr. Wilkinson, Mr. Gauthier, and Mr. Bill Jones—and some others who were added. I asked that group to look at all the areas in the fund where they thought we should be looking at changes, with the exception of the escalation matter because we had another committee working on that. That committee worked and brought forward its report, which was accepted and the bill was put in—and we all know about that. It resulted in a one per cent increase in contributions.

The other group worked over the spring and looked at all these other matters and identified them. The best five years, rather than the best seven years, was one of those matters—along with a whole host of other matters. Part of the work of that committee was to identify the cost of implementing these various changes. Again we get to this communications lag, but the feeling was that there was adequate money in that fund to change these kinds of things without an increase in teacher contributions.

As I've said, in looking at the fund the actuaries found it's certainly providing the benefits that it should under the present levels of contributions, or perhaps the money is even buying a better plan than it would

under a private plan, given the same levels of contributions. Anyway, all this suggested to us that if other changes were to be looked at, like the best five rather than seven years—and a whole host of other changes that were discussed—then we would also have to look at increased contributions. These figures were all worked out and we tried to work out priorities, and so forth.

The committee is still sitting and discussing these various matters, so I can't tell you when there will be any determination of these matters. However, from our point of view, we certainly feel that any changes in benefit levels—and certainly best five instead of best seven years is a change in benefit levels—would have to bring concurrent changes in contributions by both parties.

That's part of the ongoing work the committee is doing at the present time, to verify figures and see just what the increased contributions might be. For instance, in the past it has been a 50-50 split, so much by the contributors so much by the provincial government. That's really where it stands. As a result of that committee's work we did make 21 changes in the plan which were in a bill passed here just before we adjourned in the summer.

Mr. Moffat: It seems to me, Mr. Chairman, that the committee to which you referred, should be able to give us some guidance as to a kind of time limit when at least they will report so that teachers will have a basis upon which to calculate pension contributions and so on.

I agree with your statement that any kind of increase or change in going to the best five years rather than the best seven years is bound to mean a change in contribution. I think what we should do fairly quickly is be able to come to some kind of understanding so that at least people in that profession will have an idea as to where they are going.

I wonder, too, if the committee to which you referred is studying the question of changing the 90 factor to an 85 factor, which I believe has been put forward by the teachers' federations. I would also like to say that in many instances when teachers were working in 1967 I think the average teacher's salary was in the neighbourhood of $6,500. The average teacher's salary from most boards now is somewhere in the neighbourhood of $10,-500 or $11,000. It seems to me that calculating those lower-paid years in the beginning tends to make the pension available to a teacher significantly lower.

I would urge you to make that kind of input to the committee and to suggest to them that your ministry supports that kind of change. I wonder if you could tell me if the 90 factor is going to be changed to the 85 factor?

Hon. Mr. Wells: That's one of the matters which that committee is looking at, as I say, along with other things. I can't tell you what our opinion would be of that. That is all part of the work of the committee and what we are going to have to look at when we see the cost figures associated with it.

The committee, I think, is hoping to make some kind of report to us early in the new year. At that time we will have to review them and decide just what can be done.

I draw to your attention, to show you the kind of situation we get into in this matter, the amounts of money which have to be voted here in these estimates. An increase in benefits resulting from even a 50-50 spread in the contribution is going to increase the amount of money that is going to be needed in the Ministry of Education estimates. We are going to be under a constraint, as the Treasurer (Mr. McKeough) announced in his statement the other day, in the development of our estimates for next year.

We are going to weigh priorities as to what money we have to spend. In other words, if we take a large chunk of money and put it into the teachers' superannuation fund to match contributions to get increased benefits in the plan we may not be able to put money into some other area of the Ministry of Education estimates, like general legislative grants or special education sections and so forth. We have to have that priority-setting process go on as we develop our estimates.

Mr. Moffatt: With respect, the people we are talking about now are people who for the great percentage of their teaching years worked at extremely low salaries and carried the Ministry of Education and various people who have since become Premier on their backs in order to create an educational system in this province. Those are the people who today are being asked or told to retire on pensions which are not in keeping with pensions in other fields because of a number of factors, including the reluctance of the government to move in reducing that retirement factor which would free the classrooms for younger people to take those places.

The whole business of keeping teachers in the classroom until they build up that 90 factor causes hardship in a great many cases. I would suggest that one of the things that has happened in Ontario is that the people who have put together the educational sys-

tem—I don't happen to be one of those people who tears it apart all of the time and thinks it is evil and misrepresenting and so on—are the ones retiring. At this point in their lives they are worthy of more consideration than they seem to be getting from the ministry.

Hon. Mr. Wells: I want to say certainly we have all been attempting to develop a pension programme for teachers which is equitable and fair. I think that if my friend compares it with a lot of pension plans that are available in the private sector, he will find there a lot in the private sector who would like to have something that is as good as the teachers' superannuation fund and pension, with the kind of guaranteed stability that's in it plus the fact that we now have built in this escalation feature, which again is not available in a lot of private plans at this particular time.

Granted, it's being paid for in contributions; but still, for the very people you are talking about—those in the last few years of teaching—I think it is an awfully good addition and enrichment to the pension plan; and it guarantees that once they do go on pension, that pension is going to continue to increase if inflation continues to increase. We hope it won't and that therefore the escalation wouldn't be necessary; but if it does, they are not going to be caught. That's an enrichment that I think is going to help them.

I guess what I am really saying is that that was the priority this year when we came to looking at various changes that could have been made in the plan. The priority was that the escalation feature should go first and then we will have to look at some of the other priorities and see how we are for funds.

Mr. Moffatt: The part that does bother me a bit is the fact that, as you indicated, the Treasurer has priorities for the Province of Ontario; but as the leader of this party indicated this afternoon, whatever priorities are established in economic terms in this province, it seems to be services to people which will indeed suffer.

I suggest to you, sir, that what has happened is that those teachers presently retiring had significantly lower salaries for most of their teaching careers than those in the industrial sector of our economy; indeed, they had lower salaries than almost any other group in our economy. It seems to me only fair that since at that point they accepted a lower salary for 10, 15 or 20 years of their teaching career, maybe we could look after them in a perhaps fairer fashion in this day and age.

Mr. Chairman: The hon. member for London South.

Mr. Ferris: Mr. Chairman, the minister answered my question in his remarks to the last gentleman.

Mrs. Gigantes: Perhaps the minister could explain why it is, if the superannuation investment in government bonds is such a good deal for the teachers that the Ontario Energy Board in its report in 1974 warned Hydro that it might not be able to look for future financing from that superannuation fund.

Hon. Mr. Wells: Hydro has never borrowed from the teachers' superannuation fund. It has been straight government of Ontario bonds that the government itself has bought for the teachers' superannuation fund not—

Mrs. Gigantes: Yes, it's an indirect link.

Hon. Mr. Wells: I am not sure I know exactly what you mean.

Mrs. Gigantes: It was suggested in the energy board report that if the superannuation fund were invested in other than government bonds that Hydro's financial position in the future might be in doubt; given a warning on that score, because apparently the energy board thought there was good reason for the teachers to question the investment of the superannuation fund in Ontario government bonds.

Hon. Mr. Wells: I guess what you mean is that if the government didn't borrow its money from the fund, it would have to borrow somewhere else; and that borrowing somewhere else would mean that Hydro couldn't borrow that money at that time and therefore Hydro would then find itself in difficulty to get money for itself.

I suppose that could be a possibility, but I just want to emphasize to you that while I read a lot about borrowing from the teachers' superannuation fund, again I think this indicates a communications gap. In my official meetings with the Ontario Teachers' Federation, it has not been put forward to me that there should be a different arrangement. As a matter of fact, they have never asked—certainly not while I have been minister, for instance—that they be allowed to take over the pension plan. I hear that in the field from time to time, I read it in the Globe and Mail and I hear of certain people

making speeches about it. But the official position put forward by the Ontario Teachers' Federation has never been that the teachers would like to completely take over the plan and run it themselves, because they realize that there are great advantages in having the plan run by the government and having the stability that results therefrom. They really have never suggested that they should take it over.

[4:45 p.m.]

I think the same could be said for the fund being used to purchase bonds in other areas or make other kinds of investments. I think that some times—particularly in this kind of economic era that we're living in, where they see all kinds of high interest rates and all kinds of very attractive investment situations—people picture being able to take this fund and invest it in some way that's going to earn much greater interest. But I think that if they study some of the large pension funds in the United States and so forth, which perhaps do have a much wider portfolio to draw from, the overall returns are not any greater than this fund. In fact, sometimes they're a lot worse. The return of some of the pension mutual funds in the States last year was not all that great.

Mr. Foulds: I have one comment and, I I think, two questions. We shouldn't let the item go by without clearly indicating that the escalation clause does have an upper limit. It is eight per cent. What the minister has said earlier didn't clearly outline that and I think we should clearly state that.

Hon. Mr. Wells: The federal government copied our plan.

Mr. Foulds: The question that arises out of that is: You made that level, I believe, last July, when the amendments were brought forward; did you have a preview of the Thanksgiving message, or was that just something you pulled out of the hat with sheer blind luck?

Hon. Mr. Wells: No, it is just the good management of this government. Don't forget also that while it does have a cap of eight per cent there is a carryover feature. If inflation runs at a higher rate you can carry over the percentage that is higher than the eight. So it is a little better.

Mr. B. Newman: For how many years?

Mr. Foulds: Yes, for how many years does the runover come? Is it for the next year?

Hon. Mr. Wells: It is unlimited, except that you can never get any more than eight per cent in a year.

Mr. B. Newman: But is there a carryover all the time? Supposing it goes up eight per cent one year, 10 per cent the next year and so forth, does that percentage carry over so that eventually it equalizes itself?

Hon. Mr. Wells: Yes, it does.

Mr. Foulds: Mr. Chairman, I had a question on the statutory items down below, and I don't quite know how we raise that, but they're moneys that we spend under these estimates.

Mr. Chairman: The statutory items are not subject to the vote, but if the minister wishes to accept a question on any of the items the Chair will be pleased to accept it.

Mr. Foulds: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. It's a question over the student aid loans write-off. Is that because it's been entirely moved to Colleges and Universities? In 1973-1974 you were budgeting for it.

Hon. Mr. Wells: Yes. As I understand it, Mr. Chairman, these appear in here, and that is back in the 1973-1974 year, this is an accounting technique. We had to write off those loans from the days, as you pointed out, when we were making those loans which are now made by the Ministry of Colleges and Universities. They were accumulated old student loans that were not repaid, and this was to write them off in that year.

Vote 2801 agreed to.

On vote 2802:

Mr. Chairman: Item 1, programme administration. Shall that item carry? Carried. Item 2, curriculum development.

Mr. Sweeney: I note from the estimates of the minister that for curriculum development almost $12 million is to be allocated, which would indicate that this is an important part of the ministry's operation. I think we should recognize that the Education Act of this province very clearly allocates to the provincial ministry the responsibility for curriculum development and curriculum guidelines in the Province of Ontario.

I think we should also appreciate that over the last number of years the approach of the ministry to curriculum development in this province has been a loosening-up kind of approach and a more humane kind of approach. We applaud that, and I believe the ministry probably feels some pride about it.

Any remarks that I should make are not intended to be construed as a desire in the area of curriculum to go back to some of the deficiencies of the past. We do not want to go back to the area of rigid, box-like structures whereby every student was asked to do the same thing at the same time in the same way. We applaud the more humane approach where we try to take the understanding of the individual student needs and attempt to meet those needs.

I do, however, in my remarks to the minister, want to point out that there are many in this province—and I am one of them—who believe that in some ways we have gone too far in the swing of the pendulum; that we have in some senses loosened up the curriculum of this province, at the provincial level particularly, much too much and that we are finding that we are paying a price that may be too high.

At the present time in this province we are under a series of guidelines, a series of documents from the Ministry of Education, which indicate exactly what the curriculum should be. Perhaps just for a minute we can go back and discover how we got here. In 1937 the Ministry of Education issued a little guideline rather affectionately called the "little gray book". That guideline set out for the Province of Ontario what was expected to be taught in the classrooms. That guideline was in fact the official curriculum guide for the primary and junior division of this province, up to and including 1966, almost 30 years.

At that time we started getting a series of interim guides for the primary and junior division. These interim guides were not compulsory. It wasn't until 1971 that a consolidation of these guides was brought out and became compulsory as the curriculum format, if you will, of the Province of Ontario.

One of the significant changes that occurred when these P1 and J1 documents were brought out was an indication that what the student wanted, what was considered "fun in education", was the right way to go. I think it was not too long before many people in this province recognized that that particular approach to education, that particular understanding of human psychology, had some rather serious faults in it. We have known always, and we particularly know now after our exposure to this approach, that education and learning cannot always be fun. It certainly can be and should be enjoyable wherever possible, but in many cases it has to be hard and difficult.

An example in point is what we sometimes call rote or drill learning. It is not fun to learn mathematics tables and it is not always fun to learn how to spell, but these things must be learned. They are the basic tools of communication in our society. At the present time, within our curriculum guides those are not stressed as compulsory areas of study.

As a matter of fact, there are statements in curriculum guides which would lead us to believe they are not even considered to be priorities, at least in some ways. If I may quote from a rather famous curriculum guide in the Province of Ontario, the 1969 edition of English for the intermediate division. I would point out that this edition is still the official English guide for the Province of Ontario for the grade years 7 through 10; for the age level 12 through 16. In many areas of this province this document is not looked upon with any great favour. I would draw to your attention comments such as this,

> There is no significant correlation between the teaching of formal grammar and the improvement of one's use of English. There is no significant correlation between the teaching of formal English grammar and the successful acquisition of a foreign language.

There are other statements along that line. I do not believe it was the intent of the author of this document, nor was it the intent of the ministry, to downplay the need for such things as formal study of grammar, punctuation, spelling, etc. But it is comments like that which have created that very kind of position in this province.

We do not have in our schools today a serious study of the basic language skills—not in all of our schools but in too many of our schools. We are finding from parents, students themselves, teachers, employers, university professors—I mention only some—a grave concern about the ability of our students to be successful in what we know as the basics of education in this province.

I believe what has happened is that we have, intentionally or otherwise put out the perception that what we know as the basic skills of education in this province, the basic computational skills, the basic language skills, are not important and that our students can get by without them. If there is one thing I think all of us heard loud and clear in this province during the last election campaign it is that the majority of people among the groups I named earlier do not believe that this job is being done well and they are asking why.

It is here that I feel the Ministry of Education, which should be providing the guidance, the direction and the leadership in this province, is not meeting that need. The P1 and J1 curriculum documents which we have had in this province for the last six or seven years—the most recent one the minister has alluded to, "The Formative Years"—do not give that kind of direction.

There is not included, either in the former document or in this document, a clear statement of what we expect our students to learn in the basic educational subjects, if you will, reading, writing and arithmetic. There are some allusions as to what they should be looking at but there is not a clear statement as to what they should be learning. There is not a clear statement as to what we should rightfully expect from the average student in this province, and I use that word deliberately.

I am not referring to the 15 or 10 per cent of our students who have serious learning problems. I am not referring to the other 10 or 15 per cent of our students at the other end who can be expected to learn much more. I am referring to the great bulk of our students, the 70 to 80 per cent who are considered average learners.

There is not a statement of the level of expectation in this province in any of the guides which this ministry puts out which says what those students should be learning. Equally, there is not a statement which advises school boards and teachers as to how they should monitor the evaluation of those skills to see that they are being done. There is simply a statement saying is should be done.

[5:00]

May I go back to a remark I made earlier. I do not believe that it is necessarily the intention of the minister or his ministry to put out this kind of perception. But the fact remains it is there. The fact remains that the kinds of things that have been printed by this ministry, the kinds of statements that have been made by this ministry, have led many to believe that basic education is no longer necessary and no longer important. We are reaping the results of those kinds of statements.

The Ministry of Education has made very clear that as a secondary school level, four of the 27 credits necessary for secondary school graduation must be English. It is generally perceived by the public—and I'm using the larger public here—that these would include basic language skills, skills such as sentence structure, spelling, punctuation, grammar and so forth. Yet it is entirely possible—it is not only possible but it is a fact—that in many of our secondary schools students can choose four courses in English that contain none of these skills. They can choose four courses in English that are predominantly and perhaps totally in the area of English literature, where they would never have to cope with the language skills that they are going to need to be able to communicate effectively.

I would suggest that that is a rather serious defect, and perhaps an unintentional deceit among the people of this province as to really what is being done with respect to English in the secondary schools.

The same thing is true of the two compulsory subjects in Canadian studies in this province at the secondary school level. Once again it is the perception of parents, it is the perception of the public, that when we talk of Canadian studies, we are talking of such things as Canadian history and Canadian geography. Yet in many schools of this province students can take studies in the areas defined as Canadian studies, that have nothing to do with Canadian history, nothing to do with Canadian geography. I would suggest that it is a mini-scandal that students can, in this province, go through our secondary schools without ever once studying anything about the history or the geography of their country.

The point I am trying to make is that we have some very fine ideals about education and about curriculum in this province. However, too many of those ideals are not in fact being met. The ministry has not provided the leadership and the direction and the guidance which is needed.

I applaud the fact that individual differences are being considered. I applaud the fact that we have taken a more humane approach to education. But surely if there is one area in this province where we need more direction, more guidance, a firmer stance from the Ministry of Education, it certainly is in the area of basic education—the three "Rs," if you will—in the area of the understanding of the history and the geography of our country. We do not have that at the present time.

I would also draw one last point to the minister's attention. This is one that has been mentioned several times, and I believe it falls in the area of curriculum. That is the place of grade 13 in our secondary schools.

At the present time it is possible for students from outside the Province of Ontario

with 12 years of education to come into this province to enrol in our universities. We did a random spot check of this. York University accepts these students; the University of Toronto accepts these students; the University of Waterloo accepts these students. As a matter of fact, it is estimated that right at the moment approximately 100 students presently in the University of Waterloo are from outside this province, and that their basic education was at the grade 12 level. Sixty-seven of those students, I believe, are from the Province of Alberta.

I think we have to take a good hard look at why it is necessary in the Province of Ontario for a student to take 13 years to gain university entrance—we are talking about average students now, we are not talking about advanced students who do it in less—whereas in other provinces in Canada it is possible to accomplish the same aim to enroll in Ontario universities after only 12 years.

The pendulum in education in this province has swung—and I repeat myself I think unintentionally—too far. We can have a fine system of education but it must be reviewed and we must take a stronger stance in the area of curriculum guidelines.

Hon. Mr. Wells: I just want to say that I don't disagree with everything that my friend has said. I think that perhaps he has made the same mistake that a lot of people have made. They have seen the pendulum swinging away over too far, as he said, but they haven't perceived what has actually happened in the last couple of years.

I would like to ask him first and foremost, if it may be only in the form of a rhetorical question, are the students in the Waterloo Roman Catholic separate school board getting a good education in the basics?

Mr. Sweeney: Mr. Chairman, may I speak to that?

The point that I am trying to make is that the leadership and the guidance coming from the ministry are not indicating to the school boards and the teachers of this province as to what is expected of them. I believe that there are many school boards and there are many teachers who are doing what they believe to be right. Whether in fact they are right, I don't know. When I was a director of education I did what I believed to be right with my teachers and my school system. I do not know how they stack up against any other school system in this province.

You will notice that I confined my remarks to basic education. I wasn't talking about all those other subjects where I think there should be a tremendous diversity of learning opportunity. If there is one thing where I think there should be a common standard and a common norm, it is in basics. As a matter of fact, Mr. Minister, in your remarks of last week, in the documents that your ministry has provided, you refer time and time again to provincial norms and provincial standards. What I am saying to you is that they do not exist. They do not exist as far as the teachers of this province are concerned. They do not exist as far as the parents of this province are concerned and they do not exist in the minds of many of the students who have gone through our system.

It is in that area, I do believe, that in some cases teachers themselves feel that they go against the ministry's guidelines when they teach sound basic education. Some teachers feel a small twinge, if you will, of civil disobedience. I do not believe that that is the intent, but nevertheless that is what is out there, and it is what is out there that we must address ourselves. It is for that reason and that reason only that I make these comments.

Hon. Mr. Wells: First of all, it is ridiculous to say that people who feel they are teaching basics are going against the guidelines of this ministry, because certainly in the last three years that has never been the situation. But I still didn't get an answer to my question as to whether the young people in the Waterloo Roman Catholic separate school board in the last three years have been getting a good basic education. Are they or aren't they? That's what I want to know.

Mr. Sweeney: I don't believe they have ever got anything else but that.

Hon. Mr. Wells: That is what I thought. That answers my question.

Mr. B. Newman: It is the director who takes care of that.

Mr. Foulds: Are you sure that that direction came from your ministry?

Mr. Sweeney: As a matter of fact, if you refer to what has happened for the last three or four years, may I remind you of what has happened in your ministry as far as curriculum guidelines have been concerned in the last three or four years? It was, I believe, in 1973 that your ministry recognized some of the defects which you yourself speak to in the introduction to this document. We were advised that by the spring of 1974 this would be available. It wasn't. We were asked by your regional office officials to set up meetings in the fall of 1974, because this was going to be available. It wasn't.

Another province-wide curriculum conference was held in February, 1975, I believe. It was going to be immediately available. It wasn't. It was finally delivered to schools—this and this only; none of the backup material that the minister referred to—in June of this year, I believe. I personally know of five school boards that have not sent this out to their teachers because they do not believe that it contains the answers that the ministry's curriculum conferences, the ministry's officials and the minister himself said it was going to contain.

I also understand—this by hearsay—that this document sat on the minister's desk for at least two months because he himself was concerned that it did not clearly and specifically enough outline the kinds of things that I have referred to. I cannot attest to that; it's simply a statement I've heard.

I do not believe that in the last two or three years the minister can allude to direction or guidance from his ministry in the area of curriculum; it has just not been there. What is happening out in the schools is happening in spite of what the ministry has done, and not because of what it has done. I am not saying that's intentional; I'm simply saying that's way it is.

Hon. Mr. Wells: I would have to disagree with the hon. member, because I think he shows a very shallow appreciation of the idea of shared curriculum responsibility. He would be the first to stand up in this House if this ministry was suddenly to say, "This is the way you will do it in Waterloo county." This is the way you will do it in Toronto" and "You will do no other; you'll teach exactly what we say in this book." That's the kind of bad thing that we don't want to go back to. We've got professionals all over this province who can assume a shared curriculum responsibility. What we need are the firm guidelines.

I'm not going to talk about what went on five and six years ago. I'm going to talk about what has gone on since I've been minister in this ministry. We have been and are providing what I think are clear guidelines.

The hon. member indicated some concern about the holdup in this document being delivered. The holdup in this document being produced was to be sure that it was simple, concise and clear. I believe it is that. I believe that the educators who have worked on it and the educators I've talked to feel it is that kind of document and does stress the basics. But the hon. member has stood up in this House and tried to tell me that it doesn't even do that; that it doesn't satisfy his need for a document that stresses the basics.

I don't know what in heaven's name he thinks would be the kind of document that he's looking for.

We have shared curriculum responsibility; we have a group of highly trained professionals; we've got a wide variety of students out there, all of whose aims, objectives and potentials have to be taken into account. Given these facts and the fact that I don't think there is anyone in this province who doesn't believe that children must have the basic skills—no one disagrees with that—what we've got to do is get together and show people it is being done.

One of the most hypocritical things of the last campaign, as I've said, was the kind of simplistic statements that were made by members of the Liberal Party about going back to the three Rs. Heavens, no one knows what they were talking about.

I've talked in terms of teaching the basics over the last few years and in presenting this document to teachers, and I guess the one complaint that comes back to me from teachers is, "What do you think we've been doing in the schools? We've been teaching the basics. Perhaps the thing that is regrettable is that there has been a communications gap and people don't know that we are doing it. They don't believe the basics are still being taught in the schools because kids don't sit in straight rows with their hands behind their backs and not make a noise any more. They sit in little groupings and there is a lot of activity going on; there are kids learning at different levels and they are reading different books in the same classroom." Then somebody says, "That's not good enough. There is no discipline in this class and the basics aren't being taught." That's a lot of nonsense, as far as I'm concerned.

I just want the hon. member to know that as far as we are concerned, we've been making a concerted effort to remedy the defects in the curriculum guidelines that this ministry puts out, to try to put out clear, concise guidelines that would set general objectives, general patterns and yet allow for the cooperative curriculum development approach so that teachers, principals and local boards could take the broad guidelines, put the flesh on them and make them into specific guidelines to apply to their particular situation. I think in this kind of approach we can take into account the diversity of interests and learning abilities of the vast majority of young people who are in our schools.

[5:15]

I don't want to say, and I'm not going to say, that everything is perfect. We're trying to develop, we're trying to refine, we're trying to improve a system. We're not trying to go back to something we used to have. I think we all have to look forward to making the system that we've got a better system. That's the kind of challenge we're trying to meet.

As I say, I don't think and I don't want anyone to feel that the Ministry of Education is abdicating its responsibility. Its responsibility is to set the broad objectives and guidelines—not in an authoritarian manner, but to set those objectives and then work with the people in the school system so that they can develop the programme. That's the kind of approach that I've felt was needed and the kind that we're following in this ministry.

Let me just comment on one other thing that you mentioned—grade 13. It is not the policy of this ministry or this government to phase out grade 13 in this province. Grade 13 is, I guess, an extra year, if you will, in this province. Certainly those provinces that have reverted to the credit system or that have adopted the credit system are only asking for about 26 credits, whereas a young person in this province, when he or she completes grade 13 will have 33 credits. So they obviously have a greater body of knowledge than those from other provinces.

I'm a little surprised to learn that the universities of this province may be taking into our three-year programmes people from other provinces with the four-year graduation degree. They may be taking them into our four-year programmes, but I'm surprised if they are taking in young people from other provinces into the three-year pass arts programme. I always thought that in this province we had an honour graduation diploma which would allow a young person to go into a three-year university programme and he or she could still graduate in the same length of time as others in most of the other provinces where they had four-year programmes. I'm not sure about that and I haven't got the details on that particular matter here.

Certainly it's not the intention of the ministry or the government to phase out grade 13 in this province. Our thrust is to make provision for those students who can complete grade 13 in less than five years, to do this through an acceleration programme which would allow them to do it in 4½ years or four years if their aptitudes, their desire and their ability allow them to do this. We think that's a better approach, because we talk about learning that isn't in a lock-step process, yet we expect everybody to end up on the finish line at the same time and that just always isn't going to be so.

Mr. Grande: Mr. Chairman, first I would like to congratulate you on the position which this House has conferred on you. Secondly, I would like to thank the Minister of Education for having provided for me his speech that he delivered the other day.

Mr. Chairman: If I might interrupt the member for Oakwood, I understand that microphone is dead. Do we have the permission of the House to allow him to move to another microphone?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

An hon. member: Provided his speech is the same.

Mr. Foulds: There is a nice one right here.

Mr. Grande: I won't repeat what I said previously.

Hon. Mr. Welch: I think you should.

Mr. Grande: I congratulated Mr. Chairman, first of all, for the position which the House has conferred upon him and I joined with other members of the New Democratic Party in those congratulations. The second point was that I thanked the Minister of Education for having provided for me his speech that he made in this House the other day. It was very nice of him to do that.

Let me assure the minister that I and my party are not among those people who seem to be bent on criticism seemingly for the sake of negativism alone. This is what the minister said in his speech. We on this side of the House will criticize the Minister of Education, will criticize any other ministry of the government, but at the same time we are going to be providing as many alternatives as possible for the people of Ontario. This is what good government is all about. This is what the people expect us to do.

The minister in his statement makes three fundamental basic points. He first talked about the quality of education, then he talked about the assessment of a child's educational attainment, and then he discussed honest and straight reporting to parents regarding a child's educational achievement. As far as I could understand it, these were the three main thrusts of his speech.

Under the quality of education, the minister defines it as, "a system that develops efficiently and effectively the greatest possible

potential of the largest possible number of students." Let me humbly suggest to the minister that his view and definition of quality education is at least limited. His view and definition ought to be, "a system that develops effectively and efficiently the potential of every student." The minister's definition leaves out a tremendous number of pupils His definition leaves out the inner-city child and the culturally different child.

As long as this government says it is doing its best, then it cannot be faulted; as long as the educational institutions say that they are doing their best, they cannot be faulted; hence, by inference, the fault must be within the child's background, within the child's experience prior to entering a school setting. The system has involved itself in this kind of circular thinking for a long time. The circular thinking is sometimes verbalized in the following fashion.

The child may be one or two years behind in educational attainment, measured by the tests which the minister mentioned in his speech. The next step is to take a look at the child's background. Here the system finds that the child's family does not speak fluent English; or that the child is being reared by only one parent; or that the head of the household only received an elementary education; or that the head of the household has a job that is not considered in the professional or managerial categories on the Blisken scale. The next step is where the rationalization and justification occurs. It is verbalized in these words: "What can you expect? What else can we do? We have done our best."

This type of thinking pervades the whole educational process. This type of mentality prevents thousands upon thousands of children from receiving the best possible education, and consequently limits their educational opportunities.

This circular thinking, as far as I am concerned, must be halted. The vicious circle must be broken; otherwise the educational figure of many pupils looks bleak indeed.

The minister should look at the Toronto Board of Education's "Every Student Survey, 1970," the updated version of it if it is still in print. He should look at Bernard Coard's pamphlet, "How the West Indian Child Is Made Educationally Subnormal In The British School System;" and a recently-published book by OISE, "The Education of Immigrant Children."

Also, he should look at the draft report of the Multicultural Trustee Work Group of the Toronto Board of Education. This draft report, as far as I am concerned and as far as many people in the communities out there are concerned, represents a milestone in recognizing the difficulties of the culturally different child. It is a document, Mr. Minister, that you and this government should embrace and implement, because it provides a tremendous number of sound solutions to the problems that the educational system has in planning for the best education of the culturally different child.

Let me talk for a few minutes on the education of that particular child, and if anyone in this House thinks I am talking about two or three per cent of the school's population, let me assure every member that I am talking about 50 to 55 per cent of all the children who are attending schools in Metropolitan Toronto, whether they be in the public or separate school.

Yet, even though half of the population within Metropolitan Toronto schools is composed of students of non-English-speaking background, their problems are considered to be peripheral and marginal to the whole system itself. Even your own ministry does not encompass the English-as-a-second-language programme, which leads me further to think that you, yourself, consider that aspect of that curriculum to be something other than within the jurisdiction of your ministry.

One of the fundamental concerns which you and every board of education in Metropolitan Toronto must squarely face is the concern voiced by thousands of parents and community leaders that the culturally different child lags far behind his Anglo-Canadian schoolmate in academic achievement. The reason for that under-achievement can be summed up in one single word, and that is language.

Educators are well aware that unless a child has oral command of the English language when he enters school at the junior kindergarten level he will not and cannot progress according to the educational norm. It appears that fluency in English is a prerequisite, then, for academic success. Unfortunately, at the present time oral fluency cannot be expected, given the tremendous number of pupils. But the logical question to ask is: What is a school that has 75 per cent or 80 per cent of its students who came from a culturally different background going to do?

The teacher will try his best to teach his children in English. They use the methods and techniques they have found to be successful with English-speaking students. I do

not intend to minimize the efforts of the teachers. As you probably are aware, I have been one for the past eight years.

In many cases, they attempt to do their best with the all-English approach. This is how they were taught at the teachers' colleges; they were not prepared for a multicultural classroom. I will make further comments in terms of the teachers' college when it comes to that particular item.

The basic all-English approach has obvious limitations in helping the culturally different child to learn. Let's take the case of a four-year-old child, who reflects a French or Portuguese or Greek or Italian background, on his first day of school in September. His first encounter is with a teacher—with an adult. The teacher speaks a language that is alien to the child; the child cannot understand the teacher. The question is: How can that child learn in that atmosphere?

What the child finds is that he himself has not only that particular pressing need of learning the English language and being able to communicate with that teacher, but also there is a pressing need that he has to make use of that language immediately in order to function as a pupil. From that day on the child begins to drop behind his English-speaking age-mates who have no difficulty understanding what the teacher is saying. This is the definition of educational retardation. Not retardation because of lack of abilities, but retardation because it is built in within the system.

[5:30]

The ill effects of this all-English approach show up most dramatically when the culturally different child is in grade 3 or 4 and the scores in a reading achievement test prove that he or she is approximately two or three years behind the expected level.

In other words, Mr. Minister, what is the point of testing the culturally different child with the test that you mentioned in your speech when we know that that child will score low on such tests? Is your intention to further humiliate the child into believing that he's incapable of learning? This situation is really emotionally damaging to that child, because what he sees and understands is that he is failing, that he cannot learn, and consequently he blames himself for the failure.

It is impossible for him to reason that the failure that he encounters is not his fault but is the fault of a system that is culturally and linguistically biased. Let me make it clear that I am not referring to children who have just emigrated from another country. What I am talking about is 90 per cent of those children who were born right here in Canada.

The present situation has to be remedied. The implications are really enormous. Bluntly stated, it may be contstrued that the linguistically and culturally different pupils are deprived, by a monolingual educational system, of their fundamental right to receive an education commensurate with their abilities. Solutions to this basic void in the education of a culturally different child must be found and implemented.

Throughout the United States of America and in many parts of the world educators, community leaders and governments are turning to bilingual-bicultural education as one possible approach that makes good sense in educating that particular child. By bilingual-bicultural I mean using the child's mother tongue and culture with either of the official languages.

Mr. Minister, as you will recall, the Toronto Board of Education, with your permission, two or 2½ years ago instituted such a programme at the kindergarten level. To find out if the approach is effective, a research component was added. The report that has been published by the Toronto Board of Education, "Transition from Italian in the First Year," has made public the findings of the first year of a two-year programme.

Incidentally, let me point out that neither from the Toronto Board of Education nor from the ministry itself did this particular programme receive any kind of public attention. One could be led to believe that both the board and ministry mounted the programme because of the public pressure that was brought to bear upon them and as soon as the two years elapsed, we would quickly forget about it. That has not happened.

Let me quickly report to you, Mr. Chairman, the highlights of the report. The children in this bilingual-bicultural programme were found to be more verbal than the children in the control group. That means the children were able to express themselves more than the control group, and also, I quote: "On the average, more children in the bilingual programme participated in group conversation periods." This finding is especially significant in the light of the fact that kindergarten curriculum in Toronto devotes a great deal of attention to the importance of speech in group situations. The fact that more children speak in these group situations may be viewed, "as an important signal that the child feels comfortable in a

group setting and may also indicate that he feels his own thoughts are significant enough to contribute." Increase in self concept is the direct result of the bilingual-bicultural programme.

The second significant difference that was found was that:

> While parents from the comparison group expressed as great an interest in their children's education, as did the General Mercer parents, fewer of them had attended specific school events.
>
> In other words, at General Mercer parents seemed to have become more directly involved with their children's programme. These findings demonstrate that the availability of the Italian language has already had direct positive effects on both the students and their parents.

Mr. Minister, if you are convinced that one of the biggest challenges for education today is to involve parents in the schools in a meaningful way, I would urge you to look at these bilingual-bicultural programmes with favour.

The third important finding in the report, which is really significant, is that even though the children in the bilingual programme used Italian for the better part of the year, those children in that programme learned as much English as the children in the control group. Therefore, in terms of the myth that the children won't learn English, propagated by those who still haven't seen the value of such a programme, I would like to put their fears to rest.

The conclusion which can be safely drawn from the evaluation of this particular bilingual programme is that the model works. In other words, a bilingual-bicultural programme in which the mother tongue of the child and English are used as the languages of instruction is a realistic, sensible, practical, inexpensive and humane way of introducing the culturally different child to the educational system and at the same time introducing the educational system to the non-English-speaking parents.

Another concern which many Canadian and non-Canadian parents alike have and are becoming vocal about is that the first language of the children in the schools right now is encouraged to deteriorate. I said it before and I will say it again: It is a criminal act perpetrated by your ministry upon every child who has knowledge of a third language to allow that knowledge to deteriorate as he proceeds through the elementary school.

It is ironic that a student on entering high school is offered the opportunity to learn his first language. By that time, during the intervening years, immeasurable damage has been done to his self-esteem and to the communication between his parents and himself. The communication skills the child had on entering kindergarten are lost by the time he enters high school.

This policy of your government is senseless as far as I'm concerned. It would be much better to encourage the child in the elementary setting to maintain his mother tongue from the first day he steps into kindergarten. There's a large section of the community which will demand this approach, What can you do to remedy the situation?

Actually, there are two things you can do. One is that you should amend at once the Education Act of the Province of Ontario, to permit the teaching of languages other than English and French at all levels. Next, permit teachers to use languages other than English and French in communicating with their students at all levels. This change would allow fully bilingual programmes to be developed and implemented.

The Province of Ontario would not be the first jurisdiction to make such a change. The Provinces of Alberta, Saskatchewan and Manitoba already have legislation to that effect. The Congress of the United States of America passed the bilingual education Act in January, 1968. I would like to read the very first section of this Act.

> The Congress hereby finds that one of the most acute educational problems in the United States is that which involves millions of children of limited English-speaking ability because they come from environments where the dominant language is other than English; that additional effort should be made to supplement present attempts to find adequate and constructive solutions to this unique and perplexing educational situation; and that the urgent need is for comprehensive and co-operative action now on the local, state and federal levels, to develop forward-looking approaches to meet the serious learning difficulties faced by this substantial segment of the nation's school age population.

The State of Texas passed bilingual legislation in 1973. The State of Massachusetts in 1971 enacted the Transitional Bilingual Education Act.

The second thing that the Minister must do is to ensure that adequate funds are made available to the boards of education across Metro, and indeed the whole province, to encourage and assist in the development of these bilingual programmes.

The federal government must assume its responsibility for the immigration policy decisions it made in the late 1950s and 1960s. It is about time that the federal government understood that its responsibility does not end as soon as the immigrants land at Malton airport. The feds will probably tell the minister that education is a provincial responsibility; but now that they have become bosom buddies in essence, the feds will probably listen.

The minister should remind them that over the past years the federal government has indeed contributed nearly $2 billion to education. For example, there is the Federal-Provincial Fiscal Arrangements Act of 1967 for secondary school education; the Technical and Vocational Training Assistance Act, which was superseded in 1967 by the Adult Occupational Training Act; the Canada Student Loans programme; schools for the children of the armed forces; and funds have been received to soundproof schools in Etobicoke, etc.

I hope the minister has paid heed to these remarks and will move with speed to remedy the situation. It is really critical. It has often been said that our strength as a nation lies in the diversity of its people. Let us not annihilate this diversity, because in doing so we will destroy and prevent the true development of our Canadian society.

Mr. Warner: Mr. Chairman, I can certainly appreciate that there could be some discomfort in the minister sitting there facing the largest number of elected teachers that this House has ever seen. I assure you that for my part I view my role as a politician who happens to be a teacher.

I hope, in what appears to be some consternation on the part of the government in coming to grips with its whole thrust of education, that the minister could appreciate that perhaps he has two problems on his hands; one, of inheritance and, second, of trying to decide where the real governing power belongs. Speaking of inheritance, I noticed that the minister made some reference to the fact that he was talking about his tenure as minister; perhaps that in itself reflects that there is some concern about past Ministers of Education.

Hon. Mr. Wells: No, it does not.

Hon. Mr. Davis: He was worried about Egerton Ryerson.

Mr. Foulds: This is the first time I think I remember the Premier being in the House for these estimates for four years. It is good to have the former Minister of Education here.

Mr. Warner: If that is the case, it certainly is well founded because it was during the 1960s when money was spent on buildings and on furnishings but not on teacher development, curriculum, quality of education —not on all of those ingredients which now come to the fore as problems for students, for teachers, for parents and for taxpayers.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Look where all the money went in those years when 75 per cent of it went for teachers' salaries.

Mr. Foulds: That's the transfer grants; come on.

[5:45]

Mr. Warner: We saw during that time no real concerted effort to do educational research. During that time if a teacher wished to become proficient in the teaching of English, for example, he had to attend Columbia University in the United States. It's because of that inheritance difficulty perhaps that the government has come to rely on what one might refer to as the great white father syndrome. Can we look and say that local boards have now reached a position of wisdom whereby we can transfer authority to them and let them run their own show? What happens when that occurs is a vacuum. I think it's within that context that we face the serious problems that we do.

We heard from another party, a third party, during election time that one way to cut spending would be to cut out the regional offices, and at the same time they said they could decentralize. I have no idea how those two are compatible. I realize fully that the ministry has made some attempts toward trying to bring about some standards throughout the province. Yet what has been ignored unfortunately are the local boards. I remind the minister that it was only at the time when all of the power was centralized here at Queen's Park that we saw teachers' strikes. It was only during that concentration of power down here that we saw local trustees talking about being disgruntled with the educational system.

I submit that our problems arise from the fact of decentralization. But they are not solved by simply having a great white father approach and blandly turning it all out with the kinds of material that we've seen produced, the P1J1 and the HS1 which effectively let you off the hook. It's not that easy. Although all of us realize, I am sure on both sides of the House, that we want a good

sound educational system for our children and that we want everyone to grow up literate, I don't think that it can be done by simply abdicating responsibility in the area of curriculum.

I urge the ministry, for example, to consider very seriously the implementation of compulsory subjects in the area of physical education and in the area of English and Canadian studies. That in no way should be misconstrued as taking away autonomy from the local boards. In all of this, the people who have been forgotten are those very people who were very upset during the election, the students, the teachers and the parents. Nowhere in all of this swing of the pendulum from local board control to centralization down here, nowhere in all of that were the students consulted as to curriculum, were the teachers consulted as to curriculum or were the taxpayers consulted. The decisions were made by the civil service.

Hon. Mr. Wells: Oh, no.

Mr. Warner: The decisions were made by the OISE ivory tower and the decisions were made by the Minister of Education and his deputies.

Hon. Mr. Davis: That is where your party organizers are. What do you mean ivory tower? Your party organizers are up there.

Mr. Warner: And we are now re-organizing it. We may in fact disband it if we get a chance.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Why don't you tell him? He can volunteer to retire.

Mr. Deans: Why should he?

Mr. Warner: We have two ministers of education now.

An hon. member: We've got a Minister of Education and a mini-Minister of Education.

Mr. Foulds: He may become the deputy premier.

Mr. Warner: I would ask the Minister of Education if he could please explain when this government will earnestly approach the students and the teachers and the parents. By that I do not mean any sort of formal superstructure in any taxpayer organization or the students' council per se or the principals of the province. I mean the students themselves who are not organized, the teachers who are working in the classrooms and the ordinary taxpayer. I would ask the minister when those people will be approached as to what they want in terms of education in this province and as to how changes can be effected by talking with those particular groups. Where are the results?

Hon. Mr. Wells: Teachers, of course, and students and parents are all involved at various levels, both at the provincial level and, of course, more particularly at the local level where it's easier to involve them in the process.

I can't let go by the statement that teachers are not involved in the development of the curriculum. A person happens to come down here and work as a provincial civil servant; he holds a teaching certificate and has served well as a teacher—just as my friend has served and now becomes a member of this Legislature; he's still a teacher—and these gentlemen sitting in front of me are still teachers. We have a programme to involve them in things which go on in the classroom and I have to emphasize to you that the curriculum which is used in this province is developed by educators and teachers with input from students and parents.

Specifically, you said why didn't we ask these people what they wanted and what their opinion was of what was going on? We did a very massive informational study over the past 2½ years, I guess, of teachers, students and parents to find out what they thought about the system, what they wanted done, the whole ball of wax. If you'd like to see a copy of that you are perfectly welcome to take a look at it.

Mr. B. Newman: I wanted to ask the minister if there are any developments going on within the ministry toward recognizing other languages at the secondary level. You will recall a year ago or earlier this year I was in touch with either you or your officials as a result of a presentation made to me by the Ukrainians in the city of Windsor. They want the Ukrainian language considered an accredited subject in the secondary school system and also want guidelines so that the teachers would have to fulfil certain requirements and be accredited instructors or teachers in the Ukrainian language at the secondary level.

Hon. Mr. Wells: There already is provision for credit courses in a whole variety of languages other than the normal ones we think of—French, Spanish, German and Latin. There is provision for a whole variety of other language courses for credit in the secondary schools starting at year one. The provision is that there be the demand for that language in the community. Then the board has the

option of instituting the programme in one of the schools.

I look here and I see Finnish, Hungarian, Polish, Ukrainian, Portuguese, Chinese, Hebrew, Lithuanian, Latvian, Yiddish and some of the native people languages are all being offered for credit in secondary schools across the province at the present time.

Mr. Philip: I was somewhat dismayed and concerned during the last election campaign at some of the simplistic views and attacks on the educational system which were proposed by certain people wishing office in this House—most of them to the left of me, incidentally.

An hon. member: Only physically, not politically.

Mr. Gaunt: Don't get sanctimonious.

Mr. Philip: I wonder if, in developing the curriculum budget, you have given serious consideration to ways in which teachers can be given some help in implementing innovation in such a way that parents and the community can understand the kinds of innovations taking place without having the kind of backlash which we experienced during the last election campaign. It seems to me that innovation or curriculum development means more than just consulting teachers and parents. It's the whole process by which one consults the parents and teachers, and the whole process by which the teachers learn to be comfortable in consulting with the parents and other people in the community.

In talking with a number of teachers I find that, for whatever reason, they are afraid of parents, and when that kind of thing happens, it seems to me that we have within those teachers some fear of their own competence in explaining and in working with the parents on curriculum. I am wondering if any thought has been given to developing with the teachers the kind of techniques and processes which will help them to feel more comfortable in working with the community and innovating curriculum with the community?

Hon. Mr. Wells: Mr. Chairman, each of our regional offices has a budget of about $20,000 for professional development and curriculum development; in other words, money where they can organize programmes in their region to help the teachers in the various systems organize curriculum development programmes and institute programmes to help those teachers explain the programmes and institute programmes to help those teachers explain the programmes to the parents in their particular area. I can't guarantee that this kind of development work is going on because, in their wisdom, some of the regions may have decided to institute different types of curriculum development activities. I think what you have said is vitally necessary. It certainly is my perception that a lot of the misunderstanding and concern expressed by parents is because they really don't understand at the present time just exactly what's going on in the schools, and because they don't understand they have a feeling of mistrust and a feeling of lack of confidence in what is going on, because it is different than what they remember, and they don't know why and nobody has taken the trouble to explain it to them.

I think what you said about some teachers being ill at ease in explaining to parents what is going on, is actually so, and that is one of the things I think we are going to have to come to grips with.

I delivered a speech not so long ago to the Canadian Education Association, the whole thrust of which was this whole business of parental involvement in the schools. That is probably one of the biggest things that we need in education today. If we can get the parents in as volunteers and helping in the schools, then they will know what is going on and they will understand what is going on, and there will be that bond of communication built up, because the teachers who perhaps are a little afraid of parents, seeing them and working with them in the schools will develop a rapport with them that will allow them to be able to explain things to the parents.

If we don't have that, and I don't think we can expect all parents to be volunteers in the schools, then I think the schools have got to open their doors and welcome parents in; they have got to have days where the teachers explain what is going on in the schools in a meaningful, easy-to-understand way. You have to realize that there are a lot of these curriculum days in schools and parents go, and they come away and they don't really understand what's going on at all, because somebody has given them a lot of educational jargon that is not completely understood by them, and therefore are no better off.

We have to develop programmes where teachers can communicate with parents about what the schools are doing, how the learning process is going on, what is being taught, so that they can be shown that the basics are being taught in the schools, and just how they

are being taught. When that comes about, I think we will quell a lot of the concerns that parents have, and quite rightly so, because they are not sure exactly what is happening.

These are the kind of things that I think the school system has got to direct itself towards, and that is the kind of thing that I have been preaching as I go around the province. It is not something that you overcome overnight, as my friends over—

Mr. Deans: It doesn't happen though. You can stand here and speak about it as long as you like, but it doesn't happen.

Hon. Mr. Wells: I know, but it has got to happen. We have got to do something to make it happen—

Mr. Deans: What are you doing? Tell us what you are doing.

Hon. Mr. Wells: —and that is what we are trying to do. Let me just indicate one small manifestation of concerns about this. Those who were in this House last year when we put through the new Education Act will recall that we made parents official visitors in the school.

Mr. Deans: That has been a big help. They have been going to schools ever since.

[6:00]

Hon. Mr. Wells: Who were the greatest group of people who were opposed to that particular section but the educators in this province, and particularly school principals. They said, "Good heavens, you are going to interrupt the whole process in the schools if we have a group of parents running around schools. You shouldn't do that in a piece of legislation—making parents official visitors in the schools."

There is a new book by a professor at Calgary university that I think is an excellent one on this whole subject. He said there are now signs on the doors at schools stating, "Anyone visiting this school must first go to the principal's office."

You can't walk into a school and even go to your own child's classroom. It's going to take a while to overcome some of these ideas and impressions parents have and that teachers have, but I think we've got to work on it.

Mr. Foulds: I wonder if I could ask the minister whether he plans to reply to my colleague, the member for Oakwood (Mr. Grande), at the conclusion of this item or with that—

Hon. Mr. Wells: Oh yes, I certainly do. He delivered a very excellent presentation and has done a very fine job in this particular area, and I congratulate him in his first speech here.

Hon. Mr. Welch moved the committee rise and report.

Motion agreed to.

The House resumed, Mr. Speaker in the chair.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Speaker, the committee of supply begs to report certain resolutions and asks for leave to sit again.

Report agreed to.

Hon. Mr. Welch: Mr. Speaker, before moving the adjournment of the House, may I remind the members that tomorrow we will hear from the leader of the Liberal Party as to his contribution to the Throne debate.

Mr. Foulds: Such as it will be.

Mr. Deans: Better wear your hardhats.

Hon. Mr. Davis: I have an appointment out of town.

Mr. Deans: If you have, can I come along?

Hon. Mr. Welch: Following this, we will go into committee of supply for the continuation and consideration of these estimates, which we will do in the evening as well. Tomorrow evening at 8 o'clock, the standing committee on estimates will continue its examination of the estimates of the Ministry of Industry and Tourism.

Hon. Mr. Welch moved the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to.

The House adjourned at 6:05 p.m.

CONTENTS

Monday, November 3, 1975

Conditions in correctional institutions, questions of Mr. J. R. Smith: Mr. Lewis, Mrs. Sandeman, Mr. Nixon, Mr. Bullbrook 163

Toronto teachers' negotiations, question of Mr. Davis: Mr. Lewis 164

Automobile insurance rates, questions of Mr. Handleman: Mr. Lewis, Mr. Singer, Mr. Makarchuk 164

Asbestos emissions at Johns-Manville operation, question of Mr. Miller: Mr. Lewis 165

Payment for cattle purchases, questions of Mr. W. Newman: Mr. Nixon, Mr. Gaunt, Mr. Worton 165

Advertising of rent review, questions of Mr. Davis: Mr. Nixon, Mr. Lewis 166

Home warranty programme, question of Mr. Handleman: Mr. Deans 168

Krauss-Maffei system, question of Mr. Snow: Mr. Singer 169

Mustard report on health services, question of Mr. Miller: Mr. Williams 169

Highway extensions, question of Mr. Snow: Mr. Dukszta 169

Purchase of railway land in Erieau, question of Mr. Bernier: Mr. Spence 170

Ontario's credit rating, questions of Mr. McKeough: Mr. MacDonald, Mr. Nixon 170

Human rights code, question of B. Stephenson: Mr. B. Newman 171

Minimum wage, question of B. Stephenson: Mr. Makarchuk 171

Definition of disability, question of Mr. Taylor: Mrs. Campbell 171

Spending revisions, questions of Mr. Auld: Mrs. Bryden, Mr. Reid 172

Anti-inflation programme, question of Mr. McKeough: Mr. Shore 173

Holiday closings for retail businesses, question of Mr. MacBeth: Mr. Bounsall 174

Family planning clinics, question of Mr. Miller: Mr. Sweeney 174

Report, Ministry of Labour, B. Stephenson 174

Resumption of the debate on the Speech from the Throne, Mr. Lewis 174

Motion to adjourn debate, Mr. Nixon, agreed to 187

Estimates, Ministry of Education, Mr. Wells, continued 187

Motion to adjourn, Mr. Welch, agreed to 206

SPEAKERS IN THIS ISSUE

Auld, Hon. J. A. C. Chairman, Management Board of Cabinet (Leeds PC)
Bernier, Hon. L. Natural Resources (Kenora PC)
Bounsall, E. J. (Windsor-Sandwich NDP)
Bullbrook, J. E. (Sarnia L)
Bryden, M. (Beaches-Woodbine NDP)
Campbell, M. (St. George L)
Davis, Hon. W. G. Premier (Brampton PC)
Deans, I. (Wentworth NDP)
Dukszta, J. (Parkdale NDP)
Evans, D. A. (Simcoe Centre PC)
Ferris, J. P. (London South L)
Foulds, J. F. (Port Arthur NDP)
Gaunt, M. (Huron-Bruce L)
Gigantes, E. (Carleton East NDP)
Grande, A. (Oakwood NDP)
Handleman, Hon. S. B. Consumer and Commercial Relations (Carleton PC)
Hodgson, W. (York North PC)
Leluk, N. G. (York West PC)
Lewis, S. Leader of the Opposition (Scarborough West NDP)
MacDonald, D. C. (York South NDP)
Makarchuk, M. (Brantford NDP)
McKeough, Hon. W. D. Treasurer, Minister of Economics and Intergovernmental Affairs (Chatham-Kent PC)
Miller, Hon. F. S. Health (Muskoka PC)
Moffatt, D. (Durham East NDP)
Newman, B. (Windsor-Walkerville L)
Newman, Hon. W. Agriculture and Food (Durham North PC)
Nixon, R. F. (Brant-Oxford-Norfolk L)
Philip, E. (Etobicoke NDP)
Reed, J. (Halton-Burlington L)
Reid, T. P. (Rainy River L)
Riddell, J. (Huron-Middlesex L)
Ruston, R. F. (Essex North L)
Sandeman, G. (Peterborough NDP)
Shore, M. (London North L)
Singer, V. M. (Wilson Heights L)
Smith, Hon. J. R. Correctional Services (Hamilton Mountain PC)
Smith, R. S. (Nipissing L)
Snow, Hon. J. W. Transportation and Communications (Oakville PC)
Spence, J. P. (Kent-Elgin L)
Stephenson, Hon. B. Labour (York Mills PC)
Sweeney, J. (Kitchener-Wilmot L)
Taylor, Hon. J. A. Minister of Community and Social Services (Prince Edward-Lennox PC)
Warner, D. (Scarborough-Ellesmere NDP)
Welch, Hon. R. Culture and Recreation (Brock PC)
Wells, Hon. T. L. Education (Scarborough North PC)
Williams, J. (Oriole PC)
Worton, H. (Wellington South L)
Yakabuski, P. J. (Renfrew South PC)
Young, F. (Yorkview NDP)

No. 6



Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT — DAILY EDITION

First Session of the Thirtieth Legislature

Tuesday, November 4, 1975

Afternoon Session

Speaker: Honourable Russell Daniel Rowe
Clerk: Roderick Lewis, QC

THE QUEEN'S PRINTER
PARLIAMENT BUILDINGS, TORONTO
1975

10

CONTENTS

A list of the speakers taking part in the debates in this issue of Hansard appears, in alphabetical order, at the back of this issue.

Daily contents of proceedings also appears at the back of this issue. Reference to a cumulative index of previous issues can be obtained by calling the Hansard Reporting Service indexing staff. (Phone 965-2159).

Hansard subscription price is $15.00 per session, from: Sessional Subscription Service, MGS, 9th Floor, Ferguson Block, Parliament Bldgs., Toronto, M7A 1N3. Phone 965-2238.

LEGISLATURE OF ONTARIO

TUESDAY, NOVEMBER 4, 1975

The House met at 2 p.m.

Prayers.

Mr. Ziemba: I would like to introduce to the House a group of ladies representing the west end YWCA immigrant coffee group who are seated in the west gallery, and I would like to ask the members to welcome them.

Mr. Hodgson: On behalf of my neighbour from York Centre (Mr. Stong), I would like to introduce 76 pupils from grades 10 and 11 at Thornlea Secondary School under the leadership of R. K. Smith.

Mr. Bullbrook: Would you join my colleagues in welcoming 40 students of grade 10 from Sarnia Northern Collegiate who sit in your west gallery?

Mr. Speaker: Statements by the ministry.

Oral questions.

FEDERAL HOUSING PROPOSALS

Mr. Lewis: A question for the Minister of Housing. Has the minister any idea specifically what the impact on Ontario will be of the federal housing announcements yesterday and more particularly the amount of money which has or will be designated for use in this province under the AHOP programme or any other?

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: No, Mr. Speaker, I can't tell the direct impact. We received the information yesterday, a very short period before the announcement was made in the House. All that we have so far concerning that proposed programme is the statement that the minister gave. It is now being looked at by officials in the ministry to see just what effect it will have on the province and how much money will be available.

Mr. Lewis: By way of supplementary in two parts, first, do I take it as accurate that the government will of course continue with its mortgage rates credit programme, as announced during the election campaign, to reduce the effect of interest rates since there appears to be no useful intervention on the part of the federal government to that end in terms of Ontario's needs?

Secondly, would the Province of Ontario also pass legislation requiring insurance companies and loan and trust corporations to direct some of their investment moneys or retained earnings into the housing market since, again, so much of the federal money will be excluded from Ontario by virtue of the maximum price?

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: Mr. Speaker, the first part of the question, the question of the mortgage interest subsidy, probably should be more properly addressed to the Treasurer (Mr. McKeough). I am not going to jump to the conclusion that the programme announced by the federal minister does not have some sort of impact in this area until we have had a chance to analyse the total impact of the programme. As far as the second portion is concerned, I did advise the federal minister yesterday that Ontario would join with the federal government in approaching those financial institutions that are in Ontario to join in this programme and to follow the lead. I suppose, if legislation is necessary, then of course it will be just as the federal government has indicated.

Mr. Renwick: You were going to do that last spring.

Mr. Nixon: Can the minister make it clear? Do we have a provincial cost allowance programme that is supposed to run out as of December, 1975? If so, are we going to make arrangements more or less to support the federal initiative in this regard for rental housing in order to extend it for at least another year?

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: Mr. Speaker, I'm sorry, I can't answer that. Perhaps the Treasurer can.

Mr. Nixon: Is there such an allowance?

Mr. Lewis: Supplementary: What happened to the very strong initiatives which were allegedly taken with the insurance companies, the loan and trust companies and the banks by the Province of Ontario prior to the

last election campaign, supposedly to release the funds which the federal government is now re-releasing on our behalf? What happened to all those meetings and all those undertakings and guarantees?

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: Mr. Speaker, I am being repetitious. One would have to pass this question on to the Treasurer. I just don't know.

Mr. Reid: Maybe you could answer both of them.

Mr. Lewis: Maybe I could pass it on.

Mr. Speaker: As the hon. member is still asking questions, it's okay.

PRIVATE INVESTMENTS IN HOUSING

Mr. Lewis: It would be a new question then to the Treasurer, if I may. What happened to all of the meetings he had with the private investing field, I guess, to free money for Ontario's housing market? How much money was actually freed in addition to commitments that had already been made and how will that jibe with the federal announcement yesterday?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: I am not sure about the second part of the question because I haven't had an opportunity to read or to understand the statement in full.

With respect to the first part of the question, meetings were held with the chartered banks, with the insurance companies and with the trust companies. The problem was put in front of them and I thought there was a very excellent reception. I think we tabled that in the House at that time. In terms of statistics as to the growth, particularly by the banks, which, as we all know, just a few years ago—

Mr. Renwick: Oh, come on! We tabled that before your meeting.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: —were not in the—I think we had a very excellent reception from them. It is my recollection that they committed something in excess of $250 million, if memory serves me correctly, over and above what they were already committing.

I don't think that has all been taken up because it ran right into interest rates. The problem in the last two or three months has not been the availability of funds from the lending institutions; the problem in the residential market, both in terms of single-family housing and rental housing, has been interest rates.

Mr. Lewis: A supplementary, if I may. If it hasn't been a problem, why does the federal government feel it necessary to threaten by way of legislation the release of an additional three-quarters of a billion dollars? If all of the money is there, then how is it that the Treasurer is claiming an easy access to the money market which the federal government says it has to legislate about?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: As I read the statement yesterday or the newspaper reports as I said, I haven't had a chance to read the statement in full, nor have I had a chance to discuss it fully with my colleagues—what the federal government is proposing to do is in some way subsidize the interest rates, which means the money that is available will be taken up and they hope that an additional amount of money, whatever the figure was, will also be put forward. I think if there is some answer to the interest rate problem put forward in the federal proposals yesterday, then the existing funds which are available will be used very quickly and I think there will be a further demand for mortgage funds.

Mr. Shore: A supplementary to the first part of the question. In view of the statement made by the federal minister, could the Treasurer elucidate the announcement he made on government spending control:

> If there are any major new federal expenditures in housing, then I will serve notice now that we expect the federal government to adopt the same budgetary self-discipline that we and local governments, universities and hospitals are now exercising, and to find the money in existing low-priority programmes.

Does that mean anything now that that annoucement has been made?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: It certainly does. I think one of the large pressures on the economy has been government spending, and what we said to Ottawa was that if you're going to move into—

Mr. Roy: You are starting to realize that, are you?

Mr. Reid: Your $2 billion has nothing to do with it?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: We are partially responsible here—

Mr. Reid: It's the first time you have admitted any responsibility.

Interjections.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: —and most of the clamour comes from you people over there, not from us.

Interjections.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: What you promised during election would have cost billions more!

Interjections.

Mr. Speaker: Let's get back to the question period.

Mr. Reid: Two billion dollars—

Hon. Mr. McKeough: I say to my friend from Rainy River, don't come around talking to me about the problems of your—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. Order.

Mr. Nixon: We thought you took "nice" pills.

Mr. Roy: Is that a threat? Now, Darcy—

Interjections.

Mr. Speaker: Are there further questions? I think we had better get on to another subject. We've had several supplementaries—

Mr. Renwick: By way of a supplementary question to the Treasurer—

Mr. Speaker: Is it a brief supplementary? All right, we'll allow it.

Mr. Singer: It's all our fault, is it?

Mr. Gaunt: I thought the Treasurer had tried to change his image.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Mr. Renwick: By way of a supplementary question to the Treasurer, did the announcement by the Hon. Barnett Danson yesterday let the government off the hook with respect to its intention and obligation to introduce legislation relating to moderating the impact of mortgage interest rates in the province?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: I'm not sure whether I agree with the phrase "off the hook." If yesterday's announcement, when we have examined it, means that the government of Canada are reassuming the role which they have properly had for a number of years, of being responsible for mortgage financing in this country without trying to unload it on to the provinces, then I would say yesterday's announcement was very welcome indeed. When we have examined the situation and seen just what it does mean in terms of the Province of Ontario, then we will be able to give a more definitive reply.

Mr. Lewis: By way of a new question, I would like to ask, did I understand that answer properly? Are you wriggling on the hook or off the hook?

Interjection.

Mr. Lewis: I haven't asked you yet. Just relax for a moment; I'll give you the full opportunity—

Interjections.

Mr. Breithaupt: Is this a supplementary question?

Mr. Speaker: It sounded like a question to me.

FEDERAL HOUSING PROPOSALS

Mr. Lewis: It's a new question, Mr. Speaker. Is the Treasurer implying that the reduction of mortgage interest rates, the programme to which the government committed itself during the election campaign, may now be jettisoned in light of the federal announcement yesterday, which in fact will have a negligible impact on interest rates for those who wish to purchase homes in all of the major centres of Ontario? Does the Treasurer know there are only 20 AHOP homes available now in the entire Metropolitan Toronto area?

An hon. member: Good question.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Mr. Speaker, no, I wasn't aware.

Mr. Lewis: Is the government going to reconsider its mortgage interest rate programme?

[2:15]

Mr. MacDonald: That was a pre-election promise—

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Mr. Speaker, what my leader said very clearly a couple of months ago was that he felt something had

to be done about mortgage interest rates in this country. He said he felt that that was clearly the responsibility of the federal government, but if the federal government were not going to take action and not do something about interest rates—

Mr. Lewis: They are not.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: —then we were prepared to do so. My friend has read the paper and has the answer to all the questions.

Mr. Lewis: No, I do not believe that AHOP stuff is going to work.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: We have not yet studied what Mr. Danson said. Not being an instant expert like the hon. member, I am not quite prepared to throw the whole programme out the window—

Mr. Lewis: Particularly if it lets you off the hook.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: —as the hon. member is, after reading this morning's Globe and Mail.

TORONTO TEACHERS' NEGOTIATIONS

Mr. Lewis: I have a question which I would like to ask the Minister of Education since he is appearing in the wings. If the Treasurer does not answer me more clearly, some columnist will call him a protestant underachiever.

Interjections.

Mr. Lewis: Someone convey that to Norman Webster, if he is not in the gallery.

I would like to ask a question of the Minister of Education. When is he about to intervene in the very critical Metropolitan Toronto high school board dispute?

Hon. Mr. Wells: Mr. Speaker, I guess what we need is a definition of the word "intervene." I am not sure what the hon. member means by intervening. If he means, am I concerned about what is happening in Metropolitan Toronto, the answer is yes. If he means, have I been speaking to the Education Relations Commission and its chairman, Owen Shime about what they can do and asking them to do all they can, the answer is yes. If he means, have I been meeting with the teachers over the last few days and talking to them, the answer is yes. If he means, have I been meeting with the school board over the last few days, the answer is yes.

Mr. Lewis: Thank you very much. I have one supplementary. Is the minister prepared personally to bring both sides together in an effort to reach a settlement before the teachers walk out? That is what I meant.

Hon. Mr. Wells: Mr. Speaker, if I can usefully be of help, I will bring both sides together to avert a walkout, if that is possible. I am not sure when the time to do that might be or if it ever will be, but that we will have to see.

Mr. Nixon: Supplementary.

Mr. Speaker: This could be asked as a new question. I think it is the hon. member's turn to ask questions.

Mr. Bullbrook: Well, he can ask a supplementary.

Mr. Nixon: This is a supplementary, if you don't mind.

Mr. Speaker: You can call it whatever you like. It is your turn to ask questions anyway.

Mr. Nixon: I will ask a supplementary, thank you, Mr. Speaker, of the same minister. Is he aware that when a similar question was put to the Premier (Mr. Davis) yesterday he indicated that the minister would have a statement or might have a statement in this regard? Can the minister indicate if there is still that hope that we can avoid a strike? Would the minister undertake, if he brings the two sides together, to ask the Premier to accompany him in meeting the two sides and as well have a representative of the federal authorities, who have the powers of wage controls in this area, so that we can do everything we possibly can before the teachers walk out—God forbid, but it appears that they will—on Wednesday next?

Hon. Mr. Wells: Mr. Speaker, hope springs eternal. I always look for the bright side. I believe, notwithstanding the storm clouds on the horizon—

Mr. Lewis: Yes, such as the fact that we do not know the outcome of the vote.

Hon. Mr. Wells: —we still may not have a strike. As I indicated in answer to a question from the Leader of the Opposition a few minutes ago, if and when the occasion arises that I should call the parties together, I will do

it. How I do and who is present at that time will be something that will have to be decided at that time.

Mr. Nixon: Supplementary: Since we are all obviously concerned with this, perhaps the minister would indicate what would lead him to decide to bring all parties together.

Hon. Mr. Wells: I indicated in my answer to a question a minute ago that I had asked the Education Relations Commission to see how they were going to carry out their duties under the Act of this Legislature, which is to assist in arriving at an agreement between teachers and school boards. They are presently looking at ways that they can involve themselves to a higher degree in the dispute in Metropolitan Toronto. That presently is taking place. I'm waiting to hear back from them to see just what they are proposing at this particular point in time, given also the fact that they are conducting the official vote tomorrow. That, I underline, is the official vote that will decide whether the board's offer is accepted or not.

Mr. Lewis: Oh yes, the crystal ball vote.

Hon. Mr. Wells: My friend, the hon. member, is asking me who should be involved at that particular time when we call the parties together. It may be that I would want to involve the Leader of the Opposition and myself at that meeting.

Mr. Lewis: Oh, with pleasure.

Mr. Bullbrook: Why doesn't the minister invite Jean-Luc Pepin? He has been doing most of the work for the minister anyway.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Brant-Oxford-Norfolk.

SERVICED LAND FOR HOUSING

Mr. Nixon: I have a question of the Minister of Housing. Frankly, I rather regret that he did not make a statement to the House today, having been present at the announcements in Ottawa yesterday.

Is the minister aware that Peter Martin, the executive co-ordinator of OHAP, has stated publicly that the serviced land production for new housing in Ontario is nearly one year behind schedule? Is he further aware—and I'm sure he is—that one of the aspects in the wage and price control announcement was that the federal people are urging the provinces to move more rapidly in the servicing of land? Would the minister not feel that it is incumbent upon him to make some statement, I hope an effective one, indicating that we are going to pick up the slack in the servicing of land—which is, obviously, one of the more serious aspects in delaying the fulfillment of the housing commitments made by the minister's predecessor?

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: Certainly I'm aware, as many are, that there is the problem of the necessary serviced land to provide housing in many municipalities. I can come here and make a statement, but I would much prefer that any statement that is made would be one that we can feel confident we will be able to carry out and make the programme work.

Mr. Reid: That is a brand new approach.

Mr. Roy: The minister has changed his mind before; five times on rent control.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: The statement by Mr. Danson yesterday indicates that the federal government, of course, are going to put up extra now and make money available to municipalities for servicing. Certainly, I'm prepared to co-operate in any way I can to see that more money goes into that very necessary servicing of land throughout the province.

Mr. Nixon: A supplementary: Since, in fact, there were housing funds available to us over the last two years that were not fully expended, and since three years ago we had a new Ministry of Housing established, we have had a succession of new programmes announced—

Mr. Singer: And ministers.

Mr. Nixon: And new ministers. Since it seems the real hangup in this is the availability of serviced land, wouldn't the minister agree that that is one specific area where we have almost an exclusive provincial responsibility and one where we've got to perform better than we have in the past?

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: I think we would find an unanimous feeling in this Legislature that we can always do things better; we can always make an improvement. I would have to agree that, in the case of serviced land, that has to be one of the most important parts of developing a continuing housing programme, to get land serviced in the municipalities.

Mrs. Campbell: That is a change.

Mr. Speaker: I believe the member for Brantford wishes to ask a supplementary.

Mr. Makarchuk: In view of the fact that in some communities there is an adequate supply of serviced land, but it is being held by the developers in order to control the prices, would the minister move into these areas and ensure that this land is released and put into housing so that the prices can be brought down?

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: Mr. Speaker, I'm not aware of any specific holdings such as those referred to that are serviced.

Mr. Makarchuk: I'd be prepared to give the minister the details.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: Can I answer the question, and then the member can jump up and down? He has been here before, he knows the rules.

Mr. Foulds: He was in this House before the minister was; even before he was a Tory.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: If the hon. member will make the information available to me, I will be most glad to look into the situation. If we can get land released, we'll get houses built on it. I hope the hon. member is also able to tell me that there are no delays being created by his own municipal council.

Mr. Singer: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker: Could the minister tell us what steps he and his colleagues are taking to impress upon reluctant and hesitant local councils that land should be serviced? Is the government prepared to take any action to bring councils to service land more quickly than is being done now?

Hon. Mr. Davis: The Liberal Party is opposed to that.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: I believe in local autonomy, and I know the hon. member does as well. Heavens, we know that.

Mr. Singer: Oh, of course I do, but what is the minister going to do about it?

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: We've heard all about that for 37 days.

Mr. Conway: Answer the question.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: I also feel that the various municipalities should be convinced by us that they must play their role in the provision of housing. I was most interested to read in today's Toronto Sun that the former member of this Legislature who is now a columnist, and was before, has become so enlightened in these matters since he left the New Democratic Party and became a columnist.

Mr. Singer: The minister still didn't answer the question.

Mr. Samis: What was the question?

Mr. Cassidy: Mr. Speaker, now that the minister has confirmed there is a one-year delay in the programme, could he explain how he could lose a full year in a programme that is only two years old, and give an explanation for the serious failure that is now revealed?

Mr. Lewis: You are lucky they didn't lose both years.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: Mr. Speaker, I didn't confirm there was a one-year delay; apparently someone in the ministry has suggested that. I'm not confirming that.

Mr. Singer: Are you denying it?

Mr. Cassidy: Are you denying it?

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: I don't know whether there is a year's delay or not.

Mr. Lawlor: You don't know much about this legislation, do you?

MEETING WITH NEW YORK FINANCIERS

Mr. Nixon: I would like to ask the Premier if he might report to us the concerns expressed by the financial moguls in New York that made it necessary for him and the Treasurer (Mr. McKeough) to go and have dinner with them to allay their fears and concerns about the financial status of this province.

Mr. Roy: Who paid for the dinner?

Mr. Cassidy: Did you take John White with you?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I must say it was lunch, not dinner, and the Treasurer and I—

Mr. Breithaupt: Did the Premier go to a 10-star hotel?

Mr. Reid: The Premier's lunches are our dinners.

Hon. Mr. Davis: It was lunch.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I would only say to the members of the House that we were invited to visit with certain people in the financial community in New York where this province does borrow, along with Ontario Hydro on occasion, at which time we had an opportunity to set out some of the very positive accomplishments of the people of this province.

Mr. Roy: Did that create a problem?

Hon. Mr. Davis: It was a very helpful visit and one that I am sure will be beneficial.

Mr. Nixon: Supplementary: Was one of the concerns expressed by those people at lunch that perhaps Ontario ought to cut back its spending spree that has been now in operation for four years; and that this has led the Treasurer to announce once again a programme of retrenchment?

Mr. Yakabuski: What about your election promises?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I think "the people in New York" over the years obviously have been quite impressed with the ability of this province and of the government of this province. I think that is very obvious.

Mr. Nixon: We are paying them 10 per cent interest. Why shouldn't they be?

Hon. Mr. Davis: I think it is fair to state that people who are in the business today of lending capital funds are concerned about the economy generally, not just in Canada. I think part of its relates to a certain nervousness that we sensed when we were there. In fact it was that Friday afternoon when the teachers' fund of all places, came to the rescue of the city of New York.

Mr. Foulds: Why "of all places"?

Hon. Mr. Davis: We were sitting there when the decision was made and I think it was 125—

Mr. Nixon: We don't have an independent fund. You have already spent the teachers' money.

Hon. Mr. Davis: I told them how we did it here.

Mr. Nixon: No fooling around; just take it away from them.

Hon. Mr. Davis: I told them.

Mr. Lewis: No wonder they are dropping the rating.

Hon. Mr. Davis: But I sense, Mr. Speaker, as we all are concerned about the level of government expenditure, it was possible for us to point out that as a percentage of the gross provincial product, which I'm sure now has come through to the member for Brant-Oxford-Norfolk, we as a government are spending somewhat less than four years ago. I recognize it is always politically popular to emphasize the expenditure side of the government of this province and I really don't want to repeat what the Treasurer said earlier. I just thank heaven, in terms of ratings and everything else, that we are still here and the member's party is over there, because we would have no rating whatsoever if it had ever formed the government of this province.

Interjection.

Mr. Roy: You were talking about three-star.

Mr. Renwick: A question of the Premier: Did the Premier take the trouble to allay their fears and concerns about the New Democratic Party when he was there?

Mr. Lewis: Imagine our rating if we had been the government.

Mr. Eaton: A minus rating.

An hon. member: Zilch.

Mr. Lewis: British Columbia has a double-A, which is what Ontario is getting tomorrow.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Yes and listen, did the hon. member notice there is an election in British Columbia? Did he notice they called an election in that great province?

Mr. Lewis: I saw that.

Hon. Mr. Davis: The hon. member saw that and I bet it came as a total surprise. It had nothing to do at all with the Premier's decision to have a freeze in that province. Not at all related.

Mr. Lewis: Not a thing.

An hon. member: The freeze ends at the end of the year.

Mr. Nixon: Or the Premier's decision to freeze the gas prices.

An hon. member: Leadership!

[2:30]

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. Let's get back to the question period, questions and answers.

Hon. Mr. Davis: I don't want the member for Riverdale to become upset, or his leader or anyone else on the other side of the House. I hate to inform him, but the subject of the New Democratic Party did not come up in our deliberations.

Mr. Lewis: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. On a point of privilege.

Mr. Speaker: Heavens.

Mr. Lewis: I have a message from the Treasurer which says, contradictory to the Premier, that, "We tried to reassure them—mainly the New York financial moguls—that under Lewis the Ontario NDP were a very light pink."

An hon. member: It gets darker all the time.

Mr. Lewis: "Whether they believed us, remains to be seen."

Mr. Speaker: I think we should get back to a serious question period.

Mr. Lewis: The Treasurer is quite right, by the way. The Premier may relax.

Mr. Speaker: Order please.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order: The Treasurer may have made that observation; I didn't get into any discussion of the colour of the party opposite.

Mr. Speaker: We're wasting valuable time here. The member for Yorkview.

LABOUR RELATIONS AMENDMENT ACT

Mr. Young: I have a question of the Minister of Labour, if I might. I wonder if I could ask the minister the status of Bill 111, 1975, an Act to amend the Labour Relations Act? I realize she may not be entirely clear on all these bills yet, but I would ask if she is planning to proclaim this Act in the near future and if part of the delay in the proclamation may have to do with the definition of dependent contractor, and whether or not there is a feeling that the Labour Relations Act should be further amended in order to redefine that phrase dependent contractor so that groups like the dump truck owners might be able to bargain more effectively with their employers?

Hon. B. Stephenson: Mr. Speaker, while I thank my hon. colleague for his solicitude about my lack of preparation for this role, I can tell him that I am familiar with Bill 111. The delay in implementing that specific section of the Act was promised by my predecessor in order to allow those groups within the labour force who had some concern about that specific paragraph and that definition to make their concerns known to the ministry.

We are in the process of hearing those concerns. We have two more groups to meet; when that has been completed we shall make a decision about that section of the act and will announce to this House when it will be implemented.

Mr. Young: Supplementary, Mr. Speaker: I want to congratulate the minister on her grasp of her ministry.

Mr. Speaker: Someone wished to ask a supplementary.

Mr. Good: Supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Just a supplementary? The member for Waterloo North.

Mr. Good: Does the minister see the proclamation of those sections dealing with dependent contractors as being in conflict with the task force that dealt with the whole dump truck industry in Ontario and the new legislation now before the House under amendments to the Traffic Act?

Hon. B. Stephenson: Mr. Speaker, there is some question of this. I don't see it as a true conflict at the moment, but the application of the Rapoport report will have to be made to this section of the Act and it will have to be considered in the light of the views of those who are concerned with this section of the Act.

CRIMINAL CODE AMENDMENT

Mr. Singer: Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the Attorney General. Could the Attorney General advise us about the progress he has made in tightening up, or having the federal authorities tighten up, the drinking and driving laws? I have reference to the speech he made the day he was sworn, which got headlines in the Toronto Star.

Hon. Mr. McMurtry: Firstly Mr. Speaker, I attended a federal-provincial meeting of Attorneys General a couple of weeks ago in Halifax and made representations to my

federal counterpart with respect to a proposed amendment to the Criminal Code. The proposed amendment, with which the member is probably familiar, dealt with removing from the Criminal Code the power of a judge, in most instances it would be a trial judge, to make any order of prohibition arising as a result of a drinking and driving offence. I indicated to the Minister of Justice that in my view this was not in the best interest of controlling or reducing the very serious problem relating to drinking and driving on our provincial highways and requested that that amendment be changed and that trial judges be given the power to make driving prohibitions up to a period of a lifetime for the appropriate case.

Secondly, I've met with certain of my senior officials with respect to programmes that we hope to introduce in the Province of Ontario which will again, we hope, reduce the incidence of tragedy arising as a result of drinking and driving. I hope I will have more to announce to the House in the near future.

Mr. Singer: By way of supplementary, surely the Attorney General would agree with me that the first step he mentions isn't going to tighten up the whole problem or tighten up punishment insofar as that is concerned? Secondly, would he care to take the members of the Legislature into his confidence and tell us the kind of thing he has been discussing with his officials because we've heard about this kind of thing from him and his predecessors for, lo, these last 20 years? And nothing happens.

Hon. Mr. McMurtry: Mr. Speaker, I've had fairly lengthy discussions with my officials and I don't think it would assist the House if I were to take the time of the House to relate these in details. Other than to state that—and I'm not sure of the precise thrust of my friend's question—I would agree with him if he is suggesting that punitive measures by themselves are not sufficient. I think we must embark on a very serious and in-depth educational programme if we are going to make any significant progress in this area.

Mr. Singer: That isn't quite what you said the day you were sworn in.

Mr. Williams: Mr. Speaker, a question of the Minister of Health. Yesterday in the House—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I don't see the Minister of Health.

Mr. Cassidy: You may not get an answer anyway, so go on.

Mr. Williams: The minister is returning to his seat.

Mr. Speaker: All right, the member may proceed.

MUSTARD REPORT ON HEALTH SERVICES

Mr. Williams: Yesterday in the House, I raised a question with the minister as to the status of the Mustard report dealing with delivery of health services within the province. He was kind enough to refer me to a manual entitled "Report, Reaction and Response" which I have now reviewed and as a consequence thereof it brings me to a further question. In the light of the very broad recommendations and very general nature set out in the summation of the report I am obliged to pursue the matter further in the form of a question to the minister—

Mr. Speaker: Would you ask the question please?

Mr. Williams: —as to at what point of time and in what manner the minister intends to implement the recommendations in a more specific and precise way as set out in the general recommendations? In what form will there be a modification of programme based on the criticisms which arose out of the review of the Mustard report?

Mr. Sargent: You should rehearse these questions.

Mr. Good: Go and talk to him sometime.

Mr. Nixon: Okay, when is it, he says?

Mr. Cassidy: Yes or no?

Hon. F. S. Miller: Mr. Speaker, there were a whole series of recommendations in the report, as I'm sure the member knows.

Mr. Nixon: Around the bush.

Hon. F. S. Miller: Some of them would relate to, say, the role of the health unit, its structure and reporting mechanisms. We have health units in various forms around the province and it would be our goal—

Mr. Nixon: Tell us all about those.

Hon. F. S. Miller: —to have them gradually affirm the district or regional board approach. I can't set a timetable because currently that

issue is being studied in Metropolitan Toronto, for one example.

Another recommendation was the rationalization of secondary care services and this is something that is progressing as quickly as we can do it. I would suggest that in this year of restraint it may progress more rapidly than it has in the past.

The third dealt with manpower problems in the province—

Mr. Roy: Sounds more like a statement now.

Hon. F. S. Miller: —such as doctors' supply and we've agreed to go on a voluntary method of distribution using incentives rather than legislation. There would be another dozen of these and I suspect, in all honesty, that during my discussion of the estimates next week these may come under further scrutiny. I'd welcome detailed questions from the member and other members at that time.

DREE GRANTS

Mr. Stokes: Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the provincial Treasurer. Having regard for the excellent financial position of the province, does the minister recall a commitment he made to the K-C five, a group of five communities—Geraldton, Long Lac, Nakina, Schreiber and Terrace Bay—where he would provide infrastructure grants through DREE Ontario so that they could provide the infrastructure services for the $250 million expansion under way by Kimberly-Clark? What is the time frame and when can we expect some action?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Mr. Speaker, I don't know that I used the word commitment. That may be a little bit too strong.

Mr. Nixon: A political promise, not a commitment.

Mr. Singer: It was before the election.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: In that riding? The member must be kidding.

Mr. Nixon: The Tories had a candidate and they thought he was going to win; he came third.

Mr. Singer: Why did you go there?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Mr. Speaker, through you to the member for Lake Nipigon, I will review that matter and see where it does stand. We have a number of DREE situations which we are trying to sort out and I would hope to have something more up to date in the next 10 days or two weeks perhaps. We haven't lost sight of it though.

CLOSING OF RCA PLANT

Mr. Sargent: A question of the Premier: Further to his commitment to honour the hundreds of millions of dollars in promises during the election campaign, does he recall his famous barbecue with Mr. Winkler, where he promised $500,000 to keep the RCA plant open and said no one would lose their jobs; there would be full employment? It closed today and 300 men are out of work. The Premier has reneged on $500,000. I would like to ask him: If Mr. Winkler was elected would he have reneged on the $500,000?

Mr. Yakabuski: Tell the truth.

Mr. Eaton: Let's hear the whole story; that was in committee.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Just going by memory—and I don't recall the hon. member being at that barbecue; he certainly would have been welcome, but I don't recall seeing him there—my recollection is that—

Mr. Roy: I guess not. You would have been better off to invite him.

Hon. Mr. Davis: —Mr. Winkler made an announcement. I am not familiar with what happened to RCA today, and I think the question should be properly directed to the Minister of Industry and Tourism (Mr. Bennett), with great respect.

An hon. member: You made the promise.

An hon. member: We'll spend an hour on it.

Mr. Nixon: It was the former Chairman of the Management Board who made the promise.

TORONTO TRANSPORTATION FACILITIES

Mr. Reid: I have a question for the Premier. In his meeting later on this week with Mayor Crombie and others to discuss transportation problems in Toronto, is the Premier going to commit the Ontario government to paying any of the capital cost for a park-and-ride facility at Eglinton and at Lawrence?

Hon. Mr. Davis: I don't know what other people I am meeting this week. I am meeting the mayor of the city of Toronto, that is correct.

Mr. Reid: A supplementary if I may: May I ask the Premier, is one of those articles for discussion the transportation system in Toronto and is he going to make any commitments on behalf of the government, particularly for parking facilities at the Eglinton and/or Lawrence ends of the Spadina arterial road?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, there is no question that I will be discussing certain transportation matters with the mayor, perhaps along with other matters. As far as any commitment is concerned as to, shall we say, off-street parking as it relates to rapid transit, this may be a matter that is raised. I can't say specifically at this moment and I don't know that there would be any discussion as to a specific location.

If the hon. member is suggesting that there should be provincial support for a particular facility at Eglinton and the Spadina corridor, I am delighted to have his observation.

YORK REGIONAL COURTHOUSE

Mr. Hodgson: A question of the Minister of Government Services.

Mr. Sargent: No!

Mr. Hodgson: At what stage are the plans at the present time with the architectural firm of Boigon and Armstrong as it—

Mr. Cassidy: And from behind as well.

Mrs. Campbell: When do we get out of the chaos we are in?

Mr. Hodgson: —relates to the proposed courthouse and registry office in the region of York?

Hon. Mrs. Scrivener: This project, I believe, is at the design stage and the design is under consideration at the present time by the Ministry of the Attorney General.

Mr. Hodgson: A supplementary please.

Mr. Sargent: Sit over here!

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Mr. Hodgson: Are you relating to me—that plans are not even at the architects yet? If not, are they at such a stage that the County of York Law Association—

Mrs. Campbell: If you can't hook up a telephone you can't answer that question.

Interjections.

Mr. Hodgson: I kept quiet when you were talking, Eddie.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Mr. Cassidy: His seat is so precarious.

Mr. Hodgson: Are the plans at the stage now where the County of York Law Association could review them and have some input?

Mr. Good: No, they are long past that.

Hon. Mrs. Scrivener: I believe the plans are in the hands of the architects. They are at the design stage and they are at this point being reviewed by the Ministry of the Attorney General. I think that the local law association will be involved at a certain point but they are not at that point as of yet.

Mr. Sargent: You should have a coffee with the member and tell him about it.

[2:45 p.m.]

CREDIT RULES FOR MARRIED WOMEN

Mrs. Sandeman: Is the minister aware of the different requirements made for married women when they go to get credit from a credit union or a bank as opposed to those made for married men? Could the minister tell me when he is going to bring in legislation to end discrimination in credit rules?

Hon. Mr. Handleman: Mr. Speaker, to the hon. member, I am certainly aware of some of the discriminatory aspects of credit granting practices on the part of certain institutions. As a matter of fact, I have just completed a set of guidelines which we are now putting out to the industry for comment. I hope to have an announcement to correct the situation before the end of November.

OTTAWA CORONER'S INQUEST

Mr. Roy: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Solicitor General involving the tragedy last week in Ottawa and the full coroner's inquest which is being called on this. Would the minister try to resolve the differences existing apparently between his chief coroner and the federal Solicitor General about the appearance of certain witnesses at this inquest? Is the minister in a position to guarantee the public in the Ottawa area that

we will have a full and complete inquest with all necessary witnesses in attendance?

Hon. Mr. MacBeth: The Solicitor General has assured us of his co-operation in the matter and I will do my best to see that a proper and complete inquest is carried out.

Mr. Roy: Would the minister please advise his chief coroner that when he issues an invitation to the federal Solicitor General, he does so personally and not through the press?

Hon. Mr. MacBeth: I am not so sure how that went, Mr. Speaker, but I will make some inquiries.

TORONTO AIRPORT NOISE LEVELS

Mr. Leluk: Mr. Speaker, a question for the Minister of Transportation and Communications: Has the minister had any meetings or discussions with the federal Minister of Transport, Mr. Lang, regarding what the federal ministry is doing at present or contemplating doing to reduce aircraft noise levels in the vicinity of Toronto international airport?

Hon. Mr. Snow: No, Mr. Speaker. We do have a meeting planned. A definite date has not been set up yet but my staff and Mr. Lang's staff are trying to arrange an appropriate date for a meeting which I expect will be probably—certainly within the next month, I hope.

Mr. Leluk: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker: Since the residents in York West riding and other adjoining ridings in the vicinity of the airport are directly affected by these noise levels, would the minister give me his assurance that when he has his meeting with Mr. Lang he will raise this matter with him?

Hon. Mr. Snow: Certainly it will be one of the items we will be discussing.

Mr. Reid: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker, very quickly. Can the minister indicate if, with the cancelling of the Pickering project, the air traffic at Malton will increase in the next 10 years so the noise levels are also going to increase? Is this so?

Hon. Mr. Snow: Mr. Speaker, I don't think I could indicate what the aircraft movements at Toronto International Airport will be over the next 10 years off the top of my head like that.

Mr. Roy: No.

Mr. Reid: We don't expect anything off the top of your head.

Mr. Roy: That statement is no surprise here.

Hon. Mr. Snow: There have been a great many studies done by the federal government. My ministry has not done any studies on aircraft movements at Malton; these are studies which have been carried on by the federal government.

Mr. Sargent: Supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please, we have to get on. No, there have been enough supplementaries. There are many members who wish to ask new questions. There are too many supplementaries and this is the reason many of the questions never get asked. I will call the member for Algoma, I think it was.

CENTRAL ALGOMA MEDICAL CENTRE

Mr. Wildman: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have a question for the Minister of Health: Does the visit of Dr. Copeman to Bruce Mines this week mean the government has any new proposals for staffing the Central Algoma Medical Centre or alleviating the very serious debt incurred by the construction of the centre at the encouragement of the ministry? Also, has he approached the federal government to request a review with a view to increasing its financial contribution to cover the labour on the project under the winter works programme?

Hon. F. S. Miller: Mr. Speaker, I take exception to some of the wording in there; "at the encouragement of the ministry" is not really a fair choice of words. It's very difficult sometimes to discourage people at the local level from spending a lot of money on similar health facilities. Dr. Copeman is visiting Bruce Mines this week. It's a direct outcome of the meeting which the hon. member attended with the council, a meeting I promised when the cabinet visited Sault Ste. Marie just about a month ago. We investigated the problems of that community. We know there are two doctors in it; one is supported by us and one is not. The doctor who is supported by us, as the hon. member knows, is not yet earning his keep. Therefore, it would be sheer economic folly to support another one. The hon. member also knows that we increased the rental allowance to the community to help them pay their debt.

We are sending Dr. Copeman there in the specific hope that we'll find somebody such as an optometrist willing to locate in that area and again assist the community in paying

the rent on their building. But we don't underwrite optometrists; in fact, we don't have a programme for them up there. We simply encourage them to go to areas like that. Further, we have confirmed that the doctors may dispense in that area and therefore solve the problems in that general jurisdiction. I think we have done just about all we can.

The component for winter works has been confirmed at $36,123, and that is accurate. There is no further flexibility left; if anything, we erred on the generous side in working it out in the beginning and I can't do anything else about it.

Mr. Speaker: The oral question period has expired. Might I remind the hon. members that a supplementary question is surely not necessary in every case? The Speaker doesn't like to rule them out of order all of the time—

Mr. Sargent: Tell the boys at the top that first.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I think hon. members will agree with me that if we cut down on the number of supplementaries, we can get around to more questions. Let's try that, please. Thank you.

Mrs. Campbell: It would help if some of the government members would consult the cabinet themselves.

Mr. Speaker: I'm talking about supplementaries on all sides of the House, not just one side.

Petitions.

Presenting reports.

Motions.

Hon. Mr. Welch moved that commencing tomorrow, each Wednesday, with the exception of Wednesday, Nov. 12, will be reserved for meetings of committees, and that when the House adjourns on Friday, Nov. 7, it will stand adjourned until Wednesday, Nov. 12.

Mr. Roy: Mr. Speaker, I'd just like to make a comment on that motion. To my knowledge, this province is the only jurisdiction involving the legislative process where the Legislature doesn't sit on Wednesdays. The purpose of the motion is stated to relate to the sittings of committees, but in fact I think the real motive of the motion is to allow cabinet to sit on Wednesdays.

Hon. Mr. Kerr: No, there are other committees.

Mr. Roy: My respectful submission to this House and to the member moving the motion—possibly I should make this suggestion to the Premier (Mr. Davis) would be that we explore the possibility of having the cabinet meeting either on a Monday or a Friday. I would suggest a Friday, because the House only sits for half a day in any event. It would make it easier for the out-of-town members who do not happen to sit on any particular committee at least to sit all week and then have that part of the week for their riding work, be it Friday or Monday. I would think it a more sensible approach, I say respectfully to this House and to the members, than to have the House broken up and not sitting on Wednesdays.

Mr. Cassidy: I'd like to make a comment much in the same vein, Mr. Speaker. The practical effect of having the House not sit on Wednesdays has been the following: the cabinet has been able to meet; and if it wanted to meet into the afternoon, it was able to without the trouble of having to come and meet the Legislature. Members within a 50- or 75-mile radius of Toronto have had a day in which they generally work within their constituencies. Members from farther out of town, who had long or difficult or expensive trips back home, found themselves kicking around here, manning the committees in certain cases if committees were meeting, and at other times just catching up on work and then having to take time away from the Legislature at the beginning or the end of the week in order to attend to constituency business.

Mr. Hodgson: They never missed you when you lived on the Island anyway.

Mr. Cassidy: It is a legitimate function of a member, I would add. It is perfectly legitimate for members to spend a certain amount of time meeting constituents. It is also legitimate for members to spend time meeting with people in their community who happen to keep office hours and who therefore happen to prefer to meet with members during the course of a business day rather than during the course of the evening or on the weekends. There is a kind of discrimination there between the members who live in or near Metro and people who live farther away.

The third practical thing that happened was that, apart from the private bills committee over the last couple of years, there has been no committee of this Legislature which has made effective use of those Wed-

nesdays. The estimates committees in general did not meet on the Wednesdays but met only concurrently with the House. Other committees on certain occasions would do so. I think the select committee on company law used that opportunity. But the vast majority of the members of this House, apart from the members of the cabinet, were not in fact engaged on Wednesdays in committee work.

I would point out as well, that the Camp commission report—I think it was No. 4—suggested very specifically that the hours of sitting of the House should be reconsidered. It certainly doesn't seem to make an awful lot of sense in the middle of the week when most people in most jobs are at the most intense period of activity that this House has just got a great big vacuum and nothing is happening.

As we know, Fridays have become a tag-end day which is not particularly useful, a day which is devoted to the Throne Speech debate, the budget debate and to minor legislation. Sometimes in the past two or three years the House leader hasn't really had any business at all because he couldn't find a minister to come in on that particular day. The amount of sitting time on that day wasn't very great either—only two hours as compared to between three and 5½ hours on other days.

I simply commend to the House the point that I think it is no longer the case that the convenience of the cabinet should rule the Legislature as a whole. If cabinet is incapable of completing its work between 9 a.m. and 1 p.m. or 1:30 p.m. on Wednesday, then let it find another day of the week in order to have an additional sitting. I think the matter of constituency work and the balance between that and the work of this Legislature should be recognized so that the many members who wish to give a certain amount of time to their constituencies and who happen to live outside of easy commuting range of Metro are not forced into the position that I and other members are in—

Hon. Mr. Handleman: How about Friday night and Saturday, the same as everybody else?

Mr. Cassidy: —of having to steal time from the Legislature in order to attend to our legitimate riding work. I think this should be looked at over the Christmas recess.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Where have you been for the last 10 days?

Mr. Cassidy: I would suggest strongly to the House leader that he indicate now that this is a temporary kind of thing for six weeks only and that he will very seriously consider other alternatives in future.

Mr. Speaker: The House leader.

Hon. Mr. Welch: In view of the comments, I think we should perhaps summarize things very briefly. We are in a session of a new Parliament. There have been consultations, as the member for Kitchener (Mr. Breithaupt) and the member for Wentworth (Mr. Deans) will indicate. This doesn't restrict the opportunity for any member of this House to comment, notwithstanding the fact that there has been some understanding with respect as to how we would order the business in order to get on with our job.

This motion is not being introduced for the convenience of the cabinet. The wording of this motion is very clear. There are three select committees, involving 33 members of this House, who have to find some time to discharge the responsibilities which this House gave them. In none of the three motions establishing those committees are they entitled to meet concurrently with the House.

Mr. Bullbrook: That can only be described as hogwash of the worst kind.

Mr. Speaker: Order.

Hon. Mr. Welch: The point is that these people have to have this opportunity for this particular session to do so.

Mr. Bullbrook: You mislead the House as you always do in these things.

Hon. Mr. Welch: If the member for Sarnia and others would go to their caucuses and explain—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Hon. Mr. Welch: If the member for Sarnia ever aspired to leadership, he'd better get his wick a little longer. That is all I would say.

Mr. Bullbrook: You and your friends are playing games.

Hon. Mr. Welch: I would think, too, that under the circumstances it has not gone unnoticed that the Camp commission did make some recommendations with respect to the organization of the House. We've constituted a select committee to do this. We can perhaps approach it at that time once we have the benefit of the advice from the all-party select committee.

Mr. Bullbrook: In a platitudinous fashion I speak to the motion.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The hon. member who introduced the motion wound up the debate on this.

Interjections.

Mr. Bullbrook: No. Wait a minute. Absolutely not. On a point of order then.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. This has been the custom on second reading and motions such as this. I'm sorry that I did not recognize that the hon. member wished to speak. I will allow him to make a few remarks.

[3:00]

Mr. Bullbrook: Yes, right. I want to say this to you. I think most respectfully of your position. You're quite right in connection with the custom. The custom also is for the Speaker to address the assemblage and invite others to speak before the person putting the motion is asked to wind up the debate I wasn't asked to speak. I want to say this to you, without any misunderstanding, the government House leader gets up with his pious platitudes about saying that anybody can speak to this motion but we've had our arrangements made. We'll abide by any arrangement made by our House leader, that's understood, but let this also be understood.

Interjections.

Mr. Bullbrook: I want you to understand this, Mr. Speaker. It's very important that you understand it because as I understood it when you took that job reluctantly a week ago your reluctance was because it's a difficult job to protect the interests of all the members of this assembly. I want to say this to you. It's got to be known. The government House leader was prepared to have the leader of the New Democratic Party and our House leader offer to his colleagues the ability to meet on Wednesdays—think of this for a moment—and join in Throne debate without any question period. I'm not prepared to sit in my place and accept the blatant statement that this type of rule, this type of involvement, had nothing to do with the cabinet. Of course, it has to do with the cabinet.

Hon. Mr. Welch: Just a minute. It is completely out of order.

Mr. Bullbrook: Let me say this to you. It's for the facility of the cabinet; it exemplifies basically the problem this Premier has. It's very similar to the problem another Prime Minister has—he doesn't understand the legislative process and its function in the government of this province. That's basically it.

I wanted to rise to say this to you. I'm not going to accept that type of deflection, in effect, from what the true reason is. As my colleague from Ottawa Centre said, it's for the convenience of the Premier of this province and his cabinet colleagues who really don't like the legislative process; who really don't like the question period.

Mr. Breithaupt: I must correct one impression which my colleague from Sarnia has left with the House.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Tell them the truth.

Mr. Breithaupt: That is, the suggestion with respect to the possibility of sittings which might convenience certain members to involve themselves in the Throne debate was made by me on the basis that we have had on several occasions in the past—the occasional half-day—

Mr. Bullbrook: You still don't want to sit.

Mr. Breithaupt: —which would allow Wednesday sittings and give, I understand of course, convenience to the cabinet who had been meeting at that time.

Interjections.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The hon. member for Kitchener has the floor.

Mr. Breithaupt: As a result, Mr. Speaker, while that was a suggestion which has worked to some convenience in the House in the past, it was not proceeded with at this term. I must remind you, sir, that in that particular it was a suggestion I had made with the hopes that some members who might not otherwise be able to involve themselves in the Throne debate because of a lack of time might have that opportunity.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. Speaker: Introduction of bills.

MINISTRY OF GOVERNMENT SERVICES AMENDMENT ACT

Mr. Singer moved first reading of bill intituled, An Act to amend the Ministry of Government Services Act, 1973.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Speaker, the purpose of the introduction of this bill is to provide for compulsory tendering for construction, reno-

vation and repair work and in the purchase of commodities or real property. This is the third time I've introduced this bill as a private member's bill. It is my sincere conviction that the letting of contracts must be done publicly and everyone interested allowed to have an equal chance to make a bid.

ONTARIO BILL OF RIGHTS ACT

Mr. Roy moved first reading of bill intituled, An Act to establish the Ontario Bill of Rights.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Mr. Roy: I've introduced this bill before. The Canadian Bill of Rights was enacted by the Parliament of Canada in 1960. It provides for certain human rights and fundamental freedoms but it is limited in the field of federal jurisdiction, whereas this bill would have application to provincial legislation. In spite of the fact that we have moved positively toward human rights legislation, such as our new Ombudsman, I still feel that an Ontario Bill of Rights—such as has been enacted in five or six other provinces—is necessary in this province.

ONTARIO HUMAN RIGHTS CODE AMENDMENT ACT

Mr. B. Newman moved first reading of bill intituled, An Act to amend the Ontario Human Rights Code.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Mr. B. Newman: The purpose of this bill is prevent discrimination on the basis of a physical handicap, where the handicap does not interfere with performance of duties. It's based directly on the legislation that has been operative now in the Province of Nova Scotia for well over a year.

Mr. Speaker: Before the orders of the day I beg to inform the House that pursuant to section 82 of the Legislative Assembly Act, I've been informed that the members of the Board of Internal Economy of this House are Messrs. Auld, Breithaupt, Deans, Morrow, Snow and Welch.

Hon. Mr. Taylor: Mr. Speaker, the members of the House have had placed on their desks a medallion. That medallion, I may say, is from a great area, a very historic part of Ontario known as Land of Lakes. It's represented in this House by the member for Frontenac-Addington (Mr. McEwen) and the member for Prince Edward-Lennox. I wish to indicate to the members that the gift is from the association who visited these chambers this afternoon.

Mr. McEwen: I am honoured to join with the member for Prince Edward-Lennox in mentioning the Land of Lakes. I believe during the last four years it was very seldom that the riding of Frontenac-Addington was mentioned; and I'm sure you—

Mr. Eaton: It was well represented until you came down here.

Mr. Yakabuski: How much money have you spent?

Mr. Singer: One by one you are going down.

Mr. Mancini: Look at all the cabinet material over there.

Interjections.

Mr. Speaker: Orders of the day.

Clerk of the House: The first order, resuming the adjourned debate on the motions for an address in reply to the speech of the Honourable the Lieutenant Governor at the opening of the session.

THRONE SPEECH DEBATE

[Applause]

Mr. Nixon: Mr. Speaker, I hope my colleagues are as enthused about my remarks when I have completed them.

Sir, I want to extend my congratulations to you on your re-election as Speaker. I have never been one who felt that we should have a permanent Speaker but the fact that you are here for a second term suits me. Your impartiality is respected on all sides and the fact that one of your political colleagues was a bit concerned about your decision during question period and almost interrupted the proceedings to bring that to your attention is an indication that if you are going to be unfair, you're going to be unfair to both sides. I think that's all right.

Also I am delighted that the Deputy Speaker has been selected from the ranks of the opposition and most specifically, that it happens to be the member for Lake Nipigon (Mr. Stokes). He is not in his place at this very moment, although he almost always is, in case an opportunity surfaces to speak for the great north. I think it's an indication that

when the Treasurer (Mr. McKeough) was questioned about one of the political promises which had been made in that area, he said, "You must realize it wasn't a political promise because we wouldn't be wasting our effort or our money in that constituency" or words to that effect. We're not really here to compliment the political prowess of the incumbent because these things change over the fullness of time, they tell me. I am very much convinced indeed that he will serve well and effectively and with fairness in such an important capacity as the Deputy Speaker and chairman of the committee of the whole.

Naturally, all of us are particularly interested in the remarks made by new members. Many members, before I sit down, are going to say, "Nixon is thrashing a bit of the old straw. We've heard his views on these matters before." I was very pleased indeed to hear the member for Kingston and the Islands (Mr. Norton), who was selected by his leader to move the address in reply. I sent him a note indicating my congratulations because I felt that aside from some of the over-complimentary remarks that seem to be de rigueur when these circumstances come along, particularly with reference to the Premier of the day, his comments were very apropos and valuable for us all. We tend to get involved in the political convolutions of the provincial scene and it is quite useful when a new member coming into the House indicates some broader perspective as to the requirements of the people—the taxpayers—those who from time to time look at what happens in this House. I thought his remarks were valuable in that regard.

I listened to the speech of the member for Mississauga North (Mr. Jones) very carefully. Perhaps he was a little heavy on the support for his leader but, of course, there are so few people not in the cabinet that I suppose all the backbenchers, all eight or nine of them, are looking for some preferment. I was quite interested in his comments about his antecedents coming from a working family, as I think he described them, in Scarborough.

He used a phrase which is in common parlance. He was referring, I think it was, in criticism of the NDP, perhaps even the leader of the NDP who does not have a corner in speaking on behalf of—and I use the member's words—"the little men in this province." Every time I hear the phrase I remember the comments made by the former member for Sudbury. He came second in this previous contest, Elmer Sopha, and he may yet find a seat here again.

[3:15]

Hon. Mr. Bennett: As leader?

Mr. Nixon: He would make an excellent leader of almost any party; there's no doubt about that. Every time the phrase, "little man," was used in this House he would get up on a point of order and call to the attention of everybody: "There are no little men." I think perhaps it was advice that was good for us all. Certainly in the sight of God and in a democracy there are no little men. Actually when we see some of the wage settlements accomplished in recent weeks, we realize that these things have changed dramatically.

I was very glad to hear the views expressed by the mover and the seconder, and I want to offer my congratulations to them, but all of us, whether we are old or new members, must appreciate that this House faces more difficult problems than at any time since the Depression years of the 1930s. We can list them and they are in our minds always: The problems of housing, discussed briefly in the question period today; wage and price controls, which were the principal subject of the comments made by the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Lewis) in his remarks yesterday and which I will be talking about as well today; the dislocation in our community and our economy of energy supply and pricing; and perhaps some more perennial problems but certainly in the long run just as important.

There are also the basic problems of quality and standards in education; the continuing tendency to centralize the decision-making powers of government, both here and in Ottawa; and, of course, the costs of government and the budgetary problems that all of us face as taxpayers—responsibilities that all of us bear as members of this House but which surely are the main responsibility of the Treasurer (Mr. McKeough) and the incumbent administration.

I don't want to talk at length about the election but I must be frank and express my disappointment at the outcome, because here I sit—stand at the present time—leading the largest Liberal caucus elected since 1937; and while the quality of the membership has never been surpassed, still it puts us in third position in this House. This in no way restricts our opportunities to participate in the debate, and I can assure you, Mr. Speaker, of our commitment to full participation. I believe that we will be effective. I believe that we will show by our comments and our votes

that we mean business on the basis of putting forward those matters raised in the election campaign and which we as Liberals hold as a body of principle which we must support, no matter what the consequences nor the problems associated with the political involvements in this regard.

I think I should point out to you, as I congratulate the members to my right—

Mr. Samis: Not too heavy on that word please.

An hon. member: Is the seat available?

Mr. Nixon: Do you want me to respond to that? Twice before in recent history the social democrats—evidently they are in the process of changing their name again—have had the special responsibility of being the official opposition. There are certain aspects of importance in this role; not only having the extra opportunities to toast Her Majesty, but also the emoluments of leadership and the special circumstances of having the opportunity to put amendments before other parties if they choose.

Twice before this has happened, as I say. The circumstance that I probably can remember personally better than any other was following the election of 1943 when under those circumstances the Liberal leader, who happened to be my father and was the Premier, came out of the election not having moved one step downward in the hierarchy but two steps downward; he found himself the leader of what the Premier will no doubt start calling a group, as soon as he thinks of it.

Hon. Mr. Davis: I have already.

Mr. Nixon: It was a group made up of only six or seven dauntless members. It was interesting as well that that was the last occasion in this House when the government of the day only had minority support. It lasted for two years, two sessions, and it was in fact on the Throne debate in the second session after the election that it was defeated by a vote of the Legislature. It is interesting to note—I am not indicating that this is any prophecy but at least history has lessons for all of us, politicians and others—that at the subsequent election the democratic socialists were more than decimated and returned with only a handful.

Mr. MacDonald: What about the Liberals in 1948?

Mr. Nixon: As a matter of fact, the leader himself didn't make it. That was the beginning, of course, of the regime of Conservatism that has been so electorally successful now for well over 32 years.

George Drew was the Premier, and there was a change that he undertook which really was not in the best interests of any of us I would say—and particularly not in the best interests of my friends and colleagues sitting crammed into the corner of the House. Before George Drew became Premier the arrangement of seating in this chamber was in a semi-circle. It was very possible and much easier, in my view, for any member to catch Mr. Speaker's eye. I would think that, if anything, the debate was improved rather than stultified by having that arrangement. There was even room for a few extra seats, if it was necessary to provide them under those circumstances.

Mr. Drew, being a student of history himself, and feeling that the advantages of the British tradition should be brought, let's say returned to this House, decided to have the alley as we see it here with the opposition separated from the government as it has been ever since. I would suggest that it would in no way interfere with an understanding of the democratic process if we had gone back to that semi-circular arrangement.

The other thing he did is just a matter of interest. His predecessor in the office left a good supply of stationery with the title "Office of the Premier." Mr. Drew had that thrown out. I am told that it was replaced by stationery heavily embossed with "Office of the Prime Minister." Well, at least the present incumbent set that straight as one of his first administrative and executive decisions when he came to office.

Hon. Mr. Davis: I used up the old stationery first.

Mr. Nixon: But I have a feeling that if he had to throw out the old George Drew remnants, that it wouldn't worry these big spenders; nothing cheap about them.

Hon. Mr. Davis: There was still some of Mr. Drew's paper left over.

Mr. Nixon: I don't want to dwell on this, but of course we are looking—

Interjections.

Mr. Nixon: —for some political comfort where we can find it. In the election of 1948 the same thing happened — the democratic socialists were returned as the second party. But in the subsequent election that they were returned with, I think, only three members.

An hon. member: Two.

Mr. Nixon: Just two.

Mr. MacDonald: And we are back again.

Mr. Nixon: They had the same strength as the Communist Party at that time. I wish that we, as Liberals, had something more to brag about under those circumstances, but there has been a shuffling back and forth.

I am sure that none of us can foresee the future, but I thought this background, under the present circumstances in which we find ourselves, would at least be of some assistance to me.

Mr. Laughren: We shall see.

Mr. Nixon: One of the interesting aspects of the last two elections, when I had the honour to lead the Liberal Party, was to listen to the spokesman from the third party, as it then was, talk about the popular vote. There was a certain satisfaction, sitting there as Leader of the Official Opposition, to say: "Well, you know, you won the votes but you didn't win the seats." I am now in a position where I want to talk about the popular vote.

I well remember and will never forget, of course, the events of election nights. I have had considerable training—both as an active politician and as a supporter of the former member for Brant—for election nights with almost all results, all except winning results. I drew some comfort, indeed, from the fact that the people of the province had turned in substantial numbers to the party which I lead, the Liberal Party. We found ourselves less than two per cent behind the government party, and 5.4 per cent in the popular vote ahead of the party on my right.

I hear a few groans up there, but it appears that 180,000 more people in the province voted for the Liberal Party than voted for the NDP. That is small comfort, but we did get that support.

Mr. MacDonald: How many of them were just negative votes?

Mr. Nixon: Even in the area of Toronto and district more people supported our party than the NDP. While I am prepared to congratulate the 14 members from Metro and as well the four members from Toronto and district—

Mr. Samis: There is something to work for.

Mr. Nixon: —for their effort in support of my leadership and in support of the Liberal Party, I simply put that before you, Mr. Speaker, to say that I have some regrets about the outcome. But seats count; I don't believe in the distributive ballot. The fact that Murray Gaunt got such an enormous majority, sort of dislocating this distribution, is a matter of some pride for him; and as well Hughie Edighoffer and many others who piled up these large majorities. We did substantially reinforce the basis of support and strength of the Liberal Party and I would predict to you, Mr. Speaker, that my successor is going to stand in this House before you as the leader of a government and this may, in fact, happen sooner than later.

Interjection.

Mr. Roy: We are not going to miss the member for Renfrew South (Mr. Yakabuski) at all.

Interjections.

Mr. Nixon: Even Renfrew South is vulnerable—Renfrew South particularly.

Mr. Ruston: And Middlesex.

Mr. Nixon: Renfrew South particularly.

Mr. Riddell: It just about happened this time, didn't it, Bob?

Mr. Nixon: I must certainly say to you, Mr. Speaker, that while I wish all new members well in their participation in the debate and look forward to hearing this debate as it proceeds, I am proud of those men and women who were elected in the support of Liberal principles and the Liberal platform; and I can assure you, sir, that we will actively participate in the important problems which face this Legislature, which I want to deal with in the time remaining to me.

The first matter I want to refer to is housing. The Minister of Housing (Mr. Rhodes) disappointed me a bit that he did not make a more formal statement today, particularly in response to the new statement of administrative policy from Mr. Danson, the federal minister. Certainly, it takes some time to examine the ramifications of his statements, but I was interested to hear the Minister of Housing indicate that he was at least cautiously optimistic that the initiative taken in Ottawa would be of some assistance in Ontario. The thing that concerned me is that even the rather inflated predictions of housing starts in the next year coming from Mr. Danson still leave, if the distribution of these housing starts is as it has been in the past, Ontario with only 80,000 starts, and this is substantially inadequate. The government has frequently said that anything less than 110,000 starts is not going to improve the crisis situation here and we must have some

new initiatives taken at the provincial level here in the Province of Ontario.

The programme enunciated in Ottawa to provide some assistance with a goal of giving eight per cent mortgage money has been damned already by the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Lewis). I felt at least the intention was one which is supportable on all sides and if, in fact, there isn't enough federal strength to make that effective in this province, surely we can—and it has been promised by the Premier (Mr. Davis) himself that we can—undertake a programme here which, in conjunction with the federal programme, however inadequate it may be, will bring this to an effective reality in this province. One of the areas which I raised in the question period and which formed a part of the policy statement made by the Hon. Donald Macdonald—that's federal Don—having to do with wage and price controls comes from page 19 of the highlights. It says:

> In particular, measures to increase the supply of serviced land, including municipal action to speed up approval of subdivisions and provision of services, will be discussed with the provinces.

I felt a certain degree of naïveté must have gone into that statement, since the federal government I believe must take some strong initiatives to provide financing for housing but surely all of the initiative in freeing up land for servicing and leading municipalities to accept their undoubted responsibilities in this regard lies with us in this House, and the government in particular. I am very much concerned that the initiatives of this government have so far been seen to be seriously inadequate.

We have seen the statements from the Premier establishing a new Ministry of Housing—was that three years ago or four years ago now?—and in fact ever since that time, as if it were a signal, the housing starts in this province have taken a nose-dive, not just because we have a Minister of Housing but in spite of the fact that the government has made this special commitment. We have had a number of ministers now and we have had a number of programmes, most of them being seriously inadequate and unsuccessful.

[3:30 p.m.]

Obviously we as a Legislature must support any government initiative that is going to expedite approvals of applications for subdivisions and so on. I feel that there is still a serious overlapping in the planning responsibility here. We passed a bill a couple of years ago, saying that the Treasurer was the chief planner—in case there was any doubt. It was just a five-line bill. It goes back to the days of Charlie MacNaughton when he, as some of us do from time to time, used to participate in the debates with his fist shaking and his face red; he would get up and say, "I am the chief planner." I think this reflects in the bill which makes the Treasurer (Mr. McKeough) our chief planner.

In some respects this is unfortunate because he's been around now quite a while; and he's taken a good many initiatives in his former capacity as Minister of Municipal Affairs and in other areas of responsibility. I can remember him participating in the extravaganza out at the CNE grounds when the Toronto-centred region plan was first enunciated. What an extravaganza! The house was in darkness, filled with people brought in from all across the province—the mayors, the reeves and all the Tories who wouldn't otherwise have been elected, or asked rather. The house was in darkness, with the spotlight picking out the Premier himself as he came forward to make the statement that a great new planning initiative had been taken. You know, you get this feeling—in South Dumfries we call it "déjà vu"—that it has all happened before.

Hon. Mr. Davis: But would you point out how important that initiative was?

Mr. Nixon: I didn't want to offend the member for Ottawa West (Mr. Morrow) by using French—

Interjections.

Mr. Nixon: But the same is true of—what was John Robarts' programme? The dynamic—

Mr. Bullbrook: Confederation for Tomorrow?

Mr. Nixon: No, no.

Mr. Singer: The Toronto-centred region?

Mr. Nixon: — John Robarts had a programme that was similar to this, then the Toronto-centred region plan—

Hon. Mr. Davis: It was TCR; they were both TCR.

Mr. Nixon: "Design for Development" is the phrase I was trying to raise. It was before the election of 1967, when the public relations experts had really fed it to the Hon. John Robarts. We had all sorts of programmes. Imagine the genius that came out with Home Ownership Made Easy. I can remember the Treasurer, when he used that at the time, he departed from his text to point out to any of

us who might have missed it that that spelled HOME. I said: "My God, this is an election year for sure." They had a programme called the Conservation of Wild Rivers. That was another good one.

Hon. Mr. Davis: We were a little worried about basic English.

Mr. Nixon: But Design for Development—I can remember the Treasurer going around the province setting up these special groups of interested citizens, who met hour after hour to advise the government on planning in their own area.

Mr. Bullbrook: The member for Lambton (Mr. Henderson) used to go with him.

Mr. Nixon: I can remember when the Treasurer got up in the House and dismissed probably six years of hard work and millions of dollars of commitment of public funds with a stroke of his hand, saying: "That won't work. We're going to have a plan that will really do the job." That was the Toronto-centred region plan. Well, that's gone down the drain. Oh, yes it has.

All of the decisions that have been made about the Pickering airport, the North Pickering community; and the big sewer pipe, as it is called, that is going to be running down the east side of Metro—all of those things flew directly in the face of the commitment made by the government in the Toronto-centred region plan.

During the interregnum when the member for Chatham-Kent was—

Mr. Breithaupt: In limbo.

Mr. Nixon: He was in limbo; he didn't have his hands directly on the levers and wires of big government. During that time, a fellow named John White came out of the middle distance in London and spent a few months putting his mark on planning and development in this province. About a year ago now, he got up in the House and said: "We are going to have a land-use and development plan for the whole of the province." He said, "It won't be perfect [oh boy!] but I have instructed the officials in my department [and there are platoons of them] to put this all together and it will be before the House before the end of the fall session."

That was in 1974. We never got the plan and John White isn't here. We're still coping with some of his decisions, however. It appears that as far as land-use planning is concerned we really haven't got anything adequate as yet.

I would say there would be support on all sides for the concept of a land-use plan for the whole of Ontario, particularly predicated on the conservation of class 1 and 2 farm lands and the decentralization of growth from this major metropolitan urban centre. Unless we have this sort of a structure, we can never get to the point where we say to the municipal planning officials: "Go ahead. You have the power given to you from the Legislature to fulfil the general structured plan that is a plan for the whole of the province."

Until we do that, there will always be the reference required to the nameless—well faceless, though we talk to them on the telephone—platoons of planners in the Ministry of Housing or in Treasury to which the members of the Legislature must take recourse when the delay goes on week after week and month after month.

John White tried to do one thing, and I give him credit for that since obviously he was concerned about these delays; he said it was going to be a priority for him to reduce the delay to 60 days or at most 90 days. He failed in that.

The other thing he tried to do was to get us into some direct contact with the platoons of planners in Treasury, Economics and Intergovernmental Affairs. We got an embossed invitation one day to attend some kind of a tea party over in the new parliament buildings. We were there to meet the members of Treasury who would have a planning function and the ones that we would contact directly to assist us in relaying complaints from those municipal people and individuals back home.

I can remember walking into that tea party. They had the very largest room in the new parliament buildings. They had several tea tables set up—as a matter of fact I think there were three bars available. I couldn't get over the fact of the numbers of the staff in the planning departments and branches of Treasury, which is now shared with the Ministry of Housing. There were all of these people—well educated I am sure—who sought us out as individual members.

I remember one very charming lady, who is no longer employed by the government, saying: "Mr. Nixon, I'm glad to meet you. I am the planner for south Brant, Norfolk and east Oxford;" or something like that. I thought, my God! She's a great girl, no doubt she has some degree from somewhere, but if that is the way planning is done no wonder there are these serious delays.

We're simply going to have to put that aside. We're going to have to have a plan for the province. Within that structure we're going to have to give power to and have confidence in locally-elected people and the plannig boards responsible to them, to make the decisions which are going to reduce the delays which this government has not been able to reduce, though they try their best.

I'm saying to you, Mr. Speaker, that there is no other way to do this, that we must have more confidence in those locally-elected people. Until we stop the centralization of this responsibility, we will not come to grips with the problem that has dogged not only this Premier (Mr. Davis) but his predecessor.

There is a solution that is a democratic one. Let us have a plan for the Province of Ontario in a broad structured way and let it be implemented at the local level.

I am very much concerned that this government, having been in office 32 years, has got its thinking somehow entrenched. It is not prepared to look at the alternatives that are available to it. They are defensive about the inadequate decisions and programmes that have been an embarassment in the past and they cannot bring themselves to use the initiative that is obviously necessary if we're going to do something about this continuing series of delays.

It is typical, for example—and this is another emanation from the jurisdiction of John White—that the concept was that rather than fool around with the present municipalities we will build new cities: The idea of John White was to go down into Haldimand and Norfolk counties and look out on those broad fields and say: "Here I will build me a city." It's almost frightening in its biblical overtones; but there wasn't anybody in the cabinet, even the Premier, to stop him.

We went down there and bought two city sites. We're not even talking about the Pickering fiasco; which was such a serious waste of money and a dislocation locally, there's not doubt about that. The part I find almost incredible is that when it came to planning these new cities, John White appointed the present Minister of Government Services—the member for St. David (Mrs. Scrivener); a Conservative member from the heart of downtown Toronto—to go to Norfolk county and chair the planning committee. Members want to know why Jim Allan was beaten—that's why.

The other reason was the quality of the candidate we put forward who was nominated by the local regional council to sit on that planning committee and was turned down by the chairman. The chairman had gone and consulted her master, the Treasurer or whoever it was, and came back and said, "No, we will not allow this sort of local input. We will consult with the chairman of the regional government of Haldimand-Norfolk." Of course, he was appointed by the Tories down here in Toronto, fitting hand in glove with the requirements of the bureaucrats and the planners down here.

I'm telling you, Mr. Speaker, it's got to come to an end. There has to be a decentralization of these controls. We've got to move toward some practical solutions if we're going to have something better than what we have experienced in the last two years under the programmes approved by this government. The need is obvious.

In this province we are blessed with the resources to build homes. In fact, the unemployment levels in the resource industries are seriously high. Some of the sawmills are either shut down or working reduced hours. The plywood plants are the same. We have these resources. We have high levels of unemployment, not only there but in the construction trades in general. We've got the need; we've got the raw materials; we've got the people to do the building and we've got at least two levels of government thrashing around with programmes, some more effective than others.

Surely we can solve the problem. We can build more than 100,000 dwellings in a year in this province and we must set our sights even higher than that. I say to you, Mr. Speaker, that one of the keys to the bottleneck where our responsibility impinges is to decentralize these decision-making powers and have confidence in locally-elected councils.

I want to say something about the decentralization programme which we did repeatedly talk about in the election campaign. We feel that the emphasis must come on local authority. The Treasurer (Mr. McKeough) has talked about deconditionalizing grants but still has not done sufficient in that regard. He refers to his commitment made in Calgary—was it the Calgary commitment or the Edmonton commitment? It's a sort of catch word—instead of lacing into the federal government. It's almost like Pavlov's dogs. All he has to do is talk about the Edmonton commitment and the municipal officials are supposed to nod and say, "That's right, the villains are federal villains."

I don't believe that is so. I believe it is time the Treasurer made a commitment that the municipalities will share in a specific part of the income tax revenues we get as a matter of right and by agreement from the government of Canada. The money is collected without strings attached and is payable to this jurisdiction.

I believe the money should be passed on in part, as a part which is specific to a commitment, rather than leaving the municipal people at the mercies and the political whims of the Treasurer who from time to time says, "No more money unless it comes from Ottawa." Or, if the spirit moves him and an election is imminent, he says, "We will break that rule but just under certain circumstances and just for certain areas which follow our leadership into regional government" for example; or it's for "Regional governments which are experiencing budgetary problems."

We believe there has to be a sharing of this particular resource which grows as the economy of the nation grows and, I suppose, as inflation expands. This is what we believe is the basis of decentralizing the authorities of government.

The government, instead of doing it that way, has caught some kind of disease whereby it feels compelled to set up so-called regional offices across this province. The Attorney General has eight regional offices; Correctional Services has four; Education has nine; Environment has five; Natural Resources has eight. Of course conservation authorities have their own overlapping responsibilities.

[3:45]

Housing has regional offices set up on three bases. They have regional offices for community planning; regional offices on another basis for subdivision control; regional offices on another basis for assisted housing programmes.

I suppose it would be too simple for the government to say: "All right, we are going to have offices out of Queen's Park, closer to the community. We are going to establish regional boundaries which are going to be identical or nearly identical right across the province." But no, that is not the way it has happened. We have the overlapping boundaries and the confusion which must be a continuing problem for people at the municipal level in dealing with government.

One of the things that concerns me is that even when they do contact the regional offices, so-called, if it is a decision of any importance at all it has to be referred to Queen's Park anyway.

I personally believe that kind of regionalization is a snare and a delusion. It is simply a waste of money. Those regional offices for education cost $11 million to service—

Mr. Cassidy: You're sure?

An hon. member: You're certain of those figures?

Mr. Nixon: —and in my opinion they have no useful function at all. We, as a government or as taxpayers, could save close to $50 million if we rationalized this regional procedure and in fact put the responsibility at the community level and withdrew the regional offices right across the board.

We believe as a party that this would serve democracy. It would emphasize the responsibility of the local community and, of course, it would save us money. And we are very much concerned with saving money. Even the Treasurer talks about it from time to time.

According to his recent statement his projection for the deficit—or the net cash requirement I think he is calling it this year—is $1.912 billion. One of his predecessors—we've talked about him; Jim Allan, the former member for Haldimand-Norfolk—when he was Treasurer didn't like to use the word "deficit" either. He talked about a cash shortfall. Whatever it is, it is money we must extract from the economy of this community in one way or another.

It was interesting to talk about the teachers' superannuation fund in New York saving that city from bankruptcy. We don't have that alternative here because we have already sucked these funds dry—

Hon. Mr. Davis: With a slight dinstinction. They don't make the same contribution over there either.

Mr. Nixon: —transferred the funds from the teachers' pension and the public service pension and also the Canada Pension Plan. All that money is used just as if it is revenue to the Treasurer, and there is no thought that the beneficiaries should have anything to say whatsoever about that, and, of course, we get that money at a very favourable rate of interest. Oh, yes, a very favourable rate of interest. Just over eight per cent—what is it?

An hon. member: Eight and a quarter, I believe.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Currently?

Mr. Singer: What is the current rate?

Mr. Nixon: I would suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, that it was just a year ago that the Treasurer himself indicated the access to these funds was a substantial monetary advantage to the financing of the programmes of this government.

I simply point out that we have used those funds, using the power that the government has extracted from the Legislature, as if they were general revenue funds.

I think it is very misleading indeed when the Treasurer simply says, "We have no deficits associated with that money." We've got to pay it back and his friends that he has lunch with in New York are concerned about it as well.

I believe that triple-A rating is a holdover from old Charlie MacNaughton and John Robarts. We used to kid them. We used to call him "white-lipped and trembling," because Mr. MacNaughton used to get up and say, "We face a fiscal nightmare unless something is done to bring the expenditures of this province under control." He's gone to sort of a Senate of the province; he's chairman of the Racing Commission and maybe he's not worried about it much any more. But it seems to me there is nobody on the government side worried or concerned about those matters.

The deficit—the net cash requirement— is $1.912 billion and I would predict, and I think even the Treasurer (Mr. McKeough) is even prepared to predict that this year when the accounts are all in the net cash requirement will be $2 billion. For all of his unctuous statements about cutting government costs, I predict we will have at least that large a net cash requirement next year and it will be in excess of $2 billion. Of all the posturing about saving money, the statement made by the Chairman of the Management Board (Mr. Auld)—who is just returning to his office to sign important papers and otherwise rest—

Hon. Mr. Davis: He is meeting a delegation from Sarnia.

Mr. Bullbrook: They won't get very far with Lorne.

Mr. Singer: Tell us exactly how many contract people there are in government employment.

Mr. Nixon: —made much of the fact that our civil service complement has been reduced by 1,500. I defy anybody in this province to detect any pressures that have come on the community because of the reduction of this complement. Nobody even noticed that those people had gone away. So much for the comments about saving money and, you know, "We're going to cut the expenditure from government without interfering with the high quality of our government programmes." Of course they're not going to interfere with the quality of the government programmes because the money they're cutting out is pure fat—unnecessary in the first place. We have been treated on at least three occasions to statements by the Treasurer and his predecessor about how great and brave new retrenchment programmes will be undertaken to cut government costs. They make these great statements and the sycophantic editors of the Globe & Mail say, "Isn't this great?" and "Isn't it too bad that Ottawa doesn't do the same thing?" when in fact it just doesn't make any difference to the quality of the programmes.

Hon. Mr. Davis: You borrowed that word from Stephen.

Mr. Lewis: Yes, but he pronounced it correctly.

Mr. Nixon: I didn't mean to offend the Sun in any way.

Mr. Lewis: No, no, no.

Mr. Nixon: Where's your lunch, Clare? I thought you usually had your lunch when you came in here.

Mr. Lewis: My goodness, this is a nasty day.

Hon. Mr. Bernier: He took his ugly pills.

Mr. Nixon: Anyway, Mr. Speaker, if I may continue, the Treasurer has made much of his commitment to cutting government costs, and yet in the mini-budget, just before the election, he announced that he was going to reduce the sales tax by two per cent, that he was giving a home ownership grant of what amounted to $1,500, that he was taking the tax off automobiles—by the way, I bought a car for myself a few days ago, and it is nice to buy it without the tax—

Hon. W. Newman: Isn't that a conflict of interest?

Hon. Mr. Snow: Got the tax rebate yet?

Mr. Nixon: I haven't had the cheque yet, and unless they settle the postal strike I'm going to go over to the Treasury and pick it up.

Mr. Bullbrook: Lorne just sold his car. He has a chauffeur. He resides in Petrolia.

Hon. Mr. Snow: Why not? Better than Sarnia.

Mr. Nixon: It is so interesting to see a small note here, in the Quarterly Report of Ontario Finances, dated Sept. 30, and I quote from the third paragraph: "The greater than anticipated success of the government's economic initiatives, such as homebuyers' grants and car rebates, has also increased the deficit." These initiatives were simply electioneering. If the government had wanted to do something to stimulate the automobile industry it should have taken place a year ago, when the great layoffs in Windsor and other areas were taking place, but no, it had to wait until that economy was, in fact, beginning to recover before it took the tax off. We as Liberals believe we should not have sales tax as our principal source of provincial revenue and we think the sales tax should stay at five per cent rather than automatically go back to seven per cent.

For the Treasurer to talk about these economic initiatives, it's interesting to note that they have cost us $423 million at last count and no significant cutback in government expenditures has taken place. We still have an inflated cabinet, we still have the policy secretaries, and one of them is here today. Really it's like an appointment to the Senate. I don't know what the Provincial Secretary for Resources Development (Mr. Irvine) is doing. I'm glad to see him here but I don't believe his services are, in fact, necessary in that particular capacity. The cabinet would have surely been the place to start saving money.

Mr. Roy: His contribution has always been limited, you know.

Mr. Nixon: We have seen the example of the government, under Bill 100, hiring a fact-finder, a mediator, at $500 a day and now ignoring those recommendations completely. There has just been no commitment at all to some sort of a rational control of expenditures.

I was interested to hear the Premier (Mr. Davis) the other day in response to a question from my colleague and good friend, the member for Grey-Bruce (Mr. Sargent) who asked about the fulfilment of election promises. The Premier can think of only two—one was a programme to subsidize mortgage interests and the other was to assist the elderly. Later he said, "Oh, yes, we promised to buy the grape crop, too."

We've been trying to keep track of these things because during the election campaign we—or I, as leader,—would go into a constituency and they would say, "The government is going to build a new arena down here. If you are elected, would you build it, too?" I was really amazed that a government so concerned with the cost of its programmes would go through the province, having already made a special political commitment of of $400 million in vote buying, and still feel it had to distribute this kind of electoral largesse.

The list I have is 55 promises of gifts handed out by the Premier and the members of the government. One of them was raised today. It was a commitment, a loan, to Kroehler to purchase RCA at Owen Sound. It was a commitment for $500,000—

Hon. Mr. Bennett: It was a loan.

Mr. Nixon: —made in Aug. 28 by Mr. Winkler, the former member for the area, who was Chairman of the Management Board. For the Premier to get up in his place and imply that unless he personally made the promise it doesn't count is the same kind of answer we got yesterday when I pointed out to him that the election expenses commission had written him a letter saying that the actions of his government were in contravention of the intention of the Election Expenses Act. He said, "That's just an opinion of one person." It was the opinion of the election expenses commission. It really is incredible that the Premier can get away with that sort of statement in this House. It really is incredible. I want to read some of these promises but I won't read them all.

Mr. Singer: Read them all.

Mr. Nixon: Maybe I should.

Loans to developers of low-income housing, spokesman Donald Irvine, Aug. 11, $47.5 million.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Done.

Mr. Roy: Does that still apply?

Mr. Nixon: Prince Edward Region Conservation Authority, promised by J. Taylor, $3,000. He didn't think he was in so much trouble. Eighty double-decker GO coaches promised by John Rhodes, approximately $25 million, promised Aug. 11.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: It's done.

Hon. Mr. Bennett: It's done.

Mr. Nixon: It's not done. As a matter of fact it is not done.

Interjection.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: We are still waiting for Mr. Trudeau's promise of 1974 or 1972 was it?

An hon member: He'll weasel out of it.

Mr. Nixon: It may be but meanwhile Mr. Godfrey, the chairman of Metropolitan Toronto, is on his way back from Amsterdam or Vienna or somewhere where he was looking at other light rail facilities rather than using the initiatives of the government of Ontario.

Here's one I hope the Treasurer can say "done" for. Westminster Ponds Park in London, promised by Gord Walker, then MPP; $1.25 million, promised Aug. 13. Actually it was promised before the last election—

Hon. Mr. McKeough: That's been reduced.

Mr. Nixon: —but he was elected and they didn't feel they had to fulfil it. This time he was defeated.

Mr. Singer: They don't have to fulfil it now.

Mr. Nixon: They probably will feel they can renege on that, too. Is that one done? You haven't done that yet?

Interjection.

Mr. Nixon: Here is an interesting one. An OHAP loan in Sarnia, promised by L. Henderson, MPP; $3 million promised Aug. 15. That was in Sarnia.

Mr. Singer: Yes, yes.

Mr. Roy: Very good, Lorne.

Mr. Nixon: And another one on OHAP grants in Sarnia. They were really out to get that riding. Promised by L. Henderson, $600 for each low-income home; $500 for each middle-income home; $450 for each above-average home, on Aug. 15. Is that what you are supposed to do? Is that really what you do as Minister without Portfolio? Are you in charge?

Hon. Mr. Henderson: I did those things as a private member.

Interjections.

Mr. Speaker: The leader of the Liberal Party will continue.

Mr. Nixon: Maybe the Minister without Portfolio is in charge of fulfilling election promises.

Mr. Foulds: Lorne, is that your first ministerial statement?

Mr. Cassidy: What do you do, Lorne?

Mr. Nixon: Otherwise he has become known as the minister for patronage. I'm not sure that is fair because since he has been in the cabinet we haven't heard a damn thing from him.

Hon. Mr. Henderson: You haven't been around much.

[4:00]

Mr. Nixon: Mr. Speaker, I want to go on with this list.

Cobourg senior citizens' housing was promised by Russell Rowe at a cost of $1,195,000 on Aug. 19—

Mr. Singer: Oh yes—

Mr. Nixon: Buses for the handicapped were promised by Mel Lastman at a cost of $45,000 on Aug. 20—

Mr. Singer: Remember him? Whatever happened to him?

Mr. Roy: He was a bad boy.

Mr. Nixon: The Cape Croker Indians were going to get $5,000 from Eric Winkler, but his promises don't count any more, the Premier said.

Mr. Cassidy: They never did.

Hon. Mr. Bennett: That was promised long ago.

Mr. Nixon: That was promised Aug. 20.

A study of wood waste as fuel was promised in Hearst by Dennis Timbrell.

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: They got it.

Mr. Nixon: There was no cost there. That was promised on Aug. 20.

Mr. Singer: That was the one they got, yes.

Mr. Good: That didn't cost anything.

Mr. Nixon: A sports field in Napanee, valued at $14,000, was promised by Jim Taylor on Aug. 25.

Ontario Career Action—1,000 student jobs were promised by the Premier on Aug. 26.

A trauma centre was promised by the Premier on Aug. 26; no cost involved.

Mr. Foulds: That's the Legislature.

Mr. Roy: That's for his own members.

Mr. Nixon: A community centre in Durham was promised by Mr. Davis for $350,000.

That's in Eric's former riding. They were really worried there and with good reason they promised all this.

Hon. Mr. Snow: None of those are in Oakville. Have you got any for Oakville?

Mr. Nixon: I have already referred to the Middlesex courthouse, promised by Mr. Stewart and Mr. White on Sept. 1; $2.7 million.

Georgian College in Owen Sound was promised $900,000 by a chap named Harron, the Progressive Conservative candidate, on Sept. 2.

Interjection.

Mr. Nixon: A community centre in Atikokan was promised by the Minister of Culture and Recreation (Mr. Welch), $83,075, on Sept. 2.

Interjections.

Mr. Nixon: A new government building in Dryden; a new government building in Huntsville—oh, the list is very long. Homes for the aged in Hawkesbury; a sports complex in Hawkesbury; a community centre in Rousseau; hospital expansion in Tillsonburg.

An institute of occupational health—the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Lewis) would be interested in that.

Mr. Laughren: Do you think we will get it?

Mr. Nixon: An institute of occupational health was promised by the Premier on Sept. 6.

A tax rebate for seasonal farm workers, I say to the Minister of Agriculture and Food (Mr. W. Newman), was promised by the Premier on Sept. 9; it was $150 per worker.

A Centre des Jeunes—

Mr. Roy: Was that in Ottawa?

Mr. Nixon: In Sudbury, not in Ottawa—was promised by Mr. Welch—$58,000 on Sept. 9.

Mr. Roy: No promises in my riding.

Mr. Nixon: Historic Timbertown was promised in Renfrew by Mr. Bennett—$85,500.

Mr. Singer: That didn't help either.

Mr. Nixon: A sports arena at Belle River—$525,000.

Mr. Ruston: Oh yes! Right on.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Listen, do you want us to take back the money from Belle River?

Mr. Ruston: Oh no.

Mr. Nixon: I thought the Premier would be concerned and just so he won't miss any of these promises, I would ask the page to take him this copy of the promises made by himself and his colleagues. We have retained a copy and we will be asking from time to time how the the government is progressing, not only with fulfilling the promises but finding the money in this year of retrenchment; in this year when the Treasurer (Mr. McKeough) says we are cutting back; in this year when we receive in the mail, all of us as members, a publication of the Ministry of Treasury, Economics and Intergovernmental Affairs entitled, "Insight." It shows a picture of the smiling Treasurer.

Mr. Roy: Oh, funny!

Mr. Nixon: It says, "Photos tell the story: A picture is worth 10,000 words, as the Chinese proverb suggests, and these photographs sum up election results for the two TEIGA cabinet ministers. Mr. McKeough won his largest plurality since entering provincial politics in 1963—"

Mr. Singer: All the way up to 2,000.

Mr. Bullbrook: They love you, Darcy.

Mr. Nixon: "A total of 61.7 per cent of the 37,786 eligible voters in Chatham-Kent voted Sept. 18.—"

Mr. Ruston: Small turnout.

Mr. Nixon: "Mr. McKeough received 10,146 votes, compared to 7,347 for Liberal Jim Cooke."

An hon. member: Some plurality!

Mr. Nixon: If the Chatham-Kent Tory Association, or even the Liberal Association, wanted to put that up, I think it is great. We wouldn't put it in blue, which evidently is the TEIGA colour—

Hon. J. R. Smith: True blue.

Mr. Nixon: —but the taxpayers are paying for this baloney. When we open this up—they are always looking for fillers—

Mr. Bullbrook: They are all the same.

Mr. Nixon: "What do you remember about the 1975 budget?" asks Hal Tennant, who no doubt is paid a substantial amount of money. He is a very able person; I thought

they were very lucky to get his services, yet he spends his time making up quizzes.

> In April, budgetary expenditures proposed for the year amounted to—almost $8 billion; slightly more than $9.3 billion; almost $10.2 billion; $12 billion; or none of the above?

Mr. Breithaupt: Or all of the above.

Mr. Nixon: That's right. It says in question No. 4:

> According to the Treasurer, the Ontario civil service increased 3.2 per cent since 1972, while the federal civil service grew by—five per cent; 12 per cent; 19 per cent; 24 per cent?

Well, well. It says:

> By announcing that a certain federal reduction in excise tax would be passed on to consumers, the mini-budget provided at least a small measure of joy for beer drinkers, wine drinkers, car buyers or race-track betters.

Interjection.

Mr. Nixon: This is just most fatuous waste of public money. If the Treasurer wants to save money in the budget, he is going to have to start thinking in terms of cutting out this sort of thing, as well as unctuously saying: "Why doesn't the federal government do as we do?"

The Treasurer is just asking for it. He is riding for a fall. This government has got so much fat in its expenditures—and I won't refer to anything else other than that—but it has so much fat in its expenditures and its programmes that it could retrench by 20 per cent and nobody would ever know the difference.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, just on a point of order and information—and I will be very nonprovocative. The leader of the Liberal Party sent me a list; and if it is anything like some of the research that he has done, there are probably some items missing. I will try to fill it in, but I wonder if he would mark on this list those items that he feels should be totally eliminated from any consideration.

Mr. Nixon: As usual, Mr. Speaker, the Premier doesn't want to be provocative, but as a matter of fact I would tell him—

Hon. Mr. Davis: We will get into his promises later.

Mr. Nixon: —so that his platoons of researchers are not going to waste their time unduly, that the list was as complete as we could get it up to about five days before the election. That's just when the Premier got desperate—so God knows what was promised in those five days.

Interjection.

Mr. Nixon: Actually, we are going to be following up on the commitments made. I would think that this government is going to have to concern itself very deeply with them.

I want to talk as well about a situation that concerns us very deeply—wage and price controls. I felt that the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Lewis) dealt very effectively with it in his remarks yesterday. I agreed with a good many of the things that he said—that the government is selective as far as assuming responsibilities for certain areas goes and leaving the rest to the federal authorities. But I am very glad indeed that they did not leave the responsibility for energy costs anywhere but right in this House, because we must deal with it here.

We are the biggest consumers, and the stated federal policy—and it comes from the statement of Mr. Donald Macdonald, the Minister of Finance—is to allow the price of energy to continue to rise in a series of orderly steps. If their commitment is that the price of energy rises to the world price, then certainly I don't accept that and I would hope that nobody in this House accepts that.

We believe very strongly that there has not been sufficient provincial or federal leadership in this matter, because we in this province are not devoid of energy resources. For us to be under the requirements that our costs are dictated outside of this province, particularly in Alberta, is unacceptable to us.

British Columbia has resources in natural gas and Saskatchewan has resources in oil and gas. We have resources in uranium and water power—and certainly uranium in the long run may be more valuable than any other energy resources. The Province of Quebec, in the development of hydro resources at James Bay and elsewhere, has some of the largest developments in the world and already has surplus power. In Nova Scotia there are coal and water power resources. Newfoundland has Churchill Falls, which will be one of the largest water resources in the world when it is fully developed.

Surely we can be self-sufficient in our energy utilization and have programmes for conservation that will be effective. Surely the thrust on this province should be for a national policy of sharing these resources. We must be

ready to put our uranium resources on the line. In fact they already are, since they come on a shared basis of control with the government of Canada.

I want to say that we believe the government should have accepted and must in the future accept, a substantially lower increase for the cost of electrical energy than has been demanded by Ontario Hydro and approved by the Ontario Energy Board. The representatives of my party will make that position clear when it comes to the meetings of the energy committee. My point is this: Where it suits the government, it keeps the control of costs and prices within its own hands, using the powers of this Legislature.

The same is true for rents. It was indicated in the federal statement that all provinces would be asked to impose some sort of rent control. I'm very glad indeed that the policy of the government has been maintained and that there will be rent review associated with this. That leaves a substantial area of provincial responsibility which we and the NDP believe should still comee under the direction and control of the government of Ontario utilizing the power and authority of this House.

Specifically, it deals with the employees of this government and agencies of this government. It deals with professional incomes and it deals with the teachers. The argument is put forward rather strongly and with some effect by the Treasurer that when we talk about a provincial implementation of a control procedure somehow or other we're taking a soft stand in this regard. Even if that were so—and I say to you strongly and without equivocation it is not so—the Prime Minister of Canada has indicated that wherever salaries go beyond those guidelines it will be taxed from the recipient by means of a surtax procedure. In other words, the final control still lies with the income taxing powers of the government of Canada.

This is surely only a side issue. We are a Legislature which must exert its responsibilities in conjunction with and parallel to the statements made by the spokesman for the government of Canada in imposing wage and price controls.

The Treasurer has indicated that I am talking about letting teachers and civil servants come to the head of the line. I am talking about no special favouritism but a strong and even-handed application of the laws of Canada which allow obvious variations in the decisions of the wage and price review board. It is clear from every statement which has come out of Ottawa that there will be and there will be expected to be legal variations concerned with the timing of the last contract, historical relationships and, of course, the make-up requirements which are obviously a part of a fair application of any kind of wage and price controls.

We believe the 18-month delay the Minister of Education (Mr. Wells) referred to concerns those who should not be a part of these negotiations. We believe we are heading for a number of weeks of extremely troublesome labour relations in this province. I heard David Archer, the president of the Federation of Labour, say he is prepared to go to jail and he advised other labour leaders to accept his lead in this regard if they feel they are being treated unfairly by the manifestations and orders of federal regulations.

It's interesting to note that the Ontario civil servants' organization has just received full ratification and involvement under the aegis of the Ontario Federation of Labour. Those people are the employees of this government. Their labour leader has indicated clearly that he is prepared—and he suggests that they should be prepared—to got to jail rather than accept anything they feel or they believe to be unfair in the imposition of these regulations.

This must surely have an impact on our thinking. David Archer's been around a long time and he is not given to irresponsible statements. What I gathered from his comment is that the Federation of Labour is going to take a strong and independent stand and that will include the employees of this province.

We know what happened a year ago when we were dealing with the employees of Ontario. For us to face a repeat of that situation in which the government can only say, "We can do nothing. This is in the hands of the government in Ottawa" is unacceptable and, in my view, unconscionable.

[4:15]

The second instance is even more emergent; that the secondary school teachers of this metropolitan area will, most reasonable people predict, be on strike beginning a week from tomorrow. Sure, we hope that it won't be so. The Minister of Education has said that hope springs eternal. But under the circumstances as they presently are, there will be a strike.

The only way that strike will come to a conclusion, I suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, is by the authority of this House, perhaps a month from now, maybe six weeks from now. I say to you, Mr. Speaker, that it is unconscionable and impossible that we be asked to

use the authority of this House to put the teachers back in the classrooms after the elapse of some time if, in fact, we have abdicated completely our responsibility to assist at least—

Mr. Bullbrook: Right. Think of it.

Mr. Nixon: —in the negotiations and the settlement which causes the strike in the first place. I hope that the Premier does not believe that this is some sort of a political posture. We are prepared to say—and also listen to his nonprovocative interjections. We are prepared to say that the—

Hon. Mr. Davis: I haven't been provocative all day.

Mr. Nixon: From time to time you are.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Oh yes. Usually with provocation.

Mr. Nixon: We have heard the Premier say that in no way is it a political reaction of the government to say that as far as all the teachers are concerned, all the doctors, all the public servants, that the government in Ottawa, or some board will look after it. Obviously it is a political godsend for a government that faces an acrimonious lengthy strike of secondary school teachers in the capital city—not way off in Windsor or up in Thunder Bay, where they could cope with it with equanimity and let it go on and on you know. What a lovely thing to say; "That's got nothing to do with us."

Then with our civil servants; and you know what has happened over the last two years. They have strong, militant leadership and the former Chairman of the Management Board knows what that is; he dealt with them last year. Isn't it beautiful to say: "We would like to do something but we can do nothing. You are in the hands of the government in Ottawa."

The doctors have stated without equivocation that they are demanding a 40 to 50 per cent increase. Now we could deal with that in this Legislature—not in the back rooms of the Minister of Health's office, but by a committee of the Legislature where any justification would have to come forward and the guidelines and applications of the federal law can be imposed.

Surely there is nothing unreasonable about this? In fact there is every reasonable expectation, if we look at the future, to see that we will be called into session—or perhaps it will be before we adjourn—to force the teachers back into their classrooms by the undoubted power of the Legislature. We will have to respond at least if Mr. Archer, the president of the Federation of Labour, carries out his threat, and allows himself to be put in jail, be incarcerated because he will not follow the imposition of certain rulings coming from Ottawa having to do with wage and price controls. We cannot abdicate our undoubted responsibilities in this regard.

I feel very strongly that the Premier should look at these circumstances. Both opposition parties have formally put this strong alternative to him. He may be prepared to stand firm in a commitment which has been stated very firmly.

We don't have to go through the rigmarole that nobody wants an election. We don't want an election, that's obvious, but I'll tell you that in a House of 125, 74 members believe that there should be at least some sort of a provincial administrative body that will apply the regulations under the federal law under the circumstances which are constitutionally ours. Once again, I hope that you won't misinterpret my view that 64 per cent of the voters in Ontario supported these two groups and, speaking not for all those individuals but for that political position, we are saying without equivocation that this is, in all conscience, what should be done.

We have heard the arguments that the government feels it is undoubtedly supporting the initiative of the government of Canada. You can support them in a way which gives leadership to the other provinces, and we want you to do this, but surely in a province like this, with the powers—the undoubted powers —of this Legislature, it is incumbent upon us to have some mechanism for the application of those powers to those directly in receipt of the manifestations of those powers in this province. I want to put it to the House on that basis.

I said I agree with much of what the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Lewis) has said in this regard but our stand has been stated independently and in the question period in this House before now. I'm glad the Premier is here because I feel this very strongly.

We're going to have a vote sometime before this House adjourns that a humble address be sent to Her Honour thanking her for her speech. We're not going to stand on any old-fashioned approaches. We're prepared to say: "Yes, let's send her a humble address."

Look at it this way: These two parties believe there should be some sort of administrative procedure at the provincial level to carry out the responsibilities which have been

put before the House by the Leader of the Opposition and perhaps less effectively but just as sincerely by me.

What is the avenue open to us to convince the Tories that this is not a political posture? We believe this essential for the people of Ontario. It is essential for the conduct of our role in Confederation. It is essential for the government of the Province of Ontario.

There is only one alternative to us and that is to put forward an amendment to the motion before the House. This was open to the Leader of the Opposition and he very carefully said that it is still open to him, and this debate will undoubtedly continue for three weeks. Who knows what the final disposition will be?

My colleagues and I have sweated over this. I say again, nobody wants an election. The taxpayers don't want an election but I'll tell you, the electorate said: This group in opposition has a clear commitment to provincial involvement in this matter. They sent that group in support of the government.

Mr. Bullbrook: Let it be understood.

Mr. Nixon: I just want to make it that clear. There is no alternative. There is no vote. There is nothing we can do except, on a matter like this, say: "Surely in a democracy the majority should govern."

This is a matter, I suppose, of some basic difference in principle but it is this and I put it to the Premier: It may be high principled but please do not say we do not support the federal wage and price control because we do. We regret that they are necessary but it has been decided that they are necessary and they will eventually become the law of the land. They will become the law as it applies in this province. I'm saying that if democracy means anything it is time for the government to reassess its position at least.

The government may say: "This is a good election issue. We can go out and say the Liberals and the NDP want to favour the teachers and they want to favour the civil servants and so forth." It would probably be a good election issue, but it is more than that. It is a matter of good government and we feel committed to that.

Mr. Speaker, having given you this sort of explanation for the position, I would like to move an amendment.

Mr. Speaker: Mr. Nixon moves that this House regrets the failure of the government to accept its responsibility to provide for the direct administration of federal wage and price controls.

Hon. Mr. Welch moved the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. Speaker: Orders of the day.

Clerk of the House: The 13th order; House in committee of supply.

ESTIMATES, MINISTRY OF EDUCATION
(continued)

On vote 2802:

Mr. Chairman: When we rose at 6 p.m. last evening we were on vote 2802, item 2, curriculum development; and the member for Durham East had the floor.

Mr. Moffatt: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I wanted to take a couple of minutes at this time to point out to the hon. minister what I consider to be a problem only he can deal with. In his opening remarks on the estimates on the first day of his committee, I congratulated the minister on his appropriate remarks, in which he indicated the communications problem and the problem of criticism of the school system could be, to a great extent, eliminated by the inclusion of parents in a meaningful fashion in the actual decision making and day to day operations of the school. I think that what the hon. minister said makes real sense. I regret, though, that what he has said doesn't seem to get into the school operation.

In practical terms, what in fact happens when a Minister of Education makes a statement, no matter what the statement may be, is that it goes through the following kind of delivery system before it finally gets to the people who have to understand and implement it. The statement goes to the minister; to the Mowat Block; to the region; to the director; to the superintendent of one sort or another; to the area superintendent; to the principal; to the department head in the case of a secondary school; and then, if good luck prevails, it goes to the teacher. Then, lo and behold, it may go to the pupil and eventually that statement may go to the parent.

That kind of convoluted passage of information, I think, is exactly what the minister wants to get rid of. But all he has done is deal in a sort of platitudinous manner with the problem and suggest the solu-

tion. He has not told us, in fact, how he proposes to get that solution into the hands of the people who really matter.

The group over here during the election referred to the return to the three Rs when they wanted to develop a core curriculum. If you looked very carefully at what they were talking about, what they were in fact saying was: "We need a core curriculum at the secondary level."

I would suggest to the hon. minister that that is completely silly. We do not need a core curriculum of the three 'Rs" at the secondary level. What we need is some basic idea establishing very clearly with teachers, parents and students what is expected of people in the elementary school; not in educational jargon, not in vague philosophical terms, but in real practical terms.

We need objectives that are clearly understood by the people at large. If we have that kind of goal set by the ministry, which will give us a parameter within which teachers can plan effectively the variety of things they can implement in order to achieve those goals, then I think we'll be on our way to establishing the kind of educational system which will have some meaning to the public. Then we won't have great discussion about returning to some kind of three "Rs" programme, which never was that good anyway.

But we can't stop there. If we have that kind of development at the elementary level we'll be able, I think, to then address ourselves to the problem at the secondary level, to which these people didn't address themselves. That is the problem of explaining to students what they will need when they finish those four or five years of secondary school in order to pursue whatever post-secondary education they may wish to pursue.

It is not enough to say to people: "Look, there are 65 options open to you at the secondary level, choose 12 of them each year or four of them or whatever." It's not enough to say that. It is incumbent upon the ministry right through all of its offices to say to students and parents at the secondary level: "Look, the following things will be expected of you when you finish." So far we have not had that kind of goal-setting and that's where we have to go, it seems to me.

I don't mean that we should tell people what they have to take. I mean we should tell people what they have to expect if they take course X, Y or Z. In those terms, then, we can say that we have dealt honestly and fairly with the students and with the public.

The other day we talked at length about OISE and the problem of delivery of their programmes to the teachers. It seems to me that what we should be doing with regard to OISE and all of the other programmes, is taking very careful consideration of what those programmes mean to the students.

In practical terms, the minister should be explaining to us what he proposes to do over the next several months to make sure that his statement of philosophy is transformed into practical terms. Somebody needs to be able to say to teachers: "At the end of a month or at the end of a year, what are your pupils going to know." They should be able to give you an answer; and I submit to you, sir, that they cannot give that kind of answer today.

Now the person who was my opponent for the government party in the election was the chairman of a committee in the last House which investigated the utilization of school facilities, and I believe that committe reported many things that coincide with the minister's observations in his statement the other day. But it is not enough to simply say those are good statements and those are good thoughts and we like that philosophy. We have to be prepared to act on those things. Somewhere along the line that whole educational hierarchy I listed a few minutes ago needs to be short-circuited so that the pronouncements of the ministry, without the jargon, are delivered directly to the students and to the parents and to the people who pay the bills.

That's what people are talking about. I don't think that the average citizen of Ontario minds paying his tax bill if he sees that he gets value for that dollar. It's when he doesn't understand what happens to the tax dollar in education that he starts to criticize education in general. He criticizes, then, the actions of the minister; he criticizes the action of the deputy minister; he criticizes the teachers; he criticizes the students.

And basically his criticism is aimed at the wrong people. What he should be informed of, in real terms, are those things which the schools are doing. Now one way—and it is only one way of doing that—is to go along with the minister's suggestion to have parents into the school in a meaningful way.

But that isn't happening. You can count on the fingers of one hand the number of schools across the province where in fact that does happen on a day-to-day basis. Not open house in the fall and parent's night in the spring, or something else like that; something like education week which is supposed

to be the showplace of education. We should not have education week, we should have education year. It should be every year and it should last all year long.

The kind of thing I'm talking about, Mr. Chairman, would lead to a day-to-day involvement of the parents and the students in the educational system which would make the kind of three Rs comments we heard for 37 days completely redundant.

I would like the minister to respond in some practical way to how he is going to get that kind of delivery system built into the Ministry of Education, because if it doesn't happen, Mr. Minister, we're going to have those same comments and those same criticisms. They will be just as unjustified, but they will be just as believable as they were in the past election.

I have great question about the kinds of results that we hear from surveys. In the school of which I was principal up until the election we took part in the survey alluded to the other day where certain people were selected or elected or chosen by lot to respond to post-secondary educational goals and so on. Believe me, most of the parents who took part in the survey did not understand the questions, they had to phone up ex-teachers, board members, teachers and principals to ask them what the questions meant. That's the communication problem—that's the breakdown, and that's what goes on in every single aspect.

If we would firmly establish in clear understandable terms what the objectives of this ministry might be, then we would be able to say, "Okay people, this is what our education system is trying to do. If you want to criticize our system, criticize it on the basis of it not meeting your objectives. Or of it not standing up to your criticism. Or of it not jibing with what you think it should be doing in ethnic terms."

Those are legitimate differences of opinion, and as politicians, as teachers, as citizens, we can certainly answer those criticisms. But for the minister to simply say that it's not his problem, that some other person in the hierarchy should answer, doesn't answer anything. It leaves the whole question up in the air, and it causes us grave difficulties.

Mr. Chairman: Does the minister have a comment?

Hon. Mr. Wells: Yes, Mr. Chairman, I welcome these comments. What my friend is doing is pointing out one of the real challenges to getting across a better communication policy, particularly between the schools and the parents and in a more general sense, between the schools and the taxpayers.

I think it's fair to say that some of those who have been—I say have been because I hope there aren't too many around who are—violently opposed to this kind of concept, are the very people who have to be committed to this concept in order to make it work. If you read some of the speeches I made on the community school idea about a year ago, you'll remember I said several things. One was you can't impose community education on a community—you don't wave a big stick and say, "Friends, you have to have it in your community." It has to come up from the bottom.

The community has to want to have a community school. If they don't want a community school, you can't impose it on them. And trying to impose it by saying that "all of you should be involved with your school, that you should have it," it won't bring it about. You won't get it because the apathy will be there. "Somebody else from away off somewhere is trying to impose this on us," they will say. This is what prevents it from happening.

I also said that should a community decide from the grassroots that it really does want a community school—that it wants to be involved with the school, it wants to have open communication, it wants to use the school building for a multitude of purposes, it wants to be involved in the planning of the school programme—but the principal of that school does not like that idea, is not committed to that kind of programme and really wants to put road blocks in the way of that kind of a development in his community, believe me he will be able to put the road blocks there and you won't have a community school.

It's going to be difficult if the principal fights for the traditional type of operation where he and the teachers run a kind of a closed corporation where they don't want the parents to be involved except when they want them involved. Or when we make school visitors official in the Education Act should they bring about the kind of manifestations I indicated yesterday where they want to stick big signs on the door to be sure that visitors see the principal first so that they don't interrupt the—as they put it—"orderly organization of their school," whatever that may mean. If that is the way the principal feels, it's going to be very difficult to establish the kind parental involvement and open door policy that we should have in the school.

It is very easy to enunciate this policy. It's much more difficult to have it take root in the province. I guess it's a challenge that we've got to face, all of us, to try and get that policy established. At this point in time I can't tell you any programme that we've got that will guarantee that it will be established because, as I said a minute ago, you don't establish it by waving a big wand from here at Queen's Park.

What we have to do is work on a number of fronts. We have to convince the profession that they have a role to play in bringing the parents in. We have to help the parents or make parents understand to some degree that they will understand the education system better by being involved with it. That means when they do become involved and when they do go into the school they don't get rebuffed or treated like five-year-olds who wouldn't understand what is going on and don't get subjected to a full dose of educational jargonese so they never want to go back into the school again.

That is what happens. We have all experienced these kinds of situations. It means we have to get the profession, the parents and people interested in this kind of approach to the educational system.

I can't tell you that we have a policy here which will bring this about. All I can tell you is that as a ministry and as a minister this is what I am preaching, if you will, and I think that will help lend support to it. I hope others will do the same thing and if we do that we will find these kinds of things will take root.

Some of your colleagues have taken part in some very excellent programmes. There is one in Thunder Bay, I believe. I think I opened the school which is a community school where, I believe, there is certainly an above-average involvement of parents in the particular programme.

Mr. Moffatt: I am pleased to hear what you have just said because I think you have isolated the problem exactly where it is. There are times when some things aren't obvious, but it's obvious that if you are going to change the whole question of involvement of the parents in the schools somewhere you have to develop the kind of leadership with the principals and the staff to make that kind of thing happen.

I would suggest to the minister that one of the things which would happen is that all the efforts of the regional office staff and the people who are apparently available from OISE would be brought to bear on a full-scale training session—a full scale updating—of principals and staff across the province in a direct face-to-face method on how to use parents in the school.

In my own particular school we ran this kind of programme for other schools and other teachers but it wasn't supported by the ministry to any great extent. As a matter of fact, we had great difficulty finding any person in the ministry at any of the regional offices who knew anything about it and who would be able to talk to parents.

We had people who could deal with a day-long session on inter-personal relationsips and other people could come in and talk about curriculum development in the 1960s as being a relevant psychological experience and so on. But we didn't have anybody who could come in and talk to principals and teachers and say, "This is the kind of untapped resource in your community which you as a professional person interested in kids should be able to make use of."

If the minister is looking for some way of implementing in practical terms what he has just described it seems to me that's where we start. We get away from paying sort of homage to all of the traditional kinds of things which have gone on in the province with regard to educational hierarchies.

If the deputy minister comes to town there is a big deal laid on and so on. If the minister comes to town it is an even bigger deal. If we would stop that and spend some of that initiative and some of that effort in developing one programme per year and developing it fully I think you would have far fewer people criticizing what goes on in the schools because they would start to see what's happening.

On the other side of the coin I think the minister has to go along with a two-fold approach to some programme such as parents or citizens now being official visitors of the school. If you say that, you have to explain to people in the school why that is important. I was principal in a school when that happened. I had no idea why it was important because we had always had a lot of parents in the school. I know other people who were horrified at it because they didn't know what you were trying to do.

[4:45]

It seems to me if you really want to attack this programme you start at the principal level where you have clearly understood the problem in communication lies and you help those people. I agree with you, you don't go in with a big stick and say: "Tomorrow everybody is going to have a community school." That is obviously foolish. You start by help-

ing them to appreciate what the values of that particular system would be. I think that money spent on that rather than putting on all the other traditional charades in education might be money well spent.

Mr. Warner: There was an omission in the minister's statement with regard to the role played by trustees. I am wondering what efforts have been made on the part of the ministry to get the trustees in many areas to co-operate with this philosophy he has been enunciating. As the minister is well aware, when this process of opening the doors began a few years ago, there was in some corners great resistance put up by many trustees. I am wondering if the minister has some responses to what efforts are being made by the Minister of Education and his department to try to get co-operation from the trustees.

Hon. Mr. Wells: First of all, I would say to my friend that it was clearly an oversight that I failed to mention trustees there, because trustees are part of the process and are a very important part. The assistance and the full support of trustees for this kind of programme are of course necessary also. In all our dealings with various groups, we work with the trustees to encourage them to lend their support and to be the leadership people in developing community schools and parent involvement and communication in the schools in their particular area.

Last year we set up the minister's advisory committee on community schools. This committee has an ongoing advisory role with the ministry and with the minister in developing programmes for the development of community schools and all the kind of things that we are talking about. The chairman of that advisory committee is a trustee, Judy White of the London Board of Education, a person who has been very concerned and interested and a leader in this kind of development. Along with a group of about 13 or 14 people, she is forming this advisory committee which is just now beginning to get going and develop ways that we can do some of the things that the hon. member was talking about.

Mr. Ferris: First of all, I would like to say that I agree with the minister's comments about the need for information and would hope that he would bring forward a plan to provide this information and get a better exchange of parental involvement. I would like to ask a question of the minister because there seems to be a thread running through here in the actual financing of this area. In the curriculum area specifically there is an amount of $2 million for supplies and equipment which represents an increase in excess of 50 per cent. It is equally true in many of the other areas.

I sense that there is perhaps a trend to using pieces of hardware as opposed to doing it with people. I wonder if we are tied up in a large computer programme here. It relates back to some things we talked about the other day. I would wish the minister would perhaps react to that.

Mr. Chairman: Does the minister wish to reply?

Hon. Mr. Wells: Perhaps if we could continue, I will get that information for the hon. member in a minute. Are there any other comments?

Mrs. Gigantes: In the discussion on this vote, we've been hearing the minister talk about the general philosophical goals of curriculum development in Ontario, the concept of the open schools, the idea of having parents involved in the schools, involved in the development of the programme that their kids are going through. There's been a lot of talk about communication, communication, communication. There's been mighty little discussion of what the content of that communication is supposed to be.

Picking up on some of the things that have been said by some of my colleagues here, I'd like to suggest to the minister that there's no use telling parents that you want to communicate with them about what's going on with their children in school, unless you're willing to discuss in real terms with them what the content, what the goals—the immediate goals—of the school programme are. I think the minister is getting off too easy if we allow him not to talk about the goals of schools, how they relate to children of certain ages and what we can tell parents about what —we hope—children will get out of those school experiences.

I think at the primary level, parents would like to be assured that their children are going to develop some of the basic needed skills in reading, and understand some basic concepts of mathematics, counting and so on. I don't think they feel that assurance now. I think one of the reasons they don't, is that they feel very clearly that there are not sufficient moneys being allocated to the primary level of education. They feel quite anxious about sending their children off to learn primary skills in classrooms that are too large, with teachers that are too overworked. If we're going to talk about development of curricu-

lum at the primary level and we're going to be honest with parents and we're going to set some goals about development of curriculum at the primary level, we have to talk about the amount of money being devoted to the primary level of education and the pupil-teacher ratio. I think that any discussion of curriculum development aside from that discussion is unreal. Parents won't buy it. They don't like being fed pablum any more than school kids do.

At the secondary level, there's been talk about community involvement, communication and so on and so on; and some suggestion that we should have core curriculum. Again, I think that parents who may say they want core curriculum—and it's an easy phrase to deal with and, as you know, not an easy one to talk about implementing within the school system—would be satisfied if they felt that the children, their adolescent kids, would come out of high school with an ability to write an essay; with an assurance that the kind of courses they were going to need for whatever further course of study they were taking would be provided; that the child would not come home in November and tell the parents that French had been dropped when it was necessary for next year's programme; or that chemistry had been dropped when it was going to be necessary to enter a university programme.

This is the kind of thing parents are very alarmed about. They want an assurance in real terms that the school system is providing adequate kinds of checks at the primary level for basic reading skills and math skills, and that at the secondary level—and at the primary level it would take more money—enough interest is being shown in where each child is going; that the school is communicating with parents about the actual programme the child is involved in. That is not happening now. I know parents in Ottawa who've been very alarmed, learning too late that their kids have dropped courses. Some of these parents were teachers themselves and they still couldn't figure out what was happening with their own kids.

Despite all this talk about communication, I quote you: "We can't tell you that we've got a policy here that will bring this about;" an open-door policy for our schools, an understanding of parents, of what's going on in the schools. Well, I think it's possible to develop a policy that will bring this about. I think it's possible to talk to the Legislature about a policy that will bring it about, and I think it's possible to talk to parents in Ontario about a policy that will bring it about. I think it means talking to them about the contents or the goals of that curriculum. I don't mean mind-development and consciousness-raising and that kind of thing. I mean some very concrete kinds of skills—

Hon. Mr. Wells: What do you mean?

Mrs. Gigantes: —reading at the primary level; making sure that the child doesn't get to grade 4, pushed on by the system, without being able to read.

Hon. Mr. Wells: You are getting to sound like a Liberal.

Mrs. Gigantes: That is happening now. We all know it's happening now. They're backing up at the high-school level. Then, when they get to the high-school level and get pushed on by the system, they get backed up at the university level.

Mr. Sweeney: Sounds as if a concerned citizen doesn't believe your claims.

Mrs. Gigantes: The failure begins at the primary level where we're not putting in the resources. We're not really talking to parents about that; we're not putting content into our attempt to communicate with parents in Ontario. I think it's time we did.

Mr. Sweeney: Mr. Chairman, I had not intended originally to bring this up, but the hon. minister, in his opening statements, used the term "educational jargon" with respect to teachers reporting to parents. He used it again yesterday, in responding to remarks made by both me and the educational people in the New Democratic Party, and he used it again this afternoon.

Mr. Moffatt: The platoon.

Mr. Sweeney: In other words, three times in three days he used the term "educational jargon."

The hon. minister also made it very clear that he did not feel responsible for the decisions and the actions of his predecessors, and wanted us to confine our remarks to what he had done. All right. I'll do that.

I have "The Formative Years," the document for which the hon. minister is responsible. Let's talk about educational jargon. Let's find out where it starts. Let's find out who set the example. On page 9 of this document, with respect to primary reading programmes, I read here: "Understand and use simple, syntactic, phonemic, and graphemic clues." I was asked by one of my colleagues

what graphemic clues were. Quite honestly, I didn't know. We went to the Concise Oxford Dictionary, the one that is supplied to the members. The word isnt in the Concise Oxford Dictionary. One of my secretaries eventually found it—

Mr. Cassidy: It's applied to the Liberals.

Mr. Sweeney: —in the American Websters Dictionary.

Mr. Foulds: Which edition? Third international?

Mr. Sweeney: I turn to page 11. Under junior division arithmetic: "Compute efficiently using standard algorithms." That word is also not in the Concise Oxford Dictionary. In the Webster's Dictionary there is a word "algorisms." The word "algorithm" is not there. More jargon? On page 12 under geometry, junior division, a parent asked me what this sentence meant: "Discover patterns and identify properties of two-dimensional and three-dimensional figures." And get this: "By tiling in the plain and stacking in space."

Does the hon. minister wonder why people in this province are using educational jargon? Does he wonder why the parents and the teachers in this province don't understand what your ministry and your documents are talking about?

Hon. Mr. Wells: Let me say first of all that my references to educational jargon were in the communication between the teacher and the parent. I'm not saying that there will not be, if I can use that loose term, educational jargon used in the communication of the educators of this ministry with the curriculum educators in the boards or with the teachers.

Mr. Breithaupt: I don't think they understand it either.

Hon. Mr. Wells: I'm sure they do understand those meanings. This document was developed by educators like my friend, the hon. member from Waterloo.

Mr. Sweeney: Mr. Chairman, I would never develop a document like that, nor would my colleagues.

Mr. Cassidy: They obviously couldn't spell.

Mr. Sweeney: The educators who developed that obviously hadn't been in school for 20 years.

Hon. Mr. Wells: Do you want to make a bet on that?

Mr. Sweeney: No.

Hon. Mr. Wells: He says no, he doesn't want to make a bet on that. His words were that the people who developed this document hadn't been in school in 20 years. The hon. member may find that some of them were in his system. He may find that.

Anyway, while it makes for a very nice exchange in this House, I think my friend has cast a bit of irrelevancy across what was a fairly relevant argument being put forward by the member for Ottawa.

[5:00]

Mrs. Gigantes: Carleton East.

Hon. Mr. Wells: Carleton East.

Mr. Cassidy: Don't forget it; it's a good riding now.

Hon. Mr. Wells: The terminology in the formative years was, of course, developed for teachers and not for parents. I still intend to have a parents' guide book for the formative years put out. There is, of course, also an implementation process which goes on with the formative years and another group of documents which will help make more explicit the kind of programmes expected in the primary-junior years.

I think the point being made was that while we are asking for communication, what are we going to communicate? What has to be communicated, of course, as far as I'm concerned, is what is going on in the schools. You can't ask me to tell you what is going on in every classroom in Carleton East or Scarborough or Thunder Bay at this present time. I have to know and I have to believe—

Mr. Foulds: Probably meeting in a lot of corridors.

Mr. Cassidy: Probably a teachers' meeting going on right now.

Hon. Mr. Wells: Yes, there may be a teachers' meeting or there may be some parent interviews. I can't communicate to you in this House at this time what is going on in that school on any given day. I think what we're saying is that the teachers in those classrooms should be able to communicate to the parents of the children who attend that class what is happening in that class and what is being taught.

What I'm saying about the educational jargonese is, certainly parents are not going to understand the kind of things which have just been read from the formative years book. Hopefully teachers, taking that as a broad

statement of guides, aims and objectives and translating it into the meat and potatoes of the curriculum which is taught every day—including the basics because they are all in there—will be able to explain in clear terms to the parents of the children in their classroom: "This is what we're teaching—reading, writing, arithmetic, grammar. This is how we're teaching it, here are some examples. This is why we're teaching it. You ask me any questions and I'll answer them for you. If you'd like to come back and sit in my classroom some day and see how I do it you're welcome to come back and sit there and watch how I teach the children."

I think valid points have been made on all sides. My friend from Waterloo made the point that we needed some way of measuring the achievement of these young people. I emphasize that, certainly as far as I'm concerned, it is not for the sake of comparing them with everyone else in that class so somebody can put a list on the board and say: "This child is first and this is last."

I think we must compare them with some kind of norms to know if they are achieving certain levels and to know what can be done to assist them or stimulate them or help them. It's not to compare them, but to know if they're reaching the goals and objectives which have been set for them in the curriculum. That's the kind of thing which has to be communicated and I think it can be communicated.

Again, I have to emphasize that sometimes in the communication the story doesn't get across to the parents and they go away frustrated. Further, I think the reporting of what's happening in the class—not telling them what's going on; what the curriculum is all about and what the aims and objectives of that particular classroom are—the reporting of how each child is doing in that classroom and what they're achieving has to be done in, perhaps, a better manner than is being done in a lot of classrooms today. It has to be done in a way that parents understand so they have some assurance on how their child is achieving and where their child stands in certain basic skills.

I think in my opening remarks I indicated we were going to put together a team to find out where it's being done in an excellent manner; where it's being done in a good manner; and how we can assist boards and schools which are not doing it in as good a manner as they can to develop and do it in a better manner. We are going to work on that together with looking at the way standardized tests are being used in this province. School boards are all using them now. Let's see how they are being used and perhaps how they can be adapted and used better.

Mr. Cassidy: I have a specific question about text book development that I want to direct to the minister and I don't want to engage in the more general discussion which has been going on. The question relates to the offer by the federal Secretary of State's department to match moneys being devoted by the province for the development of textbooks in the French language.

There is a serious absence of curricula for French high school students in the province, and after eight or nine years of publicly-supported secondary education in French there is also a serious absence of adequate French textbooks. For example, in the Ottawa area the entire mathematics programme from grade 9 to grade 13 in certain cases is taught with English textbooks in francophone high schools, and clearly that shouldn't be.

There are other examples. Family life education or home economics is taught with material which is English. Science courses are often taught with material which is in English. It's not possible to use textbooks developed for Quebec because the curricula there differ.

I want to know from the minister why the government of Ontario has refused to accept the fairly reasonable conditions laid down that Ontario could have $250,000 of federal funds for developing French-language textbooks if it agreed to give priority to Canadian publishers. It seems like a perfectly reasonable kind of request. The need for money for textbook development is obvious and pressing. The amount of money which the province has devoted, $250,000, is clearly inadequate in relation to what is needed. It just seems to be silly to be spiting your face to cut off your nose.

I would also add that as far as the development of English-language textbooks goes—that is texts in various subjects in English—there has been a similar outcry from the book and periodical development council which represents Canadian publishers, because they too are coming under very much the same rule. Despite the recommendations of the Camp commission on book publishing in Ontario, there is no priority being given to Canadian textbook publishers in developing or printing Canadian textbooks developed with the money which is now being made available from the province.

It's a fund, I believe, of $1 million. That is being made available to foreign-owned publishers and Canadian-owned publishers alike. Given the backing that these publishers have in the United States, in effect it means that the Canadian publishers once again are being shut out of an important area.

On the one hand you are violating the recommendations of the Camp commission on book publishing, and on the other hand you are denying the francophone population of the province access to $250,000 in federal funds which is available for the development of French-language textbooks, unless you've changed your policy very recently.

Could the minister explain why these rather perverse decisions have been taken and what prospects there are for change?

Hon. Mr. Wells: First of all, let me say in regard to your last comment, actually I would turn that statement around and would say that the federal Secretary of State's department is denying the francophone education system of this province $250,000 because of its attitude towards this particular money. They know very well what the conditions are that apply in the Province of Ontario and have not seen fit to give us that matching grant of the $250,000 because of their insistence on a condition which we cannot accept. I do not accept at all that what we are doing violates the spirit of the Camp commission report.

As I've said many times in this House, I believe in approaching these matters from the point of view that we involve the people concerned in the development of the various plans that we undertake and that we don't do things as a government or a ministry in isolation. I'm sorry, I'm reminded that that was the Rohmer commission not the Camp commission, and we want to give Richard Rohmer his due for that work.

Mr. Foulds: You may give Richard Rohmer his due. I am not sure that we do.

Hon. Mr. Wells: Brig. Gen. Rohmer incidentally is himself a very noted Canadian author and I see that his latest book is No. 1 on the Toronto Star's fiction list—

Mr. Foulds: It tells us something about the Toronto Star.

Mr. Sweeney: It indicates the level of interest of Star readers.

Hon. Mr. Wells: —I don't know what it is on Time's book list—it probably isn't listed there if Time is up to its usual tactics.

We worked with the various book publisher groups to develop the programmes that were announced by the government following the Rohmer commission report. These programmes were to help stimulate the development of Canadian books.

The programmes were a book purchase plan and a learning materials development fund and we worked with the various groups and came up with the kind of guidelines that should apply to these two particular programmes. They were particularly suggested and recommended because we no longer have what used to be called designated or stimulation grants to school boards specifically for textbooks.

There was a concern that Canadian textbooks were not being developed for the Ontario school system and that they were not being bought by school boards because there was no specified amount of money that the boards had to spend on books. The publishers were suffering because this money was not specified and the school boards were in fact—so they said—reducing the amount of money spent on books.

This money was put in, first of all to purchase the sample textbooks that are sent to school boards and for another fund to help with the developmental costs of new texts in areas where there was a need for this kind of curriculum material and yet perhaps there wasn't a financial viability if a commercial company was to produce it.

In working with the publishers and in working with our own people we set certain guidelines, and those guidelines are that the books be Canadian authored and Canadian manufactured. We do not insist in our programmes that the companies be Canadian-owned. As my friend knows, many textbooks used in the schools of this province are produced by companies which do not fall under the definition of a fully Canadian-owned company, but those textbooks are Canadian authored and they're produced in this country by Canadians.

Those same rules have been translated to apply to the French-language learning materials fund. The $250,000 that we've put in for the development of French-language curriculum materials can be used by firms that wish to adhere to our standards that the books and the materials be Canadian authored and that they be manufactured in Canada, but we have not held that there should be that further limiting qualification that they must be Canadian owned.

We do everything possible to assist Canadian-owned publishing firms if they wish to produce some of these materials, but I have

to tell my friend that if we're really interested in good materials being developed—and developed in a hurry—for the French-language school system, we've got to have a much broader area to draw upon than strictly the Canadian publishing firms. We have to draw on the full range of those firms operating in this province as good corporate citizens and which are publishing books by Canadian educators, which are having those books printed by people in this province, which are having them manufactured by people in this province, and which are having the graphics done by people in this province. I think the results of this kind of a policy bring us to the point where we now have 93 per cent of the books in Circular 14, for instance, of Canadian authorship and manufactured in Canada.

I have put this position very clearly to the Secretary of State in Ottawa. I think it's a fair position. I really can't change my position in this regard and I've asked him if he can't change his position. We certainly will give every consideration and preference to the Canadian firms when they make proposals under our plan, but we will not say that money will not be available to these other firms because we believe, first and foremost, we need good French-language learning materials for the French-language school system of this province.

Mr. Chairman: The hon. member for Ottawa South.

Mr. Cassidy: Can I just speak briefly, Mr. Chairman?

Mr. Chairman: Briefly.

[5:15]

Mr. Cassidy: Very briefly; as I understand it the Ontario Arts Council, which is the other major provider of stimulative grants to publishers, specifically restricts its grants—this is a government agency—to Canadian-owned firms. The federal government is asking simply that priority be given to Canadian-owned firms. If you can't find a Canadian-owned firm to do it, then give it to one owned somewhere else.

I have to say to the minister that when he mellifluously utters words about good corporate citizenship and that kind of thing and comes up with a statement like that, I feel rather ill. I don't think this programme the minister has talked about is doing anything at all to try to ensure that Canadian publishers can have a solid textbook trade in order to help them stay in business.

It seems to me it's a perfectly reasonable kind of thing. As a consequence of the minister's shortsightedness he is personally depriving the francophones of the province of half of the funds which could be available for textbook development.

Hon. Mr. Wells: As I said, it's got to be the other way around.

Mr. Cassidy: No, you are the one to blame.

Hon. Mr. Wells: The federal government could have got that money.

Mr. Cassidy: You are the one to blame.

Hon. Mr. Wells: They are quibbling over something which they need not quibble over.

Mr. Cassidy: You are out of step with the rest of the government's programme in Ontario, not just federally.

Mr. Chairman: Order, please. The hon. member—

Hon. Mr. Wells: I don't think my friend understands some of the things happening in the book publishing business, some of the success stories there and some of the opportunities being given to educators in this province. I suppose that's where it's got to start.

The teachers and educators of this province who want to get books published go to places where they think they can have their book or their materials published and have it receive the widest possible use. There is one publisher in this province who has used an author who teaches at one of our teachers' colleges and in the Scarborough school system. He has developed something, a learning material or learning aid, known as the Little Red School House which probably is one of the largest and best sellers in the United States. It is produced in Canada, authored by Canadians and yet is selling above all other materials in the United States.

It is produced by a firm which is not a completely Canadian firm in your terms and yet it employs Canadians here and is using Canadian authors and manufacturing materials in Canada. It is giving Canadian educators a chance to disseminate some very fine learning materials, not only in Canada but in the United States and and all over the world.

Mr. Foulds: Canadian imperialism is no better than American imperialism.

Mr. Ferris: The minister made a reference to a parents' guidebook which he hoped would assist in communication. I wonder if he would put a time-frame on when that might be available?

Hon. Mr. Wells: We are working on it and we'll get it as soon as we can.

Mr. Foulds: Come on, 'fess up. Why don't you confess the reason it is not out is that the centre page was printed upside down.

Mr. Chairman: Order, please.

Mr. Foulds: You had the whole thing printed.

Hon. Mr. Wells: No, that's—

Mr. Foulds: It was in the backup material.

Hon. Mr. Wells: No, that's not—

Mr. Ferris: The minister is not prepared at this point in time to commit?

Hon. Mr. Wells: That's not the guideline book I'm thinking of.

Mr. Foulds: This one? That's why this one was so late.

Hon. Mr. Wells: No.

Mr. Foulds: Come on, confess.

Mr. Ferris: They are sometimes slow; is there no time-frame we can put on it?

Hon. Mr. Wells: We'll get it as soon as we can.

Mr. Warner: In due time, in due course.

Mr. Ferris: In due course. Does the minister have the information available on the previous question I asked?

Hon. Mr. Wells: Yes, the supplies and equipment section of this vote this year shows a figure of $2,038,500; 1974-1975 there was $1,238,200. This is an increase of $799,300. Of that, $750,000 is in this book purchase plan I talked about; that's the money. In other words it's not being spent on hardware or supplies in the ministry but to purchase textbooks which are sent out to the school boards as part of the book purchase plan. That is the increase in the plan for this year.

Mr. Ferris: Can I continue this for a moment? Are there any computer services within this budget for curriculum development?

Mr. Chairman: I must remind the hon. member that if he wants to speak, he should rise in his place.

Mr. Ferris: I'm sorry; I thought it was in reference to the same question.

Hon. Mr. Wells: There is a small amount here for the development of mailing lists and book orders connected with the book purchase plan.

Mr. Young: Mr. Chairman, if I could bring the minister's attention to another problem, which arose in part out of the general situation in our civilization, I suppose, but was immediately triggered this afternoon by the question which the member for Wilson Heights (Mr. Singer) asked and to which the Attorney General (Mr. McMurtry) replied. He indicated that one of the solutions to the whole problem of our traffic and law enforcement and so on lies with the Minister of Education.

During the past year or so I heard and read speeches of the hon. Minister of Health (Mr. F. S. Miller) across this province where he pointed out that our lifestyle is responsible for a tremendous amount of the expenditure which we have to make in the whole health field. He specifically talks about such things as the use of cigarettes, alcohol and drugs.

Today I want to ask the minister about the emphasis which is being placed in the educational system upon that very problem. I want to take up the cudgels for the minister. I happened to sit on the board of one of our hospitals and I see there the living out of the very thing which the minister has been talking about. So I want to take up the cudgels for him and for his point of view.

I don't want to spend too much time on this because I think all of us are familiar with it, but there is no question that Canadians, along with many other people of the world today, are consuming more alcohol and smoking more and this sort of thing. They are starting younger. They are driving more today under the influence of alcohol; and they are killing themselves off much faster than they have ever done before.

We have the problems the minister talked about—alcoholism, heart disease—and all these related problems are skyrocketting. The serious thing is that they are appearing in progressively younger people. In the senior levels of our high schools and among the young people who are just out of the secondary educational system we are finding these problems multiplying.

The thing that is really interesting is the amount of alcohol in which Canadians are now indulging. In Canada we are producing about 10 litres of absolute alcohol per person

per year; whereas in Ontario, under the guidance of the Minister of Health here and against his wishes, we are consuming about 11 litres. That's startling.

In the last election campaign I heard the kind of thing which has been talked about time after time across this land, and maybe across the world for all I know. One of my opponents pointed out that people should never vote for Fred Young, the NDP candidate, because of what is happening in Sweden. "There, governments like the one he represents are a sodden group of people—soaked in alcohol—consuming so much that it is just tragic. If we elect a government like his," this person said, "then we are heading right into that same kind of trouble the Swedes are now finding themselves in."

Interjection.

Mr. Young: I happen to have the figures and the figures are startling. We have heard this propaganda year after year after year, election after election, about the Swedes who have had social democratic governments for 40 to 50 years and who are among the highest alcohol consumers in the world. Well Sweden drinks 5.7 litres per adult per year while each person in Ontario downs 10.5, nearly twice as much.

Mr. Ferris: Who is driving who to drink now?

Mr. Foulds: What is that in, Fred?

Mr. Young: Sweden has 1,515 alcoholics per 100,000 while Canada has 2,272. So it looks as if the whole propaganda line is going to have to be revised a bit. Certainly my opponent in this election campaign had just a bit of an education in this matter. I hope he won't quote this sort of thing again.

We have seen over the past year that the total amount of alcoholic beverages sold is increasing dramatically and I am not going into those figures. But the tragic thing is that our young people, particularly in the later part of our educational system and just after, are among the greatest offenders; and, of course, when the voting age was reduced, with all that meant, then we found that "alcohol-related collisions for the age group of 18 and over increased 339 per cent in the year after the change; and the number killed more than doubled." This means that somehow, somewhere, we are building up an attitude towards the consumption of alcohol and all its related ills, particularly in the traffic field in which I have been interested over these last years, that must be reversed.

I think the minister said at one time that it is costing us something in the neighbourhood of $135 million per year for alcohol-related diseases in our system. Add to that another $130 million for traffic accidents related to alcohol and then, of course, the bill gets very very high.

The other thing that is very interesting in the research that has been done in this field is that the amount of traffic accidents, as well as alcoholism, the problems we face in our hospitals, all these things, increase in exact proportion to the consumption of alcohol in our society. So it looks as if the problem we have in reversing this is in reversing the total consumption. How we are going to do that, of course, I am not going to go into today in any great detail. It has to be a many-pronged campaign and the government has already undertaken part of that in its TV and radio and other programmes. But when I look at the resources that are put into that programme compared with the resources that are used in the programme to make this kind of activity respectable and the smart thing to do, then I realize that we are fighting a losing battle.

I was struck by a quotation from the report which came after the investigation in Saskatchewan a year or two ago. The committee set up to review the liquor regulations pointed out that as far as the educational system was concerned there should be hard-hitting and comprehensive programmes in the schools to combat this matter, and I quote:

> Such an educational programme would deal with the myths and mystique which have grown up around alcohol in our society. It would give the facts about the physical, medical and social benefits, the cost and the uses of alcohol in our society. The information given would be factual and be presented in such a way as to leave the decision in regard to the use of alcohol up to the indivdual.
>
> That is not propaganda as such. This is not to say that such education would be permissive. Drunkenness would be stigmatized as an inappropriate form of behaviour. Rather than being considered manly to consume large amounts, it would be shown as exhibiting a lack of control. Rather than considering drunken behaviour humorous, it would be shown to be personally degrading and a potentially dangerous condition.
>
> Both abstinence and moderate consumption should be shown as viable alternatives. As early as elementary school, the chemical effect of alcohol should be explained. It

should be made clear that the abuse of alcohol will result in harm and death.

I know the Addiction Research Foundation is working with our boards of education in this field today. I know ultimately we say that the place where this education really counts is in the home itself. Well that may be true, but the educational system is the system through which all the children must pass in our society. Too many homes have accepted certain attitudes and mores which result in the kind of difficulties in which we find ourselves today.

[5:30]

It seems to me that this minister must face this problem realistically. I'd like to know from him just what resources are being placed into this fight, into this reversal of the present trend in our schools; because, ultimately, I think that's where it must be done, that's where the attitudes must be created if they're going to be created.

I often think of the conclusion that was reached some years ago—about four or five years ago now—about the whole problem of smoking. It was decided that no matter how much advice we give to the young people about this, it's what the teachers and the parents do that has the greatest effect. And that may be also true here; I don't know.

The fact is that the school system is where we do meet all the children. This is the place where we must make an all-out frontal attack on this whole problem. We must build the attitudes which will result in an amelioration of this problem, so that the Minister of Health can look to the future with far more confidence; and so that our whole society can see that the future is not as dark as it would appear to be with today's trends.

Mr. B. Newman: I wanted to make a few comments concerning the item that the previous speaker brought to the attention of the House. May I assure him that that problem has been a problem for years and years in the educational system, even though we did have courses in the system concerning alcohol and drug addiction.

Mr. Young: But they weren't enough.

Mr. B. Newman: You name it and it was all there. It was taught in the schools, but that didn't eliminate the problem. We here have to assume some responsibility, because we did lower the drinking age. I think that could be one of the reasons the problem is a little more serious today than it has been in prior years; but I don't know what the answer is.

I can recall teaching students about the effects of alcohol abuse, without saying necessarily that the individual should be a total abstainer but that drink should be used in moderation. However, it's so readily available to the young. At home they find that mothers and fathers don't hesitate to drink, and not always in moderation.

I don't know the answer. I don't think the ministry has the answer. In spite of all the efforts in teaching about alcohol and its use, we haven't come up with a resolution to the problem.

Even withdrawing from an individual his right to drive a motor vehicle still hasn't stopped a lot of people from drinking and driving and losing the right to drive for an extended period of time.

I wish some Solomon would come along and give us a real answer to the problem so we wouldn't be confronted with it any longer. None of us want to see alcohol used to the extent that it is today in society, but it is there. The Minister of Health may have some type of an answer.

Many of our students suffered from malnutrition in their earlier days of life and possibly are going to be mentally handicapped or handicapped after a fashion for the rest of their days because we in society didn't provide them with the proper foods required for all portions of the body to grow properly.

I don't know the answer. I'd like to hear the minister's answer. I'd like to hear a little more discussion from other members in the House concerning the problem. It's an extremely serious problem. We must, in some fashion, come to a better resolution of the problem. I fear for those who do not have the will to drink alcohol in moderation.

Mr. Foulds: I don't want to speak on this particular item, but I do want to wrap things up on this vote for our party, if I might.

Mr. Chairman: Before the hon. member continues, does the minister wish to respond at this particular point, or does he want to make his remarks after the debate?

Hon. Mr. Wells: I'd like to say a few words at this point about what has just been said about the schools and education on alcohol use and abuse and other things concerned with the health education programme. Before we wrap up this vote, I also want to make some comments about what the hon. member for Oakwood (Mr. Grande) said. I won't make those right now. I want to say that I always welcome the exchange, particularly from the member for Yorkview (Mr. Young),

about this matter. He has, of course, had a very long interest in this particular area and has expressed thoughts about it many times in this House, as has the hon. member for Windsor (Mr. B. Newman).

I think the hon. member from Windsor put his finger on it. The schools have been doing a job in this particular area for a long time. They've always had programmes in this particular area. People have felt that they could somehow give it over to the schools and they would take care of the problem and somehow it would get better. Of course, that hasn't happened.

I think that by and large the schools do a good job in this particular area. But the schools cannot replace, for instance, the parents, and the influence that the parents have in how their child handles alcohol and cigarettes and drugs and various mood modifiers and even habits that their young people develop insofar as eating and nutrition are concerned. Parents have the primary responsibility. The school's role is to reinforce, I think, the things that parents are teaching their children. But the parents' responsibility I think comes first.

The schools are not shirking their job. The schools, as part of an overall help programme beginning in the primary and junior years, and again I quote from "The Formative Years"—I think every word of this statement is in all the dictionaries; I don't think there's any word in this statement that isn't in any dictionary—it says: "Acquire an understanding of the use, misuse, and abuse of mood and behaviour modifiers." That's part of a general group of health objectives that should be taught in the first six years of the elementary school. That, of course, will be done in a manner and in a form and using materials that would be acceptable to parents and would have some effect on children of that particular age group.

Then we move into the intermediate years. Particularly talking about grades 7 and 8, we have the same kind of curriculum guidelines suggested for these years. Keep in mind that these years, 7 to 8, are the years where there is no choice of curriculum. There's no choice of subjects that you take, so that this programme is taught for all young people in the school system in these particular years. There are various resources available to help the teacher and the school do the job for these people.

As I've said, some, I suppose, are doing a better job than others. But they're not necessarily going to bring about a radical reversal of some of the figures that my friend has talked about. Hopefully they will reinforce and help a lot of other agencies in society, plus the parents, to bring about some good understanding by young people of the hazards of alcohol, for instance. Maybe that will lead to them being able to handle alcohol better, when they become eligible to use it legally.

Then we move on to the secondary school, where, after you get past year one and year two, health education and physical education become an optional subject. Here again, the curriculum guidelines for those who chose the subject are much more explicit and the courses are very good. I'm reading from the new physical and health education guideline, which was just issued last year. In it are the various subjects that should be handled in the curriculum and they're all spelled out in a very clear manner. It has under the heading "Alcohol and Other Drugs."

> The focus for these studies in the senior division should be on use, misuse, abuse, decision-making and values exploration as developments from the legal, medical and pharmaceutical factors studied in earlier years.

In other words, in the earlier years of high school the curriculum guidelines suggest certain developments and the senior guidelines should then amplify and further carry forward those kinds of teachings in a very detailed way. I think the courses being given in our schools do this.

What I'm saying is that I personally, and as a minister, am very concerned about the abuse of alcohol in our society, and certainly, where we can give leadership, we're giving the leadership to those in the school system to have good programmes that will do the school's part in helping with this problem. But I emphasize again that the school cannot do the whole job here and cannot bring about a sudden, dramatic reversal of what are very tragic figures in our society in regard to the use of alcohol.

Mr. Young: No doubt what the minister has said has some validity, but my point is that somehow or other we're failing to arrest this trend. We're just not matching, in resources, the other side which is pushing the trend.

I don't know whether visual aids have been seriously considered by our school system. Certainly the smart ads of the liquor interests on the other side, through the television medium, are building up the whole attitude among young people that this is the smart thing to do; it's related to joy, hap-

piness, prosperity and whatever else you have. I don't know whether we're trying something like this within the school system to counteract that kind of thing.

Of course, one of the attacks against this whole problem likely is the abolition of that kind of propaganda in the public media. That may come here as it has come in some other places, and I would hope it would; but that's apart from the education system.

Are we, within the system itself, trying to match some of this smart propaganda, some of this smart so-called education material, to counteract what is being done on the other side of the fence? This is the kind of thing which we should be facing and asking ourselves whether, in effect, we are mobilizing financial, brain and talent resources in this fight to arrest the trend today through our educational system.

Mr. Ziemba: I'd like to make one or two observations that might clear up for the member from Windsor and my colleague from Yorkview why this particular government and this particular party is not in a hurry to clear up the alcoholism in our society in the Province of Ontario. Simply, the greatest single source of campaign contributions over the past 30 years or so, for both the government party and the third party, has been the liquor interests—the brewers and distillers of this province.

I believe that if my colleagues are asking these people to legislate in such a way and to use our education system in such a way that will cut down on the profits of these companies, then they're chasing a will-o'-the whisp.

Mr. Sweeney: How about the union members who work in those plants? Where do your contributions come from?

Mr. Ziemba: They come from working people; they don't come from corporations, sir.

Mr. Lewis: Of course they do; it is all public, open and voted on. You disclose your source of funds.

Mr. Sweeney: It's the same source.

Mr. Chairman: Order, please. The member for High Park-Swansea has the floor.

Mr. Ziemba: During the summer we saw an advertising campaign that suggested cutting down on alcohol. Remember? It was: "Be your own liquor control board." This government spent $260,000 on that campaign, encouraging people to be their own liquor control board; yet in the week of May 3 they opened up 52 new outlets. How do you expect people to be their own liquor control board when you force it down their throats? There were 52 outlets opened in one week.

I'm appalled by this government's liquor policy, especially when it comes to young people. They allow bands, such as the O'Keefe band, to attend all sorts of school functions, and the implication is there that the band wouldn't be there and the money wouldn't be spent on the promotion of it if it weren't getting results. I think that if this government is really sincere and serious about cutting down on some of the alcohol problems in this province, it has to attack them head on by cutting down on the outlets in the area, by cancelling the advertising aimed at our young people and by getting rid of the bands and other attractions that appeal to our young people. That's my point.

[5:45]

Mr. Foulds: I have a few comments about curriculum development in general rather than this specific item.

I note in the more detailed items that well over half the amount devoted in total to curriculum development is given to the Ontario Educational Communications Authority. It rather worries me that we put under this item that amount of money—over $7.5 million—when I think most of our debate and discussion today has been that curriculum development must take place in the classroom, at the grassroots level, with the teacher, the parent and the school principal.

I would feel much more comfortable if in future that item of transfer payment to the OECA were itemized separately. I don't think we can count that in terms of the curriculum development we have been talking about in the last hour or two hours.

I also think the minister—

Hon. Mr. Wells: Can I say something?

Mr. Foulds: Yes.

Hon. Mr. Wells: As a point of information, to give you two things. First of all, it appears here because in the general accounting directions we get that's where it's supposed to appear. It is connected closest to this particular vote.

Secondly, the amount there is for the development of programmes for the curriculum by OECA. It is not intended to be a block grant for all of OECA's many programmes

but for their programmes connected with the in-school curriculum. It is for development of programmes for use there—the videotape programmes and all those things connected with the school programme and not the open sector of the programmes.

Mr. Foulds: I understand that. The point I'm trying to make is in a vote of slightly over $11 million, we have $7.5 million devoted to the most splashy technological aspect of curriculum development rather than, if you like, some of the more humane and concrete aspects of curriculum development.

I want to say, perhaps as clearly and as forcefully as I can, about the concluding statement in your introduction to the formative years book, "As always the major challenge falls to educators at the local level to translate the objectives into relevant learning experiences for each of our children" that I think I understand and know what that sentence means but we've got to be honest about that.

That means time for the teachers and the principals at the local level. That means resources at that level and because, with the kind of pupil-teacher ratio we have in the formative years we cannot expect the teachers to find the time to talk individually to the parents, we can't expect them to have the time to diagnose the problems of the children.

That means we have to talk about money. We have to be prepared to put more financial resources into elementary education if we are going to develop that curriculum the way you hopefully announced it would be developed on Friday.

The stark fact is that the pupil-teacher ratio at the secondary level is something around 17 to one and at the elementary levels it is about 24 to one. We have to be honest and say it is going to cost us money to implement this programme the way you say. It is going to cost us money.

The city of Toronto Board of Education, for example has one person full-time on curriculum development. That board, if I understand correctly, has 111 public schools; 31 secondary schools; 2,936 elementary teachers; 61,485 elementary pupils and so on. That board—a fairly progressive board—has one person for curriculum development.

I think that we have to come to grips honestly with those problems. We have to admit that it will cost us money and we have to start, as we have advocated many times in this party, beginning to equalize the grants in a fairly dramatic way on a per pupil basis at the elementary level so that they can eventually catch up to the secondary level.

I hope that the minister would respond to my colleague from Oakwood before this item passes.

Hon. Mr. Wells: First of all, maybe we will get into a little more detailed discussion about financial resources for elementary education when we come to the legislative grant procedures and vote. Certainly we have been allocating more resources and more grants to the elementary panel in the last year or so. But I have to say, and I hope that the members will look at these figures very carefully, if you think that it's going to be possible to allocate massive amounts of money to education, elementary or secondary, in the next few years, perhaps you can find where it's going to be possible to get that money.

Looking at the kind of votes that we've got here—and 87 per cent of these estimates are general legislative grants—and given the kind of restraints that the Treasurer has announced that we're going to have to operate under, it's going to be very difficult to find unlimited sources of money. In other words, we're going to have to develop the kind of improvements in education without expecting massive amounts of money, and I think that's going to be the challenge.

Mr. Foulds: And you are going to have to find some time for teachers to do it.

Hon. Mr. Wells: Surely there isn't anyone in this House who says that money will solve all our problems because, believe me, it won't.

Mr. Foulds: You can't overburden the teachers and principals at the old local level and expect your programme to be carried out.

Hon. Mr. Wells: Sure, but money won't solve all the problems.

Mr. Moffatt: But you won't spend it.

Hon. Mr. Wells: No, not "won't" spend it but "don't."

Perhaps I can get into some other comments because I studied, as I said, the very excellent comments of the new member for Oakwood and I would like to talk a bit about some of the things that he said. I congratulated him, I think, yesterday on the very fine remarks he made and on the thoughtful tone of his speech.

In immediately addressing myself to the problems of inner-city children and the culturally different child, as he was doing in his remarks, I think that this is an issue that is

bothering educators. It's troubling educators here; it's troubling our educators in the Ministry of Education and it has probably troubled educators in a number of countries for a number of years.

I think it was recognition of some of these problems, though certainly not necessarily complete recognition, that led us to giving additional weighting factors, for instance, through which we hope to encourage boards to provide more adequate programming for these children, particularly of immigrant parents who are arriving in large metropolitan areas like Toronto.

Under the composite weighting factor which enables us to determine relative needs for compensatory education; for instance, Metropolitan Toronto generates additional funding of approximately $11 million for elementary education and approximately $5 million for secondary education. In computing this factor, we do take into account the items mentioned by the hon. member, such as the percentage of children with neither English nor French as their official language. This is one of the things that is taken into account in computing the weighting factor.

I would like further to tell my friend that not only have officials of this ministry studied the documents that he mentioned such as the Toronto board's every student survey and the draft report of the working group on multicultural programming but as he is well aware, we've set up an ongoing liaison with the various groups working in the Toronto board. and we've set up our own work group that is headed by Mrs. Catherine Michalski, who is sitting here at the table in front of me today. The ministry recently hosted a seminar on multiculturalism which was planned jointly with the Toronto representatives, trustee Dan Leckie, principal Ed Kerr, and representatives from community groups, faculties of education and boards across the province. These people spent 3½ days over in the Macdonald block thinking about ways of improving both pre- and in-service teacher training so that—

Mr. Foulds: Did they escape alive?

Hon. Mr. Wells: Certainly, they had a very good time. They discussed how teachers might be better prepared for the problems and rewards of our multicultural society. We had some valuable input for teacher education institutions, and as a result of this working seminar we intend to offer a summer course, Education in a Multicultural Society, in Toronto this coming summer, 1976.

This leads me to some of the terms that have been used in our discussions of the past few days. I would like to define what we mean when we say that we subscribe to the concept of education in our multicultural society. It is an education in which the individual child of whatever origin finds not mere acceptance or tolerance, but respect and understanding. It is education in which cultural diversity is used as a valuable resource to enrich the lives of all. It is education in which differences and similarities are used for positive ends. It is education in which every child has the chance to benefit from the cultural heritage of others, as well as his or her own. If the hon. members will look again, this statement is one of the aims and objectives of education in the first six years of the elementary school as set out in "The Formative Years."

One of the first needs of the immigrant child is a good English-as-a-second-language programme. Last year 228 teachers took the Teaching English as a Second Language summer course; this year we hope to double that number. There is an active committee working on a Ministry of Education guideline for the teaching of English as a second language, and a programme in which we are working with the Ministry of Culture and Recreation which carries on a programme for adults in this area.

A question always asked at this stage is: Should we use the child's own language when teaching him or her to read or to deal with mathematical concepts? I think that my friend from Oakwood argues for this position. However, for many people the issue is still a matter for debate, as I shall show later. So we have left a degree of freedom with the boards and their teachers.

In this province the child's own language may be used for transitional purposes—to ease the cultural shock of learning and to ensure that the child understands what is being taught. However, we should make sure that there is no misunderstanding in the way it is done. The majority of parents still feel that the first priority for their child is the learning of English. Therefore classes such as my friend has been taking part in, where it is possible to use language as a transitional learning tool, is what we are encouraging as a ministry. But we are also not in any way shirking our responsibility to be sure that what we feel is a priority for a majority of parents and that is that their child learn English. This must be done in a very excellent way in the school system.

Once the child has what the parents feel is a useful proficiency in English, I think that the same parents who place this as a first priority then begin to worry about the maintenance of their child's primary language. It is on this issue—What is the role of the public school in maintaining the primary language?—that I think opinion is divided.

I appreciate the sincerity and concern for the child which the hon. member for Oakwood has demonstrated and the eloquence with which he has presented his arguments for the teaching of a child in the child's primary language for both transitional and maintenance purposes. I believe that that was what he was suggesting.

I would like, however, to draw his attention to the extensive review of the research pertaining to bilingual education, for instance, undertaken by Patricia Lee Engle and published in the Review of Educational Research, Spring 1975. As the researcher points out in that article, bilingual education has become a political issue with world-wide ramifications. Her purpose in her research study—I am sorry, I guess it is time to adjourn this.

Mr. Chairman: I would say to the minister if his reply was going to continue—

Hon. Mr. Wells: Yes, it is going to go on for a bit.

Mr. Chairman: Then we should continue the debate after the dinner hour.

The House recessed at 6 p.m.

SPEAKERS IN THIS ISSUE

Bennett, Hon. C. Industry and Tourism (Ottawa South PC)
Bernier, Hon. L. Natural Resources (Kenora PC)
Breithaupt, J. R. (Kitchener L)
Brunelle, Hon. R. Minister without Portfolio and Chairman of Cabinet (Cochrane North PC)
Bullbrook, J. E. (Sarnia L)
Campbell, M. (St. George L)
Cassidy, M. (Ottawa Centre NDP)
Conway, S. (Renfrew North L)
Davis, Hon. W. G. Premier (Brampton PC)
Eaton, R. G. Middlesex PC)
Ferris, J. P. (London South L)
Foulds, J. F. (Port Arthur NDP)
Gaunt, M. (Huron-Bruce L)
Gigantes, E. (Carleton East NDP)
Good, E. R. (Waterloo North L)
Handleman, Hon. S. B. Consumer and Commercial Relations (Carleton PC)
Henderson, Hon. L. C. Minister without Portfolio (Lambton PC)
Hodgson, W. (York North PC)
Kerr, Hon. G. A. Environment (Burlington South PC)
Laughren, F. (Nickel Belt NDP)
Lawlor, P. D. (Lakeshore NDP)
Leluk, N. G. (York West PC)
Lewis, S. Leader of the Opposition (Scarborough West NDP)
MacBeth, Hon. J. P. Provincial Secretary for Justice and Solicitor General (Humber PC)
MacDonald, D. C. (York South NDP)
Makarchuk, M. (Brantford NDP)
Mancini, R. (Essex South L)
McEwen, J. E. (Frontenac-Addington L)
McKeough, Hon. W. D. Treasurer, Minister of Economics and Intergovernmental Affairs (Chatham-Kent PC)
McMurtry, Hon. R. Attorney General (Eglinton PC)
Miller, Hon. F. S. Health (Muskoka PC)
Moffatt, D. (Durham East NDP)

Newman, B. (Windsor-Walkerville L)
Newman, Hon. W. Agriculture and Food (Durham North PC)
Nixon, R. F. (Brant-Oxford-Norfolk L)
Reid, T. P. (Rainy River L)
Renwick, J. A. (Riverdale NDP)
Rhodes, Hon. J. R. Housing (Sault Ste. Marie PC)
Riddell, J. (Huron-Middlesex L)
Roy, A. J. (Ottawa East L)
Ruston, R. F. (Essex North L)
Samis, G. (Cornwall NDP)
Sandeman, G. (Peterborough NDP)
Sargent, E. (Grey-Bruce L)
Scrivener, Hon. M. Government Services (St. David PC)
Shore, M. (London North L)
Singer, V. M. (Wilson Heights L)
Smith, Hon. J. R. Correctional Services (Hamilton Mountain PC)
Snow, Hon. J. W. Transportation and Communications (Oakville PC)
Stephenson, Hon. B. Labour (York Mills PC)
Stokes, J. E. (Lake Nipigon NDP)
Sweeney, J. (Kitchener-Wilmot L)
Taylor, Hon. J. A. Minister of Community and Social Services (Prince Edward-Lennox PC)
Warner, D. (Scarborough-Ellesmere NDP)
Welch, Hon. R. Culture and Recreation (Brock PC)
Wells, Hon. T. L. Education (Scarborough North PC)
Wildman, B. (Algoma NDP)
Williams, J. (Oriole PC)
Yakabuski, P. J. (Renfrew South PC)
Young, F. (Yorkview) NDP)
Ziemba, E. (High Park-Swansea NDP)

CONTENTS

Tuesday, November 4, 1975

Federal housing proposals, questions of Mr. Rhodes: Mr. Lewis, Mr. Nixon 211

Private investments in housing, questions of Mr. McKeough: Mr. Lewis, Mr. Shore 212

Federal housing proposals, question of Mr. McKeough: Mr. Lewis 213

Toronto teachers' negotiations, questions of Mr. Wells: Mr. Lewis, Mr. Nixon 214

Serviced land for housing, questions of Mr. Rhodes: Mr. Nixon, Mr. Makarchuk, Mr. Singer, Mr. Cassidy 215

Meeting with New York financiers, questions of Mr. Davis: Mr. Nixon, Mr. Renwick 216

Labour Relations Amendment Act, questions of B. Stephenson: Mr. Young, Mr. Good 218

Criminal Code amendment, question of Mr. McMurtry: Mr. Singer 218

Mustard report on health services, question of Mr. Miller: Mr. Williams 219

DREE grants, question of Mr. McKeough: Mr. Stokes 220

Closing of RCA plant, question of Mr. Davis: Mr. Sargent 220

Toronto transportation facilities, question of Mr. Davis: Mr. Reid 220

York regional courthouse, question of Mrs. Scrivener: Mr. Hodgson 221

Credit rules for married women, question of Mr. Handleman: Mrs. Sandeman 221

Ottawa coroner's inquest, question of Mr. MacBeth: Mr. Roy 221

Toronto Airport noise levels, questions of Mr. Snow: Mr. Leluk, Mr. Reid 222

Central Algoma medical centre, question of Mr. Miller: Mr. Wildman 222

Motion re Wednesday sittings, Mr. Welch, agreed to 223

Ministry of Government Services Amendment Act, Mr. Singer, first reading 225

Ontario Bill of Rights Act, Mr. Roy, first reading 226

Ontario Human Rights Code Amendment Act, Mr. B. Newman, first reading 226

Resumption of the debate on the Speech from the Throne, Mr. Nixon 226

Motion to adjourn debate, Mr. Welch, agreed to 241

Estimates, Ministry of Education, Mr. Wells, continued 241

Recess 258

No. 7



Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT — DAILY EDITION

First Session of the Thirtieth Legislature

Tuesday, November 4, 1975

Evening Session

Speaker: Honourable Russell Daniel Rowe
Clerk: Roderick Lewis, QC

THE QUEEN'S PRINTER
PARLIAMENT BUILDINGS, TORONTO
1975

CONTENTS

A list of the speakers taking part in the debates in this issue of Hansard appears, in alphabetical order, at the back of this issue.

Daily contents of proceedings also appears at the back of this issue. Reference to a cumulative index of previous issues can be obtained by calling the Hansard Reporting Service indexing staff. Phone 965-2159.

Hansard subscription price is $15.00 per session, from: Sessional Subscription Service, MGS, 9th Floor, Ferguson Block, Parliament Bldgs., Toronto, M7A 1N3. Phone 965-2238.

LEGISLATURE OF ONTARIO

The House resumed at 8 p.m.

ESTIMATES, MINISTRY OF EDUCATION
(concluded)

On vote 2802:

Mr. Chairman: When the committee rose at 6 we were discussing item 2 and the minister was responding to comments that had been made by various members of the Legislature.

Hon. Mr. Wells: Mr. Chairman, I think I was talking about some of the comments that the hon. member for Oakwood (Mr. Grande) had made in the House, and I was referring to some research that was published in the Review of Educational Research in the spring of 1975 by a researcher called Patricia Lee Engle. She points out in that article that bilingual education, as I think I said, has become a political issue with world-wide ramifications and is at present in many countries. Her purpose was a purely pedagogical one; it was merely to evaluate the evidence bearing on the issue of what language to use in teaching minority children—their own language, or that of the majority. Incidentally, they must learn the language of the majority well because that is a priority concern of their parents.

Engle examined 24 major studies done around the world. Her conclusions: The 24 studies provided no substantial evidence as to which approach is better for the child. She reports that they do not indicate a clear direction nor are they mutually consistent. They resemble the seven blind men exploring an elephant, she said. She concluded that the success of a bilingual education is related to a complex web of factors that differs in each situation.

I would submit that this problem is compounded in Canada by the fact that in dealing with maintenance of languages we are not dealing with bilingualism, but with what might be called trilingualism. As an example of the debate or controversy surrounding this issue, one study—the Henderson and Silverman study of transitional Italian programmes designed to ease the child's way into English and at the same time to continue instruction in other school subjects in Italian—showed that the use of the child's own language did not interfere with the learning of English. In fact, it showed the child would make more progress also in mathematics.

Yet Skoczylas, reporting in the California Journal of Education Research on the bilingual education of Spanish American children, showed that although progress in English was the same for both the bilingually and the monolingually instructed groups, the monolingually instructed groups scored significantly higher in mathematics.

We are vitally interested in doing what is best for children, and that is why we are funding research in this area. That is why we do permit the use of the child's own language for transitional purposes. If the teacher thinks a child has not understood what was said in English, for example, he or she may repeat it in the child's own language. There are many ways the transitional programme can work.

The evidence to date is that parents, I think, are as divided as the researchers are on this issue. I think that—perhaps my friend is aware of this—at General Mercer School this summer we saw an indication of this. In this particular school area the Italian parents of incoming kindergarten children were about evenly divided on whether they wanted their children to go into a bilingual English-Italian kindergarten or into an English-only kindergarten.

The maintenance of the child's own language is another issue. I am concerned about this as an educational issue. It can be approached as a cultural issue or as a political issue. But I want to look at it at this point in time as an educational issue. I agree that a facility with more than one language is, of course, a desirable objective. As the member for Oakwood quite rightly pointed out, these children of whom we are speaking today, here and now, come with a talent that should not be lost.

This was the reasoning behind our decision to extend experimental course procedures for secondary schools—so that any language might be offered for credit in grades 9 to 13. In

some 86 classes more than a dozen languages are being given in secondary schools across this province today. Italian, of course, has been offered in secondary schools for many years. This year, I think, approximately 6,500 students in grades 9 to 13, for example, are taking Italian as part of their secondary school credit programme.

At the elementary level, we have more problems, perhaps; some philosophic, some organizational. The programme of the elementary school does not easily lend itself to the offering of options, but what is more important, parents in the non-official language groups are, themselves, divided on the issue. A recent study of the non-official language groups by O'Bryan, Reitz and Kuplowska shows that, for example, while 34.4 per cent of Chinese parents would assign responsibility for third-language programmes to the primary school, 29.3 per cent prefer to allocate responsibility to ethnic or church schools, as they refer to them; in other words, outside of regular school hours. While 35 per cent of Italian parents prefer primary schools, 26.1 per cent would allocate responsibility for maintenance languages to the secondary school.

Of all the non-official language groups surveyed, only 43.3 per cent thought that the taxpayers in general should cover the costs of such programmes, while 45.4 per cent thought that the parents, or the ethnic group itself, should cover the costs. These figures, coming from the non-official language groups themselves do not suggest to me any universal mandate justifying the introduction of third language instruction to the elementary school to this province's part of the regular curriculum.

Within this province, as I have stated, we live with the basic fact of bilingualism with the two official languages, English and French. This form of bilingualism is, of course, enunciated in the Education Act in our regulations. I must say tonight it is not our intention to change the Education Act in this regard. But we are also committed to exploring ways and means of supporting third-language programmes outside the regular curriculum in the schools. To this end we are working toward several programmes which may or may not—depending on how our study on them goes in the next little while—assist in this particular matter. We are aware of the legislation that has been enacted in other provinces and various states of the US. Some of it is akin, really, to our own provisions for transitional use of the child's own language. Some of it goes further and permits introduction in, and maintenance of, the child's own language.

As I indicated earlier, we do have a ministry committee and a work group which is studying all of these issues of education for this group of young people; the whole area of language instruction other than the official languages; the whole area of multiculturalism as it applies to Ontario schools. We intend to host another seminar very shortly dealing with the issue of third- or non-official language maintenance. The committee that I talked about just a minute ago will be reporting to me at the end of this year with any recommendations for change that they may decide are necessary, and at that time I hope we'll be able to make some further statements about this very important matter.

Mr. Grande: A few questions of the minister, if I may. First of all, the minister talked about the development of this committee, and I understand it's an internal committee of his own ministry called the committee on multiculturalism. I would like to know specifically the terms of reference for setting up that committee and what it is looking at. I suspect that the Minister of Education has set up this committee for no other purpose than to stall for time. Pressures have been brought upon his ministry by the Toronto Board of Education and by many groups within the community—from the North York Board of Education and from the Borough of York Board of Education. The minister is saying, "In order to alleviate these particular pressures on the ministry, what we're going to do is set up a committee and say we're working on it." I would like an answer to that question—and then, if I may, Mr. Chairman, I have other questions which I would like to ask.

Hon. Mr. Wells: Of course, I'd be less than honest if I didn't say that is my answer: We're working on it. But I think I tried to indicate in the paper and the response that I just gave that there are many conflicting opinions about what is the best source of action to take in this particular area. You have some research and the Toronto board has a report of the working group on multiculturalism. There are a host of research studies that have been done on bilingual education in other jurisdictions. There are all kinds of things, many of them conflicting, many of them very indefinite as to what direction should be taken.

This internal ministry committee that I have told you about is the group that is working for me to help synthesize all the

things that are coming into this ministry so that we can stand up and tell you what we are going to be doing. But I can't do that, just based on the fact that you might bring in one piece of research, excellent as it is, and tell me that's the way things should go.

I think I've tried tonight to indicate some of the ways I think things can go, some of the things that are happening, and some of the things that are being studied. Yes, the answer is definitely that the group is there so that we can decide. If you think that's stalling for time, well, then it is stalling for time.

Mr. Foulds: But you haven't replied on the basis of educational research.

Mr. Nixon: I was interested that the minister, in giving his report, said that a number of the families prefer to have education and actually cultural matters taught in their church schools or the private educational opportunities in many communities.

I'm concerned about the opportunities in our regular school system, either public or separate, or at the secondary level. I'm concerned about communities with specific cultural and language interests and responsibilities having the opportunity of having courses, not necessarily taught in that language, but to have that language taught as a special language skill for the people in that community.

I'm thinking specifically of a community in my constituency where there's a very large group of Ukrainians. They've been farming in that area now for many years, actually since well before the Second World War. They have become well established and have a major role to play in the community in every respect. I have felt for a long time that there ought to be the opportunity, not for their ordinary classes to be taught in Ukrainian, but that the Ukrainian language and the literature be taught as a regular subject in the curriculum of the schools in that area where, in my opinion, the numbers of students in the families would warrant it.

Is there any reason why the school board could not take an initiative in this regard? These classes would not be special classes, but be a part of the curriculum.

[8:15]

I'm sure that it follows true in other communities, with many and cultural groups, that the young people perhaps have an opportunity to learn their native language, either at home or perhaps in church or special schools, but that they lose credit for it when they go to a regular school system. Too often we in this province, whether we intend to or not, seem to downgrade the knowledge of a second or a third or a fourth language—and why not? This seems to be one of the few jurisdictions where the knowledge of additional languages is not as highly regarded as it should be. We have one of the few school systems which graduate supposedly well-educated people at the end of 13 grades who are, in fact, unilingual and often not terribly competent in that regard.

Hon. Mr. Wells: Mr. Chairman, it is our policy to allow this. It's the policy in the schools where the board wishes it and there are parents who wish it, to have the course in, for instance, Ukrainian for credit purposes in secondary schools. That's now a policy.

Mr. Nixon: Might I ask another question that is at least related? Unfortunately, I haven't been here for all of the debate. Has the minister been asked about the disposition of the Gillin report on French language instruction? I don't know whether this has been discussed, and I certainly don't want to raise it again if I can read about it in Hansard.

Hon. Mr. Wells: No, it hasn't been discussed. I haven't made any policy statement on that report and what will follow from it. It's still under discussion in the ministry.

Mr. Nixon: I can remember when the report was first made public it received a good deal of approval from many areas in the community, educationists and those in the English-speaking community who are particularly interested in French-language instruction. There has been a substantial feeling that French-language instruction has not been as effective as it might be. I can tell you, sir, whether you're interested or not, that in saying that, in a number of schools I've had French teachers get up and tear several strips of skin off my back, but the truth really is that in this province I understand the number of secondary students taking French—that is, in the English-speaking communities—is now somewhere about 35 per cent or even lower.

This must be of great concern for us all, and I'm sure it is for the Minister of Education. He certainly doesn't want to compel anybody to do anything but it seems that in a bilingual country we should be sure that we have good opportunities for students to take the French language, to have an appreciation of the spoken language and an appreciation of the literature. I feel this is one area where

our education system has been substantially failing.

I happen to know Prof. Gillin personally. I taught with him during my extensive education career, and I know him to be a very competent man indeed, a man who worked mightily with effective assistance for many months to provide this report. It's been in the hands of the minister for how long? Fifteen months? Longer? As I say, it was well accepted by everybody. I don't know whether the minister is delaying because of some political concerns he may have, but surely in the education system in this province, a banner province in a bilingual multicultural nation, we ought to be taking the lead in providing the most effective procedures in instruction in the French language—I'm not sure I've got those phrases right; let's say French instruction—that we possibly could have?

I'm sorry there has been such a delay. Where is the report now? Is it with the minister, or has he made recommendations to cabinet?

Hon. Mr. Wells: The report is still with me. I think it's an excellent report and I'm still hoping that we'll be able to move in some of the areas.

I'll be very frank and honest with you—the reason that we're not moving at the present time and we're still working out where and how we will move with the report, is that my costing figures on implementing it "as is" in the first year were $37 million and I can't get another $37 million in my estimates at this time to implement that report. We've got to scale down some of the sections in that report and find out what is a priority, and that is what we're still working on.

Mr. Nixon: Mr. Chairman, with your permission, don't we have special federal grants that come into the province to foster French-language education? It's been the feeling of many school boards that these sums somehow get submerged in our $2, $3, $4 billion education budget and are not directly used for the fostering of this sort of education. I'm sure these grants are not large enough to pay the $39 million or whatever the figure was you were talking about. There is a phrase often used in politics about steps in the right direction. Surely a full implementation, while it might be desirable, is something which is not practical as the minister pointed out. Surely we could do something to move in the direction pointed out by the Gillin report.

Hon. Mr. Wells: Let me comment about the money from the federal government. We get money from the federal government based on the teaching of French in the schools—French to French and French to English. According to the method of calculation the amount of money which we will receive will be approximately $22.3 million. The amount we now pay out to the school boards for existing programmes is estimated to be $27.4 million.

In other words, under the identification method we now have in the grant and ceiling system, which identifies the money which goes to French-language instruction, we are paying out $5.1 million more than the federal government contributes.

Being very frank with you again, the issue becomes further confused to some degree because that money, as I said, comes here based on French to French and French to English. We get a fairly sizable grant for the French to French; in other words, the French-language educational system in this province I guess in actual terms you could say, as some of their French-language advisory committees have said, we don't pass all that money on because we don't think they need all that money above the normal funding they get in this province because the normal funding will carry on the kind of programmes they run in their schools. We take some of that money and use it to help the French to English programme which is grossly under-funded by the federal government. In other words, we give a lot more money to the school boards to help them run their programmes of French as a second language for anglophone students.

Mr. Nixon: Mr. Chairman, I'm a bit offended by the implication of the minister that the federal government ought to be paying for our French and English instruction. In the schools it's a subject like history and science and math. This is a provincial responsibility and until about 1968 it was fully covered by the appropriations from this House. I think the federal initiative was because there was a feeling that at the provincial level there had not been sufficient initiative in bringing the teaching of French to English students up to a proper level. That money was surely designed to pay for special programmes, not the regular French classes to which all of us were exposed and which are still conducted in much the same method as they were conducted back in the 1940s when they were such a failure with some of us.

Hon. Mr. Wells: Yes, it's basically designed for the French programmes in the elementary schools which we all agree could stand to be improved. The money is to carry on those programmes which actually do involve extra cost above and beyond that the board would normally be paying. Usually the teacher who normally is teaching a full elementary class through all the subjects in the curriculum can't do that, so they have a special French teacher and the other teacher has to do something. There is an incremental cost to that board for the French programme. Any increase in the programme is going to cost more to that board than carrying on the normal programme in one language.

Mr. Nixon: If I may finish with one more question. Do we understand the minister to say that no aspect of Prof. Gillin's recommendations are to be implemented in the coming year? Is there any prospect of any implementation barring some additional funding?

Hon. Mr. Wells: I hope we will be able to introduce some aspects of his report within the coming year.

Mr. Grossman: Unfortunately I missed the comments of the member for Oakwood (Mr. Grande) on the general subject of multiculturalism. As the member for a downtown Toronto riding which is, perhaps, the focal point of what is happening in Metropolitan Toronto with regard to this issue, I wish to emphasize to the minister that the issue is indeed as complicated as he has set it out and with as many ramifications as he has indicated. It's really a trauma which affects the very family life of those immigrant families, although the parents in very many instances are saying: "We do want our children to get an education in the English language." The net effect of that after two, three, four and five years is that those children and their parents have some difficulty in talking with each other and communicating adequately. So while the parents want one thing to occur, the net effect is something they aren't always happy with.

The parents are also wrestling with this problem. They are very much interested in seeing that this problem be alleviated whenever possible and wherever possible. I am not generalizing, but this is some of the playback I get from my constituents. Many of them are of the school that is concerned about things such as field trips and so forth. They are used to a more structured school system—and I hear sounds of the election campaign rolling through my head. They are used to a system in which the three "r"s are the three "r"s with nothing added. Indeed that's often what they expect to get. They don't quite understand nor in some cases appreciate the tremendous value that some of the extra added attractions of our educational system provide.

Mr. Nixon: Like a trip to the Legislature.

Mr. Grossman: Like a trip to the Legislature—on the right days.

Mr. Bain: It gets them right to the heart of the problem.

Mr. Grossman: So—now, just wait. You spoke at some length.

So as the report on multiculturalism sets out, it's a complicated problem that needs some resolution. But it must be resolved in a manner in which the parents of those children are satisfied that their children are going to be able to go out of this system and, unlike what the leader of the Liberal Party has said, be well educated in the English language and be able to cope in this country.

Unlike some others, I have a lot of faith in the quality of the teachers in this province—in the teachers who will be asked to implement some of the programmes that the minister is anticipating will come through.

Mr. Foulds: He's not anticipating anything.

Mr. Grossman: I am convinced that we need not—

Mr. Makarchuk: Why don't you pay them if you think so much about them?

Mr. Grossman: I am convinced that we need not—

Mr. Chairman: May I point out to the spectators or the visitors in the galleries this evening that one of the House rules is that there will be no applause or emotional outburst from the galleries.

Mr. Lewis: Maybe the member would like to give the teachers some sense of his English skills—

Mr. Chairman: Let the hon. member for St. Andrews-St. Patrick (Mr. Grossman) continue.

Mr. Lewis: —his skill with language.

Mr. Chairman: Order, please.

Mr. Lewis: He could make a few guttural sounds.

Mr. Johnston: Everyone heard it.

Mr. Chairman: Order, please.

Mr. Grossman: I thought I heard the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Lewis) earlier—I may have misunderstood him but I thought I heard him indicate that he really wasn't trying to carry a special brief for any special group—

Mr. Lewis: That's right.

Mr. Grossman: —and perhaps that doesn't quite coincide with the member for Brantford (Mr. Makarchuk).

An hon. member: I did hear him say he'd use anybody he could.

Mr. Grossman: That's true. The member for Brantford doesn't quite agree. He's pitching where he can and when the people are present. I am addressing myself—

Mr. Foulds: You are striking out.

Mr. Grossman: —to the quality of the teachers in the system and how far you have to go, and how far we can go, without getting too far involved in a complicated school system.

If they were all that simple, that long draft report—mind you, it is still a draft report on multiculturalism—would not have been called for. It would not be as long as it is and would not need the study that it does need. I might add the trustees involved agree and admit that it needs further study, and certainly the parents agree that it needs further study. Indeed, the multiculturalism report has been debated in four or five locations in Metropolitan Toronto alone, and with some very mixed reactions among the parents—indeed, among the students as well.

[8:30]

Mr. Foulds: What language is it in?

Mr. Grossman: But I am happy to say that the minister appears to have grasped the problem. I was in the House for his remarks, and they did indicate that he had a good grasp of the problem and how far we have to go to resolve it. I would hope that he would not forget—

Mr. McClellan: A stranglehold.

Mr. Grossman: —those figure that he quoted with regard to the wishes of the parents. There is also a very great danger that they will feel that the educational system, while attempting to meet their needs, is not in some ways meeting their emotional needs, wants and desires.

With those comments, I would say to the minister that I hope he will keep that in mind and I hope he will make an effort to obtain the minutes, or at least whatever minutes are available of the various meetings held by the group on multiculturalism in the communities through Metropolitan Toronto. It is a complicated issue.

Mr. Grande: Mr. Chairman, I don't know to whom or to what we owe the pleasure of having the leader of the third party in the House. During the past two or three days, when the Education estimates have been on, he has disappeared as soon as the question period was over.

Mr. Sweeney: Speak for your own party.

Mr. Nixon: It must have been because you were talking, whoever you are.

Mr. Grande: Mr. Chairman, if I may, I would like to return to the basic discussion.

Mr. Nixon: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman, does the hon. gentleman object to my taking part in this questioning?

Mr. Grande: None whatsoever.

Mr. Nixon: Oh, that's good, I just wanted to get that straight.

Mr. Foulds: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman, the member for Brant-Oxford-Norfolk might speak on the correct vote, which was debated a day or two ago.

Mr. Nixon: Did you raise the Gillin report then?

Mr. Foulds: Yes.

Mr. Nixon: Oh, the minister didn't recall it.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Oakwood has the floor.

Mr. Ruston: He hasn't said anything yet.

Mr. Chairman: If you would be quiet he will.

Mr. Grande: I will this time; listen.

Mr. Riddell: We don't want to hold our breath.

Mr. Grande: Mr. Chairman, the minister mentioned the multicultural committee that he has established, the internal committee within the ministry. He said it is not a way to stall for time—

Mrs. Campbell: It is infernal not internal.

Mr. Grande: —but it is a way of gathering up information. Let me remind the minister that in 1972 a lot of people got together, invited by this government, to appear before the government's so-called "Heritage Ontario" committee. They were asked to tell the government: "This is what we think is important for the students and for the particular ethnic communities in this area."

Mr. Nixon: That wasn't the same gang who went to Italy with the Premier (Mr. Davis) was it?

Mr. Grande: I don't know. At that particular time the ministry responded by setting up the Ontario advisory multicultural council. Two years later, in 1974, we received a report of this multicultural council. In effect, it bore a very dim resemblance to exactly what we were talking about in 1972.

Mr. Mancini: We know why he is on the front bench.

Mr. Grande: Now that the pressure comes from different sources, the minister sets up still another committee to say to the people: "Look, we're doing something about it."

Let me respond to what the minister was saying earlier. He said that the "Act allows students speaking another language—other than English or French—to use that language to facilitate the learning of English in school."

The Toronto Board of Education went before the minister 2½ years ago for discussions on this. His response was: "Yes, we will allow it; but before any other programmes of this nature are set up you will need special permission from the minister." That does not mean that the Education Act allows for these programmes to be set up. I wish the minister would be clear in this area.

The next thing is that we always raise the bogus question of parents wanting their children to speak English. Of course they do. Nobody ever said that they don't want their children to learn how to speak English and to learn how to speak English well so that they can take every opportunity available to them to improve themselves. That is not the question. The question is, what is the best approach for those children to learn English?

Your comments have completely evaded the question. You mention research and, sure, there is research. Back in the 1930s and 1940s the child who spoke another language was considered to be emotionally and intellectually retarded because he could not acquire the English language as fast as we thought he should acquire it. It was considered that having another language would hinder the child in learning English. Now we're beyond that.

In the past 10 years research has shown that without any question this approach works. As of 1971, a total of 167 different kinds of bilingual programmes have been set up in the United States both as transitional programmes, using the mother tongue as the language of instruction, and as maintenance. As a matter of fact, the federal government right now is using exactly that approach with our Indian population. In the summer of 1974, your ministry started a special programme for teachers of our native people whom you encouraged, and for that I congratulate you because finally, for the first time, I think you have taken a stand on something.

Hon. Mr. Wells: That's not the first.

Mr. Grande: Well, all right; in this particular area. If that particular kind of programme is good and you see the rationale behind it, then why is it not applied with other groups? What is your rationale for having set that up—I think it was at Hamilton Teachers' College? As a matter of fact, I went down there one day to visit it and I was very impressed.

Why is it that you're having difficulty in using the mother tongue of children who happen not to be native people and who happen not to be of French origin and not of English background? Why is it that it works in one area and does not work in another? What is the problem?

I have another point. Probably you got the information from a Toronto Star clipping about a year and a half ago which said that the parents were evenly divided, talking specifically about the General Mercer programme. I was present that particular night and 28 out of 29 parents signed the permission form right there and then. I don't know where you got the information; perhaps you could check on that.

Let me sum it up. The most important thing that I've been trying to say—that I tried to say yesterday, as a matter of fact—is that by using the native language of a child, the first language of a child, and by easing that child into the culture and into the English language that child eventually will learn the English language a lot better than he's doing under the complete English immersion programme. And the evidence shows it. So the research that you're bringing forward perhaps is slightly out of date.

Hon. Mr. Wells: Let me just add to the debate, first to say that the transitional programmes I was talking about in my remarks do not need ministry approval at this time. That may have been so two years ago but I think at that time we were still feeling our way on the kind of programmes which should be used. At this particular time if the teachers feel this is the approach to take they do not need ministry approval to conduct that kind of programme.

I suppose the only thing is what my friend is saying presupposes that there will be a specific class set up where this will be used. That may not, of course, be the case. It may be that the teacher will use it for some of the students in his or her class; we have to allow for that difference also.

Insofar as our ministry work group is concerned, I want to make it very clear that I had a meeting with the chairman of the Toronto Board of Education—who I'm sure is a friend of yours and of the Leader of the Opposition—I guess early in the year. He told me about this report of the work group on multicultural programmes, told me what was happening and asked how we could co-operate.

I indicated the way we could co-operate was by giving them a liaison person—who is the chairman of our work group—and liaising with them as they develop their report. That's exactly what's going on and I draw to the attention of the House that the final report of their work group isn't here yet.

To suggest we're stalling and everybody else is waiting for something to happen—I guess what I would say in answer to that is we are waiting for the final work group report. The process they are going through is—

Mr. Grande: You have a report.

Hon. Mr. Wells. Is that the final one?

Mr. Grande: Not the last report; the draft report of the multicultural work group. You have a report of the General Mercer programme in your hands and it has been in your hands since last year.

Hon. Mr. Wells: Yes.

Mr. Grande: Right.

Hon. Mr. Wells: I acknowledge that but this goes far beyond the General Mercer programme.

I assured the chairman of the Toronto Board of Education that we would study this report very carefully. Instead of being put in a position of being confronted with a report and then arguing over it, we have a group who are working as this final report is developed so we know what's in here—what we might accept, what we might not, what we agree with and what we do not agree with.

I think we are really quibbling over things which don't need to be quibbled over in this House. Within the general policies which I stated in my remarks—which may or may not be the same kind of policy my friend is thinking of—within that general context, we are working toward doing certain things to assist in this particular kind of education in Metropolitan Toronto.

Mr. Grande: I am sorry the minister thinks we are quibbling. Thousands of children out there are not quibbling. Thousands of children are not receiving the best possible education we can give them. All it requires is an organization with which to do it. All it requires is legislation which allows it to get done. Otherwise they will always be left behind academically. Until the culture and the language of the child is taken into account in the curriculum that child is going to be left behind.

Perhaps 10 to 15 per cent of the brighter ones will go to the top because after all it has always been that way. The cream always comes to the top. A large number of these children are destined for vocational schools and until the minister moves to rectify that situation it's going to be that way for a long time.

Mrs. Campbell: I, too, must apologize for not being here to follow through on some of the things which have been said in this particular series of votes. Representing the riding of St. George as I do, a downtown riding, I would have to lend my voice to what has been said concerning this whole question of multicultural teaching in the school system. [8:45]

As I expressed before, not just this year but in other years, I have had the opportunity to see some of our children in the court system and to see what has happened to them. They have, in fact, been placed in the position of being considered less than average in intelligence when it had nothing to do with basic intelligence at all, but simply with the fact that they were not comprehending because of their difficulties with language.

I certainly have to renew the plea I have made in the past. I do query the kinds of figures which the minister has given, simply because there are two things involved here. The parents, as has been said, want their

children to understand English and to be proficient in that language.

I think there are some parents who are concerned about the teaching of English in the way it is taught and in the whole atmosphere of the school system, because it has become divisive in families. I have seen dichotomies between children and their families. I think this is one of the points where parents may not be giving the accurate picture of their concerns and their desires for those children. I think we have to understand that many of them are very angry, because they feel their children are being placed into courses which are not suited to their talents, as they see it, simply because of the language problem.

We have already said earlier today that we feel education is a provincial function. But we in this party are never quite sure any more what we can pass off to the federal government. I understand that we are now looking for more support from the federal government in the French scene before we are going to educate in that area. Perhaps we could turn over the whole of education to the federal government, as we have turned everything else over to them, to let them educate our children as they see fit.

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: Nonsense. Your usual high calibre.

Hon. Mr. Wells: I did not say that I was waiting for money from the federal government in order to implement a French programme. All I was sharing with you, in a very frank manner, was the kind of cost involved in developing a programme. I should think that the members of the Liberal Party would be most concerned about that because they were the ones—

Mrs. Campbell: We are!

Hon. Mr. Wells: —who were going to cut millions and millions of dollars from the budgets of this province if they had won the election.

Mr. Mancini: Talk on the question.

Mrs. Campbell: Administrative costs, yes.

Mr. Lewis: Oh, come on.

Hon. Mr. Wells: That's very easily said, but I just think—

Mr. Nixon: It is easily done.

Mrs. Campbell: Easily done.

Mr. Nixon: Do away with your regional offices in one sweep.

Hon. Mr. Wells: The centralized—

An hon. member: What a hypocrite.

Hon. Mr. Wells: My friend, the Leader of the Opposition, says it—

Interjections.

Hon. Mr. Wells: My friend the leader of the third—

Mr. Lewis: But it certainly adds up.

Interjections.

Mr. Chairman: Order, please. Let the minister reply.

Hon. Mr. Wells: My friend, the leader of the third party, is still making the same kind of silly statements he made during the election.

Mr. Mancini: There is your bed partner right over there.

Mr. Good: You didn't lose 23 seats.

Hon. Mr. Wells: I think that if he had been here for the opening of these estimates, which he wasn't, he would have heard what I said about the education critic for his party who stood up and all he did was ask us to spend more money. He didn't suggest where we could save any money, he just said spend more money. Cut out the educational ceilings; spend more money on special education.

I agree. All these things have to be done, but let's not have all this—

Mr. Gaunt: Oh, you and the NDP make a great pair, I tell you.

Hon. Mr. Wells: —let's not talk out of both sides of our mouths. What I wanted to say to the hon. member for St. George was that I really didn't want to leave the impression that we would only move in the French language area if we got more money from Ottawa. I just wanted to show you that we are, in fact spending more money than we do receive from Ottawa on French language programmes. That idea that we are getting money from Ottawa and not even spending that on French language programmes is absolutely false.

Mr. Nixon: It just sinks into your regular programme.

Hon. Mr. Wells: I want you to know also that we have gone to Ottawa to ask them if they wish to help in multicultural education. We will have our meetings with them and see whether they are willing to give some

funding, but what we do in that area will not be dependent on the money that we get from Ottawa. Sure, it would be nice if we could have it, but if we can't get it we will still look toward bringing in programmes that we think are necessary and it won't be dependent on whether we get money from Ottawa or not.

Mr. Chairman: Item 2 carried. On item 3, planning and research.

Mrs. Campbell: Could I have one question on planning and research? I think it is the proper vote. Do I understand that the report of the Lowes committee, which was a research report I think, is now before the Robarts commission? Have I missed something in translation? Was it tabled here?

Hon. Mr. Wells: Yes, it was tabled here and I will be happy to get the member a copy.

Mrs. Campbell: It has gone to the Robarts commission?

Hon. Mr. Wells: Oh, yes, it has gone and we have sent to the Robarts commission all the briefs that were submitted and all the research that was done. Everything has gone to them and they are studying it along with all the other matters they are studying about Metro Toronto. I will see that you are sent a copy so that you have it.

Mr. Chairman: Item 3 carried. On item 4, special education services.

Mr. Godfrey: Mr. Chairman, I would like to make a few remarks, following up my preliminary remarks with regard to the special education services. I wish to speak particularly on children with learning disabilities.

I addressed a question to the Minister of Education previously as to the ratio of funds which were being put into this particular area. As you will recall, sir, during his preliminary remarks he was good enough to point out he was not being simplistic when he pointed out learning disability was simply not simply a matter of reversals of "p"s and "b"s but actually was a very profound problem which affected a sizable number of our students. I am sure that he is aware that this has been calculated to affect some eight per cent of students in the primary school system who have an involvement and three per cent who have a very severe involvement. Of these children, some 80 per cent are males—a remark, I am sure, which will gratify my hon. colleague from Beaches-Woodbine (Mrs. Bryden).

Mr. Lewis: We have suspected it all along.

Mr. Godfrey: The point of the figures is to query whether sufficient funds have been made available in the budget for special education services. Indeed, I am surprised to see they are so low. One of the reasons why I query whether sufficient funds are being made available is because I wonder whether these funds will make available throughout the province the necessary diagnostic and assessment type of personnel who can examine these students and determine whether they do have a learning disability. For example, in my riding of Durham West we have very few facilities to examine these children. I rather suspect that bright as the students are in my riding there is about the same percentage of children who suffer from learning disabilities as there are in the ridings downtown.

This assessment and diagnostic service has to be carried out by a specialized group of people, teachers who have had far more experience possibly than the normal grade school teacher has had. The board of education in many centres has been involved in upgrading their teachers with the assistance from the Ministry of Education, but I wonder whether sufficient consideration has been given to this identification of these students. This is particularly apropos following the previous discussion with regard to children with languages other than English. I wonder how competent our educational system is to diagnose that this child's failure to make proper progess is due to the possibilities of English not being the native tongue or whether it is a learning disability or whether it is a combination of the two.

I'm asking if this is enough money that has been set aside in order for the government to attack this problem with a certain amount of imagination. The imagination lies in the fact that prevention is better than cure, and in the establishment of high-risk identification centres which could look at children in the very early four- and five-year-old range, and possibly identify them as being high-risk children who require special consideration. This consideration could be given at an earlier time, before they're put into a scheme where they are automatic failures and falling behind their colleagues, and begin developing all of the cost that goes along with that.

My worthy colleague from St. George (Mrs. Campbell) has already referred to the number of children who appear in family court as a result of failure to make normal

educational process. I hope the ministry is aware that in setting up this type of high-risk clinic and proper remediation of these children in the earlier grades we can do something toward relieving some of the load that does appear in that particular area.

Not only is it a matter of social cost with regard to the families and the courts, but it's also a matter of dollar cost. If a child is identified as having a learning disability and subsequent to that is given proper remediation, this cuts down on the amount of reworking that has to be done.

What I'm asking in essence, sir, is whether sufficient emphasis is being placed in primary grade examination and remediation in order to prevent this endless dirge we hear of students getting into high school who have difficulty with reading, writing or thesis-type thinking.

Mr. Nixon: They are getting into college too.

Mr. Godfrey: I'm also concerned whether sufficient consideration is given in this budget for the child who eventually is pushed out of the primary school system and into the secondary school system and there begins to fail even more abysmally with even more and greater social consequences. I want to know what steps are being taken to prevent that.

We've already discussed earlier in the session the necessity for specialized centres to which some parents are now sending their children in the United States. I wonder whether the Ministry of Education is considering and actively taking part in setting up centres in Ontario which can take care of these children who have this disability.

In sum, I would like to point out several questions which I wish to put to the ministry directly. Is the ministry truly involved in this programme to identify and remediate children with learning disabilities? Is it accepting the enormity of the programme? Does it have a grasp of the problem which is there? If so, is it prepared to fund a proper programme and is it prepared to fight the other ministries in the government in order to make sure adequate funds are available?

I was a little shocked to hear earlier that our powerful Ministry of Education could not raise the $30 million or whatever it was to do something which the minister thought was worthwhile. Surely in this day there are two ministries which must have priority. One of them, of course, is the Ministry of Education. Surely our minister can be as eloquent with his colleagues as he is with us and convince them that these monies should be made available.

Mr. Nixon: That may explain why he is not more successful.

Mr. Godfrey: I would also like to know, if the ministry is concerned about setting up a proper programme, why it has not made funding available to the schools through special funding for learning disability programmes. I also wish to know, in the final question, whether the minister has definite plans for an early identification type of facility which is the key to future cost saving and delivery of educational skills.

Mr, Chairman: Does the minister wish to reply? The hon. member for Kitchener-Wilmot.

Mr. Deans: Is he going to answer?

Mr. Sweeney: Mr. Chairman, I would like to draw the minister's attention to a couple of specific cases. I would also draw to the minister's attention that the time we're talking about is 1975, not a period prior to his administration. The first one is dated May 1, 1975, and it is a statement from the city of Kingston. The mother of an emotionally disturbed 16-year-old youth says it costs $20 a day to keep him in a private institution, while all other youths there receive outside financial help. It goes on and on, but the key part is this one: "The mother said her son Geoffrey was born with a learning disability which evolved into a severe emotional disturbance and behavioural problems." It finishes where the mother says: "We have an excellent credit rating, but at $20 a day it adds up pretty quickly." The point being made is that in this particular situation the school system was not able to provide the necessary help.

[9:00]

Another one is dated July 1, 1975; the heading you may recognize: "Convicted youth will end up as a killer, his psychiatrist warns the court." The story reads as follows:

> According to Toronto psychiatrist Alan Davidson it's a tragic obituary-like prediction. But it's one that's likely to come true, and it's one that nobody seems capable of changing. Jack was born in September, 1958, one of four children. He began his school career in the conventional fashion; by grade 3, however, he began to fall by the wayside. His reading and writing weren't up to par. He was, in the school board jargon of the day, a boy with a learning disability.

> Dr. Davidson said that Jack, whose IQ had been computed at between 127 and 135, is gifted but disturbed. The learning disability which meant that Jack was unable to keep up with his classmates threw him in with other slow learners, and brought with it increasing behaviour problems. Another situation where our school system couldn't help.

One more, dated July 5, 1975. This is a letter from a mother to the Globe and Mail and about halfway down it reads as follows:

> Unfortunately, because we were so late in finding the learning disability, there was considerable emotional damage done. And even at the dyslexia school in the middle of the second year, he was expelled for misconduct. Now at 14, there is nowhere for him to go. He is not ready emotionally to cope with the normal school system, and there is little else in the Province of Ontario available. Do we have to go to the United States or Britain to get help?

Who is going to help that poor kid who has just been sentenced to jail? And that was the previous article.

We could go on and on and on with cases like that. As a matter of fact at the present time, in my own riding, there is a young boy by the name of David Bruyn, whose parents participated in that celebrated Ontario Supreme Court case of last May—that did not directly deal with this ministry, but it should have. That particular case dealt with the Ministry of Community and Social Services, and the result of the Supreme Court case was the decision that that particular ministry was obliged to provide funding to send that 15-year-old boy to a special school in the United States. It costs the mother, a mother raising that family by herself, $13,000 a year to keep that boy there. The Ministry of Community and Social Services is providing $7,000 toward it.

My question is, why does another ministry have to step in and provide service to a child who has a serious learning disability? Why do we have case after case in this province, where the school system is not able to provide help to these children? Why is it necessary right in Toronto for private schools to be set up—such as the Toronto Learning Centre which in one year quadrupled, from the schools in this city, the number of students that it serves—I might add at the cost to the parents of $20 an hour.

In this province a significant programme to train teachers to handle children with severe learning disabilities is not provided. Any school system that wants to prepare teachers to do so must send them to the United States or somewhere else. There is not within this province any institution, any school, which can handle this kind of children. They have to go to the United States. At that Supreme Court hearing a representative of the Ministry of Community and Social Services, when asked by the judge if there is any place in the Province of Ontario where this child can get the help he needs, said no.

If there is one way in which this ministry has fallen down and fallen down badly—and there are specific cases which can be quoted—it is in the area of providing significant, realistic and helpful assistance to children of this province who have serious learning disabilities.

Hon. Mr. Wells: I would like to say in regard to the particular case my friend mentioned, it has been drawn to my attention that a special education consultant from the Waterloo County Board of Education and someone from one of our regional offices travelled to that school in the United States and observed the programme. The Waterloo county board feels very confident it can have an equally good programme available in Waterloo county with one exception—the residential component of that school. However, I am told that was not acceptable to the mother and she still felt that even if that was available from the Waterloo county board she would want her son to go to the school in the United States.

Perhaps that illustrates in one way what we don't have in this province. I wonder if we really want to start developing that kind of facility—that is, the residential school to provide not only the programme but also a residential facility for that student. I say that at a time when we have been moving away from residential schools for the mentally retarded. We are moving into community facilities in all various areas. The suggestion that perhaps what we need is residential schools for children with special learning disabilities is not one that particularly appeals to me.

I draw it to your attention today because I think it does underline one of the reasons these American schools are perhaps more attractive for people. I don't dispute that they can serve the purpose. I think they can serve the purpose and provide a good learning environment. I think that environment can be and probably is being duplicated in this province by school boards but not with

the residential component. For a lot of parents that is not what they want.

I think one of the real paradoxes or anomalies we find when we get into this particular area is that people decide that certain programmes are the ones needed for their child. Boards which have offered alternative programmes, which feel they have programmes which can help that child, have been turned down by the parents. This has happened.

Let me say further that in the establishment of our special education branch—which we re-established a couple of years ago—one of the roles I saw for that branch and which Mr. Clarke, the director, sees for that branch, is to provide, if you will, an ombudsman for people with problems such as the first case you indicated.

Dr. Gord Bergman, who is in charge of that particular section of the branch, is there to help people who feel they can't find the right facility, the right programme, the right school, the right type of environment for their child with a special problem. We have been doing this and that was part of the reason for re-creating the special education branch in the way it was re-created.

Let me say that the amount of money we are voting here is basically for the special education branch—the staff who make up that branch; the services they need and the training programme in our schools for the deaf. This $1 million-and-some-odd is not the money which is being spent on special education in this province. Indeed, in 1975 we find that school boards provide special education in self-contained classes to approximately 41,000 students at the elementary level. About another 119,000 were programmed for in withdrawal and resource room instruction, on top of the 41,000 who were in the special classes. Of this number, 23,000 learning disabled children received specialized programmes and services.

At the secondary level, 51,000 exceptional students received individualized instruction, many of whom are classified as learning disabled.

Now in total this means that there are 212,000, or about 10 per cent of the student population in this province, presently being provided with education by about 10,600 specially trained teachers and professional support staff. In 1975, approximately 1,400 teachers enrolled in the ministry's summer courses in special education.

The reimbursement to school boards for special education is provided through weighting factors. They of course get the normal grants and are allowed the normal ceiling for those students, but then there are weighting factors which generate more money for special education programmes. A total of $31.6 million is being provided in addition to the normal grants in 1975, and a large portion of this expenditure is allotted to the education of children with learning disabilities.

In addition, about $4.5 million is for occupational and technical programmes, plus $1.7 million reimbursement to boards for programmes in psychiatric facilities, group homes and so forth, where the boards provide the teachers to go into those facilities and the total cost is reimbursed by the ministry. This means about $58.4 million over and above the normal grant money that goes to the school boards. Incidentally, that amount of money is not the extra money that they get for the programmes for the mentally retarded, although the mentally retarded group were included in the 212,000 students I mentioned. They are accounted for—as I am sure my friend knows—in a special way in the ceiling and budget grant formulae. This is the extra money that special weighting factors generate for special education programmes.

We are also conducting about 25 research programmes in the ministry through the special education branch in the field of autism, blindness, deafness, gifted children, physical handicaps, medical handicaps and children with learning disabilities.

The approach that we take is that the school boards in Ontario have the responsibility for the delivery of services in the special education field. I think, in my dealings with them, most of them are very willing and very capable of doing so. We are trying to provide the support services and the funding and the backup research to assist them to provide programmes for children who need special help.

Of course we have this problem that my friend the member from Waterloo identified, of children who are now going out of the province for programmes. I think I indicated some of the reasons why this is happening. I certainly hope that we arrive at the day when we have programmes here for these children. I think I indicated one of the paradoxical situations or anomalies that will arise. Even when those programmes are available some parents feel these special private schools are somehow superior to any programme the public education system might be able to provide.

Let me just comment for a few minutes on the early identification of children, because

I think that's a very important area. The member for Durham West (Mr. Godfrey) indicated in his remarks—and I might say that I welcome the member for Durham West to this Legislature. I haven't had anything to do with him over People or Planes or airports, but we did used to discuss many matters concerning health when I was Minister of Health. He has had a very distinguished career in his particular field of medicine. I think that the area—

Mr. Lewis: Why do you render him to the past tense?

Hon. Mr. Wells: I understand that everybody who comes into this House becomes a full-time politician.

Mr. Lewis: Not everyone.

Hon. Mr. Wells: I hope not, because I know some friends of mine who are patients of his and who would not like to think they couldn't count upon him as a doctor.

[9:15]

I think the comments he made about early identification are right; the early identification of children with learning disabilities is very vital. We funded an early identification programme in the Windsor school system. It was started in 1971 and it went on up to Aug. 31, 1975. During that time there have been interim reports. We've studied these reports and the final report is now being made.

This was a carefully done project to see how an early identification programme could work. The reports will be available for all those concerned in school boards and teachers will be able to read them and see if this programme couldn't be duplicated or assist programmes they might want to operate in their schools.

The research has been conducted on an assessment procedure to determine a child's skills in receptive language, auditory association expressive language, mathematical capability and the recognition of colours. This assessment was administered by the class teacher for each child in five-year-old kindergartens in the project at the beginning of the school year, in September. The core of the pattern was the education and assessment by the teacher, but of equal importance were other procedures developed at the same time. The pattern that was developed as a result of this project is now being used in 30 of the Windsor school board schools.

I think that a full reading of this carefully controlled research project may lead many boards to adopt this kind of programme, to make it better and to improve it. Certainly it will put emphasis on early identification, which I think is one area we need to put emphasis on. We're intending, as a ministry, to make sure that this report and all the information on early identification is disseminated widely to the school boards in this province. A number of boards have already started to conduct early identification programmes.

Mr. Sweeney: Mr. Chairman, may I just respond to a comment the minister made before another question comes up?

Mr. Minister, I accept the fact there are many school systems in this province doing a very fine job in special education. I accept there are quite a large number of children in this province—I won't quarrel with your figure of 10 per cent—who are receiving some form of special education. The point to which I was attempting to direct my remarks concerned those children who could be identified as having severe learning disabilities – not minimal, not even moderate.

The difficulty is that there are no training facilities in this province to prepare teachers to handle such children. There are no institutions of any kind to handle such children.

In each of the specific cases to which I referred, Mr. Chairman, I have checked with the parents, and they advised me their individual school systems—and that includes the Waterloo County Public School Board that you referred to—have admitted they are unable to deal with the specific cases I mentioned. Officials from the Waterloo County system have even said they intend to put a programme into force but it will not be able to look after this particular case.

In each of those cases, the parents have only gone to private education—whether it's the Toronto learning centre or the centre in Kingston, or whether it's in Britain or the United States—because the local board can't do it. That's the area, Mr. Chairman, to which I do not think this ministry has yet addressed itself.

I think there's one other point that needs clarification. It is only one year ago, Mr. Minister, that you reactivated the special education branch. For the previous five or six years I believe, your ministry did not have a special education branch. I think it says something significant that such a long period of time elapsed before a new branch was set up again in 1974.

Hon. Mr. Wells: Let me just correct the figures. The special education branch as such was phased out in 1972 as the result of a reorganization report and then was reinsti-

tuted two years later. That didn't mean there was any less emphasis on special education; it didn't mean we were abandoning special education. It meant we had listened to some consultants who said that you shouldn't create special branches—and I am sure we have all heard this kind of dialogue before from consultants—but you should have the people working in the normal delivery service areas; you don't identify special education as such, but you have someone working in the curriculum branch, in the supervision branch and in your regional offices. That is what we did—and there was great emphasis on special education. I have to say, though, that that kind of approach doesn't work.

In order, first of all, to make people aware and confirm that you do have a real interest in a thing, you must have a special branch, a visible branch—I think what you have said today emphasizes that to me. You need people who can be readily identified by the people they serve in the school system, which is what we have done in our reinstituted special education branch.

Really, the emphasis on this problem has always been an important aspect in the ministry; it has just been a case of how it has been approached. I think the branch is the better way to approach it.

Mr. Lewis: I would like to add a footnote to this discussion, triggered by the observations of the member for Kitchener-Wilmot (Mr. Sweeney), because as I understand the minister's response to him it is really begging the question.

The matter of residential care for kids whose learning disability has been so inadequately responded to by the school system is something which in one sense shouldn't be at issue here. The ministry not only falls down in crisis intervention—all of us understand that; these Bruyn children are driven to residential care because all along the line the educational system has failed them.

Why is it not possible in the Province of Ontario to develop, at the earliest ages and in the earliest years of the elementary system, the kind of identification patterns which my colleague from Durham West talked about and the kind of support services which most of us know to be desirable?

Less than two weeks ago, curiously enough, I met for an evening with a chap named Morgan, Dr. John Morgan, of the Centre for Learning Disabilities at Guelph.

Hon. Mr. Wells: Griffith Morgan.

Mr. Lewis: I am sorry; Dr. Griffith Morgan, at Guelph. As a matter of fact, he is the fellow who spent a lot of time drafting P1-J1, as you well know; he also has a most remarkable background in Wales and in other jurisdictions dealing with special education.

One of the things which quite threw me in conversation with the gentleman was the fact that at the Centre for Learning Disabilities in Guelph they are handling, almost on an emergency basis, 40 or 50 virtual referrals from the surrounding school system which cannot be coped with within the school system.

I thought to myself that the Wellington Board of Education must surely be a pretty sophisticated board. I also wondered why it is necessary to send those cases to a special little group associated with the university, beleaguered, pressed for funds, and working largely on the goodwill and commitment of one extraordinary educator. Why is the system so wanting in substance that even the schools and the administration are sending kids with whom they cannot cope to the university setting? It struck me as a most intriguing commentary on the inadequacy of the elementary school system. It is no pejorative view of the board; it is just what is happening to boards all over Ontario. You have kids with learning disabilities who then have emotional repercussions, and the boards aren't equipped to cope; that's a failure of the system.

I am working from memory, but I think I recall that on May 1, 1975, there was a report presented to the trustees of the city of Toronto Board of Education by the special education committee of the board, showing 631—I may be three or four out; forgive me for quantifying it—631 kids in the elementary and secondary system in the city of Toronto alone for whom no adequate response was given to problems of learning disability primarily and to some extent emotional disturbance as well.

I was flabbergasted that in the board which pretends—and probably rightly—to have the broadest spectrum of responses to kids with special problems there were over 130 sliding through the system in a way which every trustee knows to be damaging and harmful to the child. Not only the trustees but every teacher senses it and every teacher is frantic about it because, for the reasons that have been stated, there just isn't the kind of expertise or the time or the support for teachers in our system to respond to that sort of calamity. And it is a calamity. It is a calamity when 630 kids in one board of education in the middle of 1975 cannot receive sensitive, human response to a serious learning disability which has already been recog-

nized by their teachers, which is already identified and which is now left in limbo.

I want to know what it is about your sacred education system, of which we talk so proudly, that makes it impossible for us to deal with those who are most vulnerable. We deal so well with middle Ontario, to use the term that might fit the Tory party. We deal so badly and so poorly with children who are vulnerable, whether it's the Wellington Board of Education or the board of education in the city of Toronto.

As long ago, I guess, as 10 years ago, you may recall that the city of Toronto had what was known then as the child adjustment service. It was a perfect commentary on the city of Toronto's view of children with problems that they called it the child adjustment service. Ten years ago they were still attempting, or they were beginning to attempt, to deal with some of the problems that present themselves now. And today, 1975, there are still kids falling through the sieve of the educational system.

It all comes back to the basic debate we've had in this Legislature, God knows how many times. My colleague from Port Arthur (Mr. Foulds) has put to you again and again that as long as you have that financial disparity between secondary expenditures and elementary expenditures and as long as you have a disparity of $515 per student we will never have the investment at the earliest years of the educational system in the primary grades to allow us to do the kind of identification which my colleague from Durham West (Mr. Godfrey) raised with you half an hour or so ago. As long as you are incapable in that ministry of reordering your priorities so that the kids with special problems are identified, responded to and assisted in the early years, then we're just going to be in this endless aggravating, repetitive situation of coming to your estimates year after year and describing situations in Waterloo, describing situations in Guelph, and describing situations in Toronto, none of them graphic enough ever to get through to the government.

No matter how many case histories we chronicle, we never seem to be able to change it. But we know and you know, because you're a better than average Minister of Education—dare I say it?—that these kids are being damaged for a lifetime and for some reason you've never been able to mobilize yourself or education in Ontario sufficiently to respond to them. That's an indictment of the system far more profound in its implications than this stuff 'n bother about the three "r's."

Mr. Warner: Mr. Chairman, I fully realize that time is of the essence. Yet I cannot sit here and idly watch what is happening and not hear from the minister clearly that for the most part the parameters of our educational philosophy rest with the political boundaries of Ontario and that somehow we have always operated within a vacuum. I wish the ministry would finally acknowledge that fact.

[9:30]

I sat here and listened to the description about the testing that would be done in Windsor—the trial situation—and how the experiment would be carried out and reports would be given and how they would consider the reports. I ask the hon. minister if he is not aware of what, in fact, has been done? I'll just give you one example. In the Province of Manitoba, when they came to grips with early testing for children who had hearing problems, they embarked on a programme where they sent out into every community in the province a mobile band with 28 audiometers and one highly skilled technician. When they arrived at a town, they summoned anyone who was interested in volunteering his or her services. For the most part these were pensioners. In a very quick session, they showed them how to use the audiometers. They then left them the 28 audiometers and went on their way. When they returned two weeks hence, they picked up all of those cases which had had the first diagnosis by the volunteers. That was a screening process, obviously. Then the highly skilled technician put those people through the final testing. Expensive? Obviously not. Community involvement? Obviously; at grass-roots, where it belongs and quite rightly so.

The community knew that their government cares about the young children. That is quite evident. What happened was that children of pre-school age, for the first time, had their hearing problem identified and were ready for a proper programme. Yet none of that has filtered through. We still will have study after study. In the areas of teacher-training, curriculum-development, special education and educational research, we operate within a vacuum.

Finally, I would ask the hon. minister if he is aware of a concept called a programme for every child; a concept which has been adopted by many states in the United States of America. What it does is diagnose pre-school age children. It takes the child and

a programme is developed that is specially suited to his or her needs, to work with that child through the early formative years. There is a great amount of literature on that programme available, yet none of that, to my knowledge, has filtered through to the Minister of Education. I ask, finally, when will the hon. minister admit to us that this educational system is the inheritance of operating within a vacuum? When will this government come to grips with the fact that there are other people on the face of this earth who know something about education and that we should be listening to them?

Hon. Mr. Wells: I don't admit that at all. As a matter of fact, we do study and we do listen. If I can be frank again, some of the problems we've got into are because educators in this province listened to what was going on in other areas of the continent. One of the examples that most comes to my mind, while it has nothing to do with this particular vote, is the open concept school which was imported from California or some such place to this province and—

Mr. Lewis: We imported a lot from California.

Hon. Mr. Wells: That's right and we've certainly never drawn a wall around this province. I'm pleased to hear things that are happening in the Province of Manitoba. I might tell you that Manitoba and British Columbia take a lot from here. They are now implementing them and the exchange process is very good. We look at what they are doing and they look at what we are doing. We certainly are not unaware—

Interjection.

Mr. MacDonald: They provide the yeast for your loaf.

Hon. Mr. Wells: There are a few things that they hope are going to help win an election for them out there—as long as everyone remembers that the Minister of Education in British Columbia is a woman.

Mr. Lewis: I don't quite know what that has to do with it.

Hon. Mr. Wells: I guess my friend, the Leader of the Opposition, was not here for the little exchange the other day when I indicated something about the Minister of Education in British Columbia and one of your colleagues said, "A fine fellow."

Mr. Lewis: Just shows the absence of sexism.

Hon. Mr. Wells: That's right. It just happened to be one of your colleagues who writes me letters quite regularly about sexism in the schools.

I was just going to say in answer to what the member for Scarborough-Ellesmere was saying, that we have a programme in this province for all those children who are identified as deaf, pre-school children. Each summer they and their parents come in, if they wish, to one of our schools for the deaf and they stay there for a week. A complete programme is gone through with them as to what services are available, assessment, an explanation of the kind of the teaching that goes on in those schools. The children may not stay in one of those residential schools. They may go into a programme back in the school area where they are living. But they do have the opportunity to come in and have this special introduction to the programmes at the School for the Deaf.

Mr. Chairman: The hon. member for Durham West.

Mr. Godfrey: Mr. Chairman, unfortunately the strictures of time prohibit me from properly acknowledging the pleasant remarks made by the minister in his previous address. However, it will not restrict me from making a few pungent remarks, I hope.

I feel the Ministry of Education is thinking in stereotypes when it talks about institutional settings for children with learning disabilities. I would draw to the minister's attention the excellent residential programme offered by the Integra Foundation with a camping programme which acts for six weeks during the summer months. During this time children with severe learning handicaps receive an excellent programme of remediation and come back greatly benefitted. That type of imaginative approach has been put up by an organization funded by the Ministry of Health and not by the Ministry of Education. The Ministry of Health has picked up something the Ministry of Education has neglected. I am surprised that they are not aware of what is going on there.

This stereotype approach to residential training marks a programme that smacks of the 1940s rather than the 1970s. I feel shocked at the early identification programme which was outlined by the minister. Was he not being a little simplistic in order to communicate? I gather that a series of five or six reasonably simple procedures are carried out on five-year-olds and the child is then identified, tabbed, etc. This will guarantee that we will have another 630 children with

learning disabilities in Windsor in the formative years from nine to 12.

Really, I am shocked that this is the flagship of their research programme, that they can say this is an investigation into early identification of children with learning handicaps. Surely the ministry realizes this cannot be done properly by a teacher no matter how highly she is trained. It takes a team of people who can look at concept formation, who can look at whether the child is grasping what it means to learn. I charge that the ministry in setting up that type of tokenism research is fudging the question as to whether it is really interested in learning disability. I am also shocked that all over Ontario they are going to carry on this sort of programme, to see it disseminated to more children throughout the province. This will then cost more money in our future education budgets when possibly another party will be deciding what the education budget should be.

But I would point out to him that the present facilities in the province are not adequate. Otherwise why does this organization I spoke of before—Integra—find it necessary to send travelling teams out to each of the major centres throughout the province in order to counsel, in order to teach, in order to see children, in order to do the ombudsman job which isn't being done by the ministry? Why is it necessary for the Wellesley Hospital in Toronto—on a medical budget—to operate a learning disability clinic on Saturday morning in order to take care of 50 children who can't be handled by the Toronto educational system and who are referred there by the Toronto Board of Education for that type of remediation?

I suggest, sir, that the Ministry of Education is really not considering in fullest detail the problem of children with learning disabilities. This augurs poorly for us in the future, not only in social costs, but also in costs which I suggest the other side of the House understands more effectively—money costs.

Mr. Chairman: Item 4 agreed to. Item 5, schools for the blind and the deaf.

Mr. Foulds: I must say it is a pleasure for me during these estimates to hear the contributions, such as that by my friend, the member for Durham West, who so clearly defines one of the areas that I have perhaps been fumbling with in the last three or four years.

Mr. Yakabuski: What did he bill OHIP in 1974?

Mr. Lewis: Oh, you are a very nice fellow.

Mr. Yakabuski: No, I am not. I am just like you at most times.

Mr. Lewis: You are a high-quality member. You bring credit to this House.

Mr. Yakabuski: Like your colleagues; $72,000 in 1972.

Mr. Chairman: Order, the member for Port Arthur has the floor.

Mr. Lewis: No wonder you lost 24 seats, and you will lose another 24 next time.

Mr. Yakabuski: No we won't.

Mr. Lewis: It is thanks to people like you.

Mr. Chairman: Will the member for Port Arthur continue?

Mr. Foulds: Yes.

Mr. Yakabuski: You can't have it both ways.

Mr. Lewis: You are a man of integrity.

Mr. Foulds: That's the longest speech you have made in five years.

Mr. Deans: Is he a new member?

Mr. Lewis: And the only one which had a noun and a verb in the right place.

Mr. Yakabuski: That kind of speech we wouldn't make.

Mr. Foulds: I want to deal very briefly with a subject that I raised when we combined items 4 and 5 last year. It is the business of negotiations between the provincial schools authority and teachers in the schools run by this ministry and other ministries in the province.

It is my understanding that the negotiations are not going as well as we could have hoped—that there has been a factfinder called into the situation between the provincial schools authority and the negotiating team. There has been only one week of active meetings—at the end of August. And since the fact-finder came in, I believe on Oct. 2, and asked both parties to meet regularly, there have been only two meetings. There has been no offer from the provincial schools authority since August.

I put it to you in the strongest terms, and I put it to you this quickly because of the stringencies of time, that if you are going to make Bill 100 work—and I believe it is Bill 132 that particularly applies to the pro-

vincial schools authority—the ministry must demonstrate bargaining in good faith with its teachers as an example to the board. When those teachers are on the average 15 to 25 per cent behind people in equivalent positions in the top 10 of the boards across the province, it behoves the provincial government to offer something over the federal guidelines and not to stick to that and hide behind that particular federal skirt.

I also think it is rather disturbing that a ministry official would say to a meeting of teachers, I believe at Thistletown, that the government will not lead in terms of an agreement to attract top-flight people to this area of education. As I understand it, the official said: "The ministry will not be innovative; the government will always have to be behind. We are in a meat market and if we can get teachers cheaper, we will."

I think that is a disgraceful attitude for the provincial ministry to be setting as an example to the boards in the province.

Mr. Nixon: I was interested that the Treasurer (Mr. McKeough) indicated in his list of government employees who don't come under the civil service aegis, those people employed in the Ross Macdonald School. Are they not considered civil servants, but contract employees?

Hon. Mr. Wells: Yes, just the teachers. The teachers are on a contract, but it is not even a contract the same as the other contract employees of this government. They are on a special teachers' contract that was devised a few years ago. In order to get teachers into the public service to teach at our schools, it required the same kind of contract as the teachers would have had if they were teaching with a board. They wanted to have the same kind of benefits that teachers have with a board—in other words, the time they can give their notices of breaking or leaving their contract; two months holiday, study time or whatever you want to call it, in the summer;—

[9:45]

Mr. Nixon: Professional development, if you like.

Hon. Mr. Wells: — the various things that make them the same as teachers who are employed by a board. There was a study done at the time and the way it was decided this could best be handled was by having them sign a contract with, at that time, the provincial school management committee.

But they are not civil servants and they don't belong to the association. Now they are in a special category again since that bill we passed here last year. They have full bargaining rights, the right to strike and so forth under the special bill that we passed giving them the same kind of rights as the teachers have under Bill 100.

The other employees at the Ross Macdonald School are all civil servants. All those who are non-teachers there, all the support staff, residential counsellors, any other staff there are civil servants.

I don't really think that I should comment any further on the negotiations that are going on at present except to say that my only words to our negotiators were to negotiate in good faith under the bill that gave them the rights and powers to enter into those negotiations. I know they're in the process of having a fact-finder look at the situation and they're waiting for his report at this time.

Mr. Chairman: Item 5 carried. Item 6, educational programmes and the developmental service centres.

Mr. Ferris: I would like to ask a brief question of the hon. minister since there is a 30 per cent salary increase there. Is there a brief justification of it?

Hon. Mr. Wells: The major portion of that increase, in fact the very major portion, is an adjustment in the salary and fringe benefits for the teachers. That basically covers the group of teachers who are teaching in the developmental centres and that was the revision in their contracts for last year.

Mr. Chairman: Item 6 carried. Item 7, correspondence courses services. Carried. Item 8, teacher education and certification.

Mr. Nixon: Mr. Chairman, just a word on this. Has the ministry given any further consideration to changing the status of the teachers' professional organization so that they would have a more specific role to play in the certification procedure? Does the minister feel that for the future this responsibility should be retained by the ministry? Or should we be moving, as I believe we should, in upgrading the professional aspects of teachers' organizations and giving them some direct control over certification, the professional development in service, and the disciplining of the profession and the members within it?

Hon. Mr. Wells: Mr. Chairman, the ministry's position, and my position at the present time, is that we think that certification should remain with the ministry.

Mr. Nixon: If I may ask further, I believe that that was the position that had flatly been

taken in the past. Are there any negotiations going on with the professional organizations toward giving the teachers a more direct control of the certification aspects, as has been given by this House to other professions? We tend to talk about the teaching profession but we treat them in a very paternalistic way, very much the way Egerton Ryerson treated them when he was godfather of education. The present incumbent has retained not only those powers, but it seems to me those attitudes, when we should be striving, as far as we possibly can, to put more responsibility with those people who feel themselves to be professional and whom we tend to call professional when we want to compliment them.

Mr. Yakabuski: Has the situation changed?

Hon. Mr Wells: I think certainly a case could be made for the very great differences between the so-called self-governing professions, who operate on a fee-for-service basis with the public, and the teaching profession in this province who are employed by public school boards. I really can't conjure up in my mind any reason why the present system of certification by the ministry is not a satisfactory one.

I might say that the Ontario Teachers' Federation presented a proposal about a governing council. I indicated that we would set up a group within our ministry to look into their proposal and see the kind of ramifications that it might have, and that is presently going on, but I have to tell you that it is our policy here that we certainly think certification should remain with the ministry.

Mr. Sweeney: A question to the minister with respect to teacher education: Now that the bulk of our teachers are being trained in a university setting rather than under the direct jurisdiction of the ministry, it seems as if—if I can use the colloquial expression—the stuff of teaching, the methodology of teaching, is getting some short shrift, and teachers coming out of that particular programme, although well versed in the theory of teaching, are not getting a solid grounding in the methods of teaching.

I recall why that shift took place, and many of us supported it, but I would ask, is there any kind of an ongoing evaluation taking place to determine whether or not the actual quality of teachers coming out of that particular teacher training programme compares favourably with the quality of teachers coming out of the other two teacher institutions which do come under the jurisdiction of the ministry?

Hon. Mr. Wells: As part of the process that we are now going through as a result of the universities taking responsibility for teacher education, except for the one institution that we still have—OTEC—and working with the presidents of the universities and the heads of the faculties of education, we have set up a procedure for an evaluation of the teacher training component of the programme at the universities. It is a co-operative evaluation process that involves ministry people, teachers and school board people, and they are charged with reviewing that part of the programme that concerns the practical teacher training part, not the academic part.

Universities, of course, were very leery of somebody coming in to accredit their academic programmes. They said this was not the proper thing to do, but we convinced them that there should be an accreditation of the methodology part of their courses and that is being done at present. Lakehead has been done, we have done our own Ontario Teachers Education College, I think Ottawa University is beginning very shortly, and over the next three or four years all the faculties of education will have been completed and then the process will start over again.

I think it should also be remembered that each of the faculties of education has an advisory committee to the dean, made up of people from the teachers and school board people in the local area that is served by that particular faculty, to help bring in practical suggestions about how the programme should operate better and suggestions, I am sure like those you have made, about the need for, if it is not there, more practical experience for those people before they come out into the school system.

In other words, what I am saying is that there is a real attempt to evaluate what is going on in these programmes insofar as the teaching methodology component of the programme is concerned.

Mr. Chairman: Item 8 carried.

Item 9, curriculum services? Carried.

Item 10? Carried.

Item 11?

Mrs. Bryden: Vote 2802, item 11, is probably the largest estimate in the entire government estimates—$1.5 billion for general legislative grants. So I don't think we can let it

go by, because it's the vote that tells us what proportion of total education costs the provincial government intends to carry and tells the property taxpayer what proportion he is expected to bear. With total education costs running at about $2.5 billion nowadays, this vote of $1.5 billion indicates that the province is carrying about 60 per cent on the average, across the province.

It took quite a long time for our friends opposite to reach that 60 per cent figure, whatever you think of it. Back in 1943, Mr. Drew in the freny of an election campaign, about which they know something across the floor there, promised to raise the provincial share from 14 per cent to 50 per cent. But it was many moons and many elections before that figure was reached, finally, 27 years later in 1960. Since then, the proportion has inched up to what appears to be about 60 per cent today.

The first question I would like to ask the minister when he responds in a few minutes is whether we are still at that 60 per cent plateau or whether we are slipping back down from that figure. But I would like to ask him an even more fundamental question and that is whether we should be thinking of moving on and having the province assume a greater proportion of the total educational costs.

We are becoming more and more aware of the regressiveness of the property tax. With the re-assessment that is going on and the artificially inflated values of houses compared to commercial properties, we know the property tax will become even more regressive on the homeowner. We know that a lot of people consider education a general service for the whole province. What is spent on it benefits everybody. It does not benefit them in proportion to the amount of property they own.

A lot of people feel it is very unfair for pensioners who have raised their families, have no children left in school and are living on fixed incomes to have to continue to pay education costs. Education is inevitably a growing cost, partly because it is largely made up of salaries and partly because we want to give good educational service and we have to pay additional fuel costs and building costs. Even with enrolment going down, it will be a rising cost. These are arguments as to why it should not be left on the very narrow and regressive property tax base.

The latest report of the government-appointed committee on the costs of education has come to this conclusion as well. I just want to read one paragraph from their June, 1975, report, which is Interim Report No. 7. They say:

> When expenditures on education increase, the province can decide the additional amount that it will provide from its tax sources. The school boards in the municipalities are left to absorb the residual amount of any increase out of a single, largely inflexible, source—the property tax. The fact that for many persons the level of taxation on their homes has already reached the point where real hardship is created adds to the inflexibility of the property tax as a source of revenue. While the financial demands on the provincial government are of considerable magnitude, it has a greater variety of tax sources available to it than school boards and municipalities. At the same time, the province's sources are more buoyant and less regressive than the property tax.

That's on page 31 of the report.

[10:00]

The committee does go on to suggest that the 60 per cent share should be increased to 66⅔ per cent. They don't quite say where they found that figure; whether they plucked it out of the air. Our party has been advocating for quite a while that we should go much further than that; that we should go at least to 80 per cent on a staged basis of five per cent a year for the next four years, and that we should then review the situation and probably go on to take over educational costs entirely by the province.

I know the minister will say, "What are you going to do about local autonomy if all of the money comes from the province?" I think in this sort of staged programme of five per cent a year there will be ample time for us to work out new methods of community involvement, of global budgets, with freedom within those budgets for community groups and boards of education to spend the money that is available, and I think there will still be local autonomy. Anyway, I think we will have time to work out those problems.

I can hear the minister probably saying, "What you are suggesting is going to be very expensive. You are suggesting that we are going to add several hundreds of millions of dollars to that deficit which is already causing our credit rating to tremble." I am not suggesting that he bring in a supplementary estimate adding to that deficit. What I am suggesting is that he start planning now for the next budget, which is less than six months

away, I would imagine, and plan a shift in educational financing from the hard-pressed property-taxpayer to the provincial revenue sources which are, as this report said, much broader, much more buoyant.

I want a shift which will be to the pools of wealth that are not being taxed in this province. Back in 1971, our leader went through some of these suggested areas that are being under-taxed, and I will run through them again to remind the minister of where he might find the money. I want to suggest, however, that we are not proposing an increase in the total educational spending in this province. We are simply suggesting that it be shifted as to who pays for it. It will be an increase in fairness, it will be an increase in equity, but it will not be a tremendous increase in the budget deficit, because we will add, on the revenue side, additional funds to cover the additional provincial share.

The sort of sources that he should be looking at for financing this shift are the resource taxes. We are still getting only four to five per cent of the gross value of mineral production in this province back in taxes. In 1974, over $2.4 billion was obtained in production in this province from mineral resources. The tax estimate from the mines profit tax for 1975-1976, and it probably covers the profits for that previous year, is estimated at only $100 million. The increases in the nominal rates, which were brought in in the last budget with a great fanfare, appear to have been offset by increases in processing allowances and in exempt income, so that we haven't really started to tap resource wealth.

Second, there is an excess profits tax, which the provincial Treasurer (Mr. McKeough) said he possibly might consider if the federal government didn't move into this field. I suggest that he should move into it right away, because $290 million of profits for Imperial Oil is certainly wealth that is not being tapped in this province.

Then there is the tax room vacated by the federal tax cuts on processing industries and manufacturing industries. These cuts were intended to increase jobs but they appear in many cases to have simply increased profits. The province could move in and pick up some of that vacated tax room.

Fourth, of course, there is the other half of the capial gains tax. We have been advocating for quite a long time that there should be 100 per cent of capital gains taxed rather than 50 per cent, on the ground that a buck is a buck, as the Carter report suggested.

The provincial income tax in this province is the second lowest in the country. I am not suggesting that everybody in this province should pay more income tax. What I am suggesting is that the people at the upper levels should pay more and that we should have further tax credits to offset any increase in the income tax in the lower and middle levels. Under the federal-provincial tax collection arrangements for income tax we can't have a graduated income tax in the province, but we can have an increase in the present percentage and a tax credit to offset it and more or less nullify the increase for the lower and middle groups.

Finally, the minister could consider putting to work the 183,000 people who are out of work, and increase his gross provincial product and his tax base that way. So I don't think the minister can plead that we cannot move away from that 60 per cent plateau because the money is not there. It is simply that this government is afraid to touch the pools of wealth that are very evident in this province. If you look around, you can see evidences of great wealth and great poverty side by side with it.

Mr. Laughren: You can tax wealth as well as incomes.

Mrs. Bryden: This is what we are suggesting you should consider—this step in tax reform as part of the educational budget next time.

Mr. Laughren: You really should listen.

Mr. Nixon: Mr. Chairman, I don't know whether the minister is going to respond to that programme or not. It has been discussed here, of course, for many years. I know the hon. member for Beaches-Woodbine has heard the debates and normally the minister waits until he is in another forum until he talks about the disastrous consequences of paying 80 per cent of the costs of education from our provincial Treasury. He never seems to understand, as the hon. member has explained once again in this House, so effectively, that it is a fairer balance of the imposition of taxation and relieving the property owners of that additional burden. It is always difficult to get the minister even to fairly consider those alternatives, but he and I both know the exigencies that sometimes prevail in this regard.

Our position has been, of course, for a phased movement toward the 80 per cent of the costs of education. Perhaps we are not so sanguine that these costs can be so readily met by those untapped pools of resources lying around. It is always the well-to-do

rather than the individuals to whom you are speaking; it is always the resource industries far away from the people to whom you are talking who can pay these bills, but essentially, I believe, as the hon. member has indicated—and also as has been indicated, at least in part, by the Committee on the Costs of Education, which has given, I believe, its final report—or does it have one more?

Hon. Mr. Wells: It has two more.

Mr. Nixon: It is probably its accounting which is still to come. It is interesting, Mr. Chairman, and you are aware of it, of course, that it was just before the 1971 election that the then newly ensconced Premier (Mr. Davis) decided we should have a Committee on the Costs of Education, and this committee has been working all these years since. There has not been much attention paid to its findings but at least it took a bit of the heat off before the 1971 election. Before this election, you may recall, Mr. Chairman—and I see you glancing at the clock—the Premier appointed another committee having to do with the costs of government. We saw the headlines at the time they were appointed but we haven't heard a damn thing from them since, because I don't really believe they are very much concerned with the costs of anything over there.

On this particular vote, what are we spending—$1.5 billion? Of course, we want to finish this in the next two or three minutes so we are very much concerned with the cost of education. The minister is, I know he is.

We have a programme from the spokesman for the NDP by which we can pay for 80 per cent of the cost of education without hurting anybody or without affecting the costs the rest of us pay. It is not a simple matter and we all know it. But I do believe, along with the member for Beaches-Woodbine (Mrs. Bryden), that the province must move on a phased basis to assuming 80 per cent of these costs. It won't be easy to do but it will be an adjustment of the tax balance between the province and the municipalities and it would be certainly in the direction of fairness.

I wanted to mention one thing. I was really interested in the rather off-handed way the Minister of Education sort of poohpoohed the open concept in education. It's a concept which has been accepted by a number of school boards which have spent hundreds of millions of dollars in providing new facilities in the open concept scheme on the understanding that the research experts down here somewhere thought it was a great idea.

I would recall to your mind, Mr. Chairman, and to the Minister of Education—I am sure you are both aware of this—that the board of education in the county of Brant undertook some elaborate investigation and made a policy decision four or five years ago that all their schools were going to be open concept. They have built them on that basis.

It really appals me when I hear complaints coming from parents about the inadequacies of those facilities to realize that the Minister of Education, with all the millions of dollars of research, communications and public relations available to him and his platoons of experts didn't get around to saying to the people in Brantford, "Maybe you shouldn't do this." Without telling them what to do in any way the minister almost treats the open concept as something preposterous, a joke imported, as he says, from California or somewhere. It is one of the ideas which has come from that other jurisdiction which has so frequently led us astray in education.

I will tell you it is here. It is not just the taxpayers in Brant and Brantford who have been paying the dollars for those schools. It is all of us as taxpayers; not just in Brant, but even in Sacarborough where the Minister of Education was chairman of the board. You were building open concept schools in those balmy days. If not you, it was your immediate predecessor or successor; both of them fine people.

It really amazes me when we look at this thing. We are close to a bottom line where we number the allocation in billions of dollars and it is still sort of run like the old Scarborough hot stove league. The educationalists sit around chewing gum and saying, "What are we going to do tonight?"

It really amazes me with a matter like this. The open concept school sounds so great. There have been so many treatises written and printed. There have been so many professional development days when unnumbered groups of teachers have sat around in school rooms and solemnly told each other about the importance of these facilities—while school itself did not go on—and the minister gives it this off-hand, "Nobody in their right mind supports that concept."

It really worries me. If there is one thing we are prepared to support it is dollars for education research. Over here, the vote went without any discussion really at all. But we must realize that the research has to have some practical emanation. You read the titles of the papers which come out of OISE and you wonder. It is adding to the sum total of knowledge in the universe which somebody

told me is unfolding as it should but I am darned if I can see any direct application of usefulness of most of that material in the practical emanation and development of an education system which is going to be significant or useful.

We are spending a lot of money on things which actually should be directed on the basis of research we can have confidence in. If I may be allowed to use the phrase, I don't have confidence in either the research or the communication of the findings of that research to the people who are spending the money.

[10:15]

Hon. Mr. Wells: I want to make a comment, but I thought that there were some other comments. I just want to say before I make my general comments that I'm sorry if the leader of the third party took it that I was in some way downgrading the open concept. I was merely indicating—and certainly he must be aware—that there are those who question it today.

Mr. Nixon: Are you one of them?

Hon. Mr. Wells: No. I am not one who questions it in its totality. I do think that at one point in time it was perhaps adopted as the cure-all, end-all and be-all in education, which it should not have been.

Mr. Nixon: It is like new math and the other things you and your predecessor have been shoving at us.

Hon. Mr. Wells: It has a place. With teachers who believe in it and feel they can operate and are in that type of environment and are committed to it, it serves well if students find that—

Mrs. Campbell: It has its place.

Hon. Mr. Wells: —they can adapt to it. There are others that find the total open-concept school is not for them. I think we have developed since those years when it was brought in in its original form. We have developed forms unique to this province that I think better suit our needs now than some of the very open schools that were opened six, seven or eight years ago. However, given the right teachers, teachers who are committed to that kind of programme, those programmes in those schools are going on well.

Mr. Nixon: The right teachers can educate in any circumstances.

Hon. Mr. Wells: It has to be remembered it is an architectural form and it's the kind of teacher and the kind of learning that goes on that counts. That kind of good learning, excellent learning, can go on in an open-concept school or a traditional-type classroom just as well.

Mr. Nixon: It can go on in a barn.

Hon. Mr. Wells: Yes, and in a barn.

Mr. Bain: I would like to address myself to one aspect of the administration that I suppose, in part, has emanated from some of the changes that have occurred with the implementation of school boards on a regional basis. One of the things that I think is most lacking with regional school boards is the personal touch. With Nov. 11 approaching again, we see this personal touch lacking.

I have had, in the last few days, a number of constituents who came to me to ask me why the Minister of Education is allowing schools to have a holiday on November 10 for the convenience of a long weekend. Because time is passing quickly, I would only like to know from the minister what his plans are to persuade school boards to observe Nov. 11 on the 11th because of its significance to us as a democracy and because of the great sacrifices that were made by our veterans. We have taken the easy route in the case of Remembrance Day. For many students, Remembrance Day is not fully appreciated. Therefore we have said we will give the holiday and it can be taken on whatever day the school board chooses to take it. In fact, in September, 1974, one regional school board in southwestern Ontario had Remembrance Day in September so the students could help harvest the tobacco crop.

This may be a very functional use of the day, but I think it's a complete distortion of what the day should be. Could the hon. minister tell us how he is going to attempt to rekindle the meaning that Remembrance Day should have for us, so that we can observe it in the proper fashion in which it should be observed so that we can soberly reflect on the contribution that was made, and on the liberties we enjoy because of that sacrifice?

Hon. Mr. Wells: Mr. Chairman, I would welcome the opportunity to send to my friend the documents which we have sent out to school boards this year—elementary and secondary—urging them to celebrate, to commemorate, to recognize Remembrance Day

in a fitting way. We've sent curriculum helps, which I think are excellent. They have been prepared by our ministry and various other people and they have gone out—as I emphasized—to both the elementary and the secondary schools.

It has long been my feeling that we could develop a much better appreciation of what Remembrance Day is all about in a total sense if there was not a holiday on Nov. 11. A few years ago, we, in the name of local autonomy, freed up the school year and gave a lot of local autonomy to local school boards. One of the things that we did was allow them to shift the holiday that is held on Nov. 11.

You say that Remembrance Day was celebrated in September. It was not Remembrance Day that board celebrated in September. A holiday was held in September for another purpose. Remembrance Day is only celebrated on Nov. 11, and that school board decided that it would have programmes in its schools on Nov. 11 rather than have a holiday.

Let's remember that Nov. 11 is not a national holiday in this country. It is a holiday in which public buildings—federal government, provincial government and I believe banks—are closed, but it is not a general national holiday such as July 1.

I believe that in the name of local autonomy and in the name of letting local people decide the kind of things that they want in their communities and in their schools, it makes good sense to allow a school board to have some other time as a holiday and have Nov. 11 celebrated in their schools. If the community doesn't approve of that and really wants a holiday, they can have that holiday by asking their local school board to put the holiday on Nov. 11.

Believe me, I am one who believes there is great significance for our young people in attending some kind of commemorative service that relates what went on in previous wars and the sacrifices made with the kind of things that have to go on in a democratic society today. There is great merit in the kind of service that can be held.

I think that there is a holiday on Nov. 11—most of our young people find that they don't get that kind of service unless the school has held the service the day before—which I had hoped they would do.

Mr. Sweeney: In 1975 in an attempt to close somewhat the gap between the ceilings for elementary school students and secondary school students your ministry added an additional $80 to the elementary school ceiling. When questioned on this you observed among other things that you hoped this $80 would be used for such things as reducing the pupil-teacher ratio in the elementary schools. I believe that you particularly alluded to reducing the ratio in the primary division.

I would point out to you that unfortunately this was one of those situations where the right hand of the ministry and the left hand of the ministry didn't know what the other was doing. A number of school boards picked up that point that you made rather happily.

If I can give a specific example: Let us assume that there is a school system with 20,000 elementary school students—and that's about average for this province. The $80 additional ceiling, if it were applied, would produce $1.6 million and if we are talking of average teacher salaries in the neighbourhood of $10,000 to $12,000, that board would be able to—using those dollars for that purpose—hire an additional 133 teachers and thus reduce the ratio.

The difficulty is that they would also have to have 133 additional classrooms in which to put those children and to put those teachers. But your ministry, at least the plant approval branch of your ministry, has a very rigid guideline which says that you need 35 students in order to build another classroom. From time to time that figure is flexible. It can go as low as 32 or 31, but it can't go anwhere near the kind of space requirement that would make possible the reduction in the ratio for, let's say, even the primary division.

The point I am trying to make, and I would like you to respond to it, is that on the one hand you quite rightfully supplied additional funds that would do something that I think every elementary school board in this province would dearly love to do. That is, reduce the ratio of its primary grades. But your plant approval branch simply doesn't make this possible. I find that, as I talk to some of my people, that there is a very large credibility gap to determine whether or not the minister really meant what he said.

Mr. Chairman: Shall item 11 carry?

Mrs. Campbell: Wait a minute. Why don't you let him handle it?

Hon. Mr. Wells: I certainly did mean what I said, but I want to tell my friend that I did not mean and I never said and I don't think I have ever said at any meeting with schools boards or others that in encouraging the use of that money to reduce, for instance,

pupil-teacher ratios, if a board so desired, we intended that there be massive building programmes in this province.

Surely, with the numbers decreasing the way they are in the elementary schools insofar as enrolment is concerned, with the number of unused classrooms around this province reported to me, these kinds of improvements can be made by school boards without building. I have to tell him that there is no intention of approving massive building programmes to allow pupil-teacher ratios to reduce in this manner and there never was when we developed the programme.

We believe that the enrichment and encouragement of better programmes in the first six years of the elementary school is going to have to be done within the context of schools which have been built. The only exceptions, of course, are in growing areas where new schools are going to have to be built or in the areas where population is increasing and where additions are going to have to be put on.

It was never our intention that there be building of additional classrooms, to add them to lower the pupil-teacher ratio in the schools. There is no way that I can see that happening in the next few years in this province.

Mrs. Bryden: I wanted to ask the minister if he could provide us with the figure of what percentage the province is carrying in 1974. I don't think the figures are published yet but does he have them? If not, could he get them for us?

Hon. Mr. Wells: I am sorry, the figure—do you mean the percentage of education costs we are paying?

Mrs. Bryden: Yes.

Hon. Mr. Wells: Yes, the figure is about—the 1974 estimate is 60.01 per cent. That is pretty close.

Mrs. Bryden: Thank you.

Hon. Mr. Wells: That's an estimate. I hope when the final figure comes out it will be pretty close. I might say that our aim, based on these estimates, is to maintain that figure of 60 per cent.

Perhaps I could comment on what my friend has said. The policy of the government at the present time is to maintain 60 per cent average support of education across the province. We are not thinking of increasing our share. I realize all the arguments put forward in committee on the cost of education, about increasing the share the provincial government pays and reducing the share the property tax bears. However, they do suggest only a 6⅔ per cent increase, which really isn't that great—nothing like the 80 per cent your party has suggested. Or did you suggest 100 per cent?

Mrs. Bryden: We are working towards that.

Hon. Mr. Wells: You are working toward 100 per cent and our friends in the Liberal Party suggested 80 per cent. I am going from memory but I think there are pages in that report which deal with the whole issue of local autonomy. While we can all stand here and say you don't take local autonomy away, if we supply all the money—and we have these great tax sources sitting there—it is just a transfer of taxes from one area to another.

I am not going to deal with that for a minute but on the whole area of local autonomy I submit to you that if the provincial government paid 100 per cent of the cost, the local autonomy of school boards would vanish within a few years. There would be no open-ended contract. I don't care what party was in power—no party in this province would give an open-ended contract to school boards. They would say, "This is the money you will get" period. If you are paying 100 per cent, there is no way you could have any local levy and I submit that autonomy would completely vanish, much more so than it has at present.

Mrs. Bryden: What about the hospital boards?

Mr. Deans: Autonomy and money are not necessarily the same.

Hon. Mr. Wells: I submit he who pays the tune calls the shot.

Mr. Nixon: With your ceilings you don't allow local levy anyway. That's why we object to your ceiling policy.

Hon. Mr. Wells: I suggest to you that would play a very big role. An even more important consideration, I think, is that it is not as simple as shifting from here over to there and taking these great sources which, of course, I don't admit and I am sure my friend, the Treasurer (Mr. McKeough) will not admit—

Mr. Foulds: He wouldn't.

[10:30]

Hon. Mr. Wells: —are just out there waiting to be taxed. There is one more important thing we would have to come to grips with first and foremost and that is are we going

to put ceilings on municipal tax spending? In the years that we've come up to the 60 per cent level, we have made some pretty significant contributions to change the percentage rate. In so doing three or four years ago, we actually reduced the property tax people were paying on education. And yet, in an area like Burlington, the people who paid the tax never saw that reduction. It was gobbled up by the municipal people; they were just desperately waiting to gobble that up.

Mr. Deans: You always told us—

Hon. Mr. Wells: What's going to happen if you assume 80 per cent at a cost of an additional $530 million out of the provincial budget, or whatever you have, and then find that you've not even reduced the property tax for those people out there who are paying the tax, because the municipalities now are taking that $530 million for themselves?

Mr. Chairman: I must remind the committee that we have reached the time for adjournment. Is there going to be further discussion on these estimates?

Items 11 to 13, inclusive, carried.

Vote 2802 agreed to.

Mr. Chairman: This completes the estimates of the Ministry of Education.

Mr. Deans: Just wait until next year.

Hon. Mr. Brunelle moved the committee rise and report.

Motion agreed to.

The House resumed; Mr. Speaker in the chair.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Speaker, the committee of supply begs to report it has reached certain resolutions and asks for leave to sit again.

Report agreed to.

Hon. Mr. Brunelle: Mr. Speaker, before I move the adjournment of the House, may I indicate that on Thursday there will be legislation as indicated on the order paper?

Hon. Mr. Brunelle moved the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to.

The House adjourned at 10:35 p.m.

CONTENTS

Tuesday, November 4, 1975

Estimates, Ministry of Education, Mr. Wells, concluded 263

Motion to adjourn, Mr. Brunelle, agreed to 289

SPEAKERS IN THIS ISSUE

Bain, R. (Timiskaming NDP)
Brunelle, Hon. R. Minister without Portfolio and Chairman of Cabinet (Cochrane North PC)
Bryden, M. (Beaches-Woodbine NDP)
Campbell, M. (St. George L)
Deans, I. (Wentworth NDP)
Ferris, J. P. (London South L)
Foulds, J. F. (Port Arthur NDP)
Gaunt, M. (Huron-Bruce L)
Godfrey, C. (Durham West NDP)
Good, E. R. (Waterloo North L)
Grande, A. (Oakwood NDP)
Grossman, L. (St. Andrew-St. Patrick PC)
Johnston, R. M. (St. Catharines PC)
Laughren, F. (Nickel Belt NDP)
Lewis, S. Leader of the Opposition (Scarborough West NDP)
MacDonald, D. C. (York South NDP)
Makarchuk, M. (Brantford NDP)
Mancini, R. (Essex South L)
McClellan, R. (Bellwoods NDP)
Nixon, R. F. (Brant-Oxford-Norfolk L)
Riddell, J. (Huron-Middlesex L)
Ruston, R. F. (Essex North L)
Sweeney, J. (Kitchener-Wilmot L)
Timbrell, Hon. D. R. Energy (Don Mills PC)
Warner, D. (Scarborough-Ellesmere NDP)
Wells, Hon. T. L. Education (Scarborough North PC)
Yakabuski, P. J. (Renfrew South PC)

No. 8



Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT — DAILY EDITION

First Session of the Thirtieth Legislature

Thursday, November 6, 1975

Afternoon Session

Speaker: Honourable Russell Daniel Rowe
Clerk: Roderick Lewis, QC

THE QUEEN'S PRINTER
PARLIAMENT BUILDINGS, TORONTO
1975



CONTENTS

A list of the speakers taking part in the debates in this issue of Hansard appears, in alphabetical order, at the back of this issue.

Daily contents of proceedings also appears at the back of this issue. Reference to a cumulative index of previous issues can be obtained by calling the Hansard Reporting Service indexing staff. (Phone 965-2159).

Hansard subscription price is $15.00 per session, from: Sessional Subscription Service, MGS, 9th Floor, Ferguson Block, Parliament Bldgs., Toronto, M7A 1N3. Phone 965-2238.

LEGISLATURE OF ONTARIO

THURSDAY, NOVEMBER 6, 1975

The House met at 2 p.m.

Prayers.

Mr. Deans: Mr. Speaker, on a point of privilege, if I may.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Wentworth.

Mr. Deans: Thank you. Mr. Speaker, I raise this matter on behalf of a number of my colleagues in the House and on my own behalf. You no doubt noticed in a newspaper article about a week ago in the financial page the substantial profits being shown by the Bell Telephone Co. I wondered if you could prevail upon them to set aside some hundreds of the millions that they have made to provide telephones for the members of the Legislature in order that they could carry out their responsibilities during this legislative session.

As you can appreciate, it is virtually impossible for a member, after having been elected and having taken on very onerous responsibilities, to carry out those responsibilities without the use of some communicative device back to his or her constituency. A telephone would be useful. If you would take it upon yourself to look into this matter on our behalf as the guardian of the members' rights, we would appreciate it very much.

Mr. Speaker Stokes: I will take advantage of the first opportunity to call this to the attention of Mr. Speaker Rowe, who is responsible for protecting the members and making sure the amenities are provided for them to carry on their duties, and I am sure he will take that into consideration.

Hon. Mr. Snow: Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to introduce to you and members of the House a group of 140 students from the E. J. James Public School in the great town of Oakville.

Hon. Mr. Wells: Mr. Speaker, I would like to draw the attention of the House and your attention, and welcome to this House, a group of the wives of the members of the Ontario Association of Educational Administrative Officers who are holding their convention in Toronto this week. These women are in your gallery attending today's sitting.

Mr. Speaker: Statements by the ministry.

EMERGENCY MAIL SERVICE

Hon. Mrs. Scrivener: Mr. Speaker, like other Canadians, I have been anticipating settlement of the postal strike each day. But as each day slips by and the strike lengthens—and no one is certain at this point just how long it may drag on—I think it is incumbent upon me to advise the House of the emergency mail service we have had in effect, and will maintain for the duration of the strike.

Special attention has been given to important mail pieces, such as GAINS and family benefit cheques and other vital service communications. For instance, senior representatives of my ministry are making appropriate arrangements with representatives of the Ministry of Revenue to distribute GAINS cheques that would normally have been due for delivery later this month.

The flow of essential mail between government offices is being handled by private courier service, bus parcel express, air express, special international mail service, telecommunications services and through the use of Ministry of Government Services' vehicles.

Field offices of the Ontario government throughout the province have established drop boxes to receive, for distribution, essential mail from the private sector addressed to all Ontario government offices and to the members.

Mr. Roy: How about courier pigeon?

Mrs. Campbell: How about the telephone?

MACGREGOR POINT PROVINCIAL PARK

Hon. Mr. Bernier: Mr. Speaker, I would like to announce that the MacGregor Point Provincial Park—

Mr. Gaunt: A good park.

Hon. Mr. Bernier: —a new 2,500-acre recreation facility on Lake Huron, five miles south of Port Elgin, will be open to the public for camping by July 1, 1976.

As I have previously indicated to this House, MacGregor Point's new campgrounds will replace those phased out at Inverhuron Provincial Park at the end of this season to comply with regulations of the Atomic Energy Control Board in line with the agreement made in 1973 with Ontario Hydro.

However, and I do want to stress this, Inverhuron Park's swimming and picnic areas will remain open to the public free of charge, only Inverhuron's campgrounds will be discontinued.

Costs of land acquisition and park development at MacGregor Point, to replace the equivalent facilities formerly provided at Inverhuron, were financed by Ontario Hydro with additional costs for the more extensive facilities provided by the Ministry of Natural Resources.

Over 150 campsites will be available to the public by July 1, 1976, with a further 200 scheduled for completion by midsummer. When completed, the new park will contain more than four times the acreage of Inverhuron Park, thus expanding both day use and camping opportunities for the 4,000,000 Ontarians who live within a three-hour drive of this part of Lake Huron's scenic shoreline.

Mr. Speaker: The Minister of Transportation and Communications.

Mr. Lewis: Housing, Housing!

Mr. Roy: The minister is still hesitant. Does he still want to change his mind once more? Go ahead, we will understand.

RENT REVIEW

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: Mr. Speaker, today I will be introducing the Residential Premises Rent Review Act. The introduction of—

Mr. Roy: Is the minister sure about that?

Mr. Cassidy: The government should have done that 2½ years ago.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: The introduction of rent control in Ontario at this time is in keeping with this government's undertaking during the last election. It should also be viewed—

Mr. Singer: Which one, which one?

Mr. Lewis: Which day?

Mr. Singer: Which day, which undertaking, by whom?

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: It should also be viewed in the context of the federal government's anti-inflation measures which it is designed to complement.

As the minister responsible for housing, I am and must be concerned with the possibility that rent control could have an adverse effect on the development of rental accommodation, which is already scarce in a number of our communities. In other jurisdictions, such a reduction has occurred and it is a distressing side-effect of the strong medicine of rent control. However, at a time when rents have been climbing, wages are limited and prices subject to review, rent levies must be legislated for the common good. Hopefully, we will be able to interest builders in our housing programmes and the new federal housing initiatives so that, notwithstanding the controls, a better supply of accommodation of all types will become available in these communities.

The following are the general principles of the legislation:

Leases commencing before July 30, 1975, while not subject to this Act, may be considered by rental officials named under the Act if a tenant requests a review of the statutory rent increases allowed when such a lease is renewed.

Leases commencing beween July 29, 1975, and Jan. 1, 1976, will be limited to a maximum rental increase of eight per cent of the rent paid in July, 1975. During this period the allowable increase cannot be appealed by either party. Appeals will be allowed either party for the balance of the term after Jan. 1, 1976. Provision is made to require landlords to refund overpayments.

Leases commencing between Dec. 31, 1975, and Aug. 1, 1976, will be subject to a maximum rental increase of eight per cent which may be appealed by either landlord or tenant.

Leases commencing between July 31, 1976, and Aug. 1, 1977, will be subject to a new maximum rental increase established by order-in-council which may be appealed by either landlord or tenant.

In any appeal case, the person affected by the appeal may ask to have the rents reduced rather than increased or increased rather than reduced, as the case may be. The onus will be on the landlord to demonstrate that increased costs justify the rent increase.

Disputes will be first heard by a rent review officer with a right of appeal by either party to the Rent Review Board.

Residential premises for the purpose of this Act will be either a dwelling unit that contains bathroom and kitchen facilities or land used as a site for a mobile home. Rent will mean not only the amount paid by the tenant for accommodation, but that paid for any ancillary service or "thing" such as parking or lockers. A tenancy agreement may be written, oral or implied.

We will be naming rent review officers in all parts of the province and making provision for the Rent Review Board to hold hearings across Ontario for the convenience of tenants and landlords.

The rent review officer will be empowered to approve the amount sought by a landlord if he is satisfied that the costs presented justify the amount of the rent increase. On the other side of the coin, he can order the landlord to reduce the rent increase to an amount less than eight per cent on appeal by the tenant and order the landlord to pay back rent already paid in excess of what is finally allowed.

Until such time as the rent review officer makes his decision, a rent increase up to the eight per cent limit established by the Act may be collected by the landlord. Also, the discontinuance by the landlord of a service, privilege, accommodation or "thing" which results in a substantial reduction of the tenant's use and enjoyment of the premises will be considered a rent increase. Neither party may charge for any equipment or service which cannot be justified.

The rent review officer is empowered to review such actions by landlords and tenants who sublet. Tenants will not be able to sublet for a consideration greater than the rent that is lawully charged by the landlord and may not charge any consideration for assigning the tenancy agreement.

This Act will not apply to a number of residential premises. These include those owned by federal or provincial governments or government agencies, buildings of four residential units or fewer, luxury accommodation—which is defined as having a rent of more than $500 a month—co-operatives and non-profit housing and several similar exclusions. Also exempted are new buildings, no part of which were occupied for residential purposes before Jan. 1, 1976.

Any person who knowingly contravenes the limiting sections of the Act is guilty of an offence and on summary conviction is liable to a fine not exceeding $2,000.

Mr. Lewis: Members opposite should be more enthusiastic than that. Or are you still kicking and screaming?

Hon. Mr. Davis: It's completely consistent with what we said last August.

Mr. Nixon: On which day?

Interjections.

LANDLORD AND TENANT ACT AMENDMENTS

Hon. Mr. McMurtry: Mr. Speaker, the introduction of the Residential Premises Rent Review Act for first reading this afternoon requires further legislation to ensure security of tenure. I therefore intend to introduce amendments to the Landlord and Tenant Act next Wednesday, to protect tenants who become involved in rent disputes. I would like to review the main points of this legislation this afternoon because of the important connection between it and the rent review legislation.

The first important change will be to require landlords to give reasons for terminating a tenancy at the end of a term. No terminations will be permitted without notice to the tenant specifying reasons and particulars.

If the tenant does not consent, the landlord will be required to apply to a judge to obtain possession. He will have to satisfy the judge that reasons given for termination constitute "just cause" under the terms of the amended Act.

The list of just cuases for termination at the end of a term will include such things as excessive damage to the premises, offensive or illegal acts, undue nuisance or disturbance of other tenants, or failure to pay rent. A draft of these provisions is being delivered to spokesmen opposite and will be made public this afternoon.

To protect other tenants, the amendments will also enable the landlord to terminate the tenancy of an unreasonable tenant prior to the end of the term. To get possession of the premises, the landlord may need to prove his case to a judge. Landlords will also be required to give the tenant notice of default and an opportunity to remedy it, before going to court.

In addition, special provisions will be made for landlords to obtain possession of rented premises for extensive renovations or demolition. Notice to tenants will be necessary and the landlord will, once again, have to prove

the validity of termination to a judge if a tenant objects.

We are very concerned that tenants have the fullest possible opportunity to assess rent increases and contest them if necessary. To this end, landlords will be required to give tenants three months' notice of intended rent increases, whether the tenancy is for a week, a month, a year or longer.

We are satisfied that the rights of good tenants will be improved—and fully protected—by these amendments.

Further legislative changes will be made to provide new rights to the owners of mobile homes who rent sites for them. The courts have declared that the Landlord and Tenant Act does not apply to tenants who rent the site but not the mobile home. In some cases, this has led to serious hardship. Amendments to be introduced next week will ensure that the provisions of the Act do apply, including security of tenure.

In addition, the tenant will be given the right to sell his mobile home while it is on the rented site, without payment of a fee. The landlord will have a right to refuse consent if he can demonstrate just cause.

Landlords of mobile home parks will be prohibited from making charges over and above reasonable expenses for such things as entry to or exit from the park, installation or removal of a mobile home or the granting of tenancy.

In addition, landlords will not be allowed to restrict the tenant's right to purchase goods or services from the person of his choice. Landlords will be required to provide garbage disposal and maintain common facilities and internal roads, plumbing, sewerage and electrical systems in the park.

These initiatives will extend to Ontario mobile home owners a measure of legal protection unequalled in any other Canadian province.

Finally, important procedural changes will be made to the Landlord and Tenant Act to help a tenant present his case and obtain redress.

Tenants and landlords will be allowed representation in court by other than a lawyer. Tenants will gain the right to apply to a judge for termination of tenancy, a return of security deposits with interest, or abatement of rent. Presently, only landlords can make application to a judge under the Act.

Hearsay evidence will be permitted in court for the first time under the Landlord and Tenant Act, an important breakthrough for tenants who must rely upon their own spoken evidence to make their case.

The new legislation will allow a group with common interest to bring or defend an action before a judge if a judge approves. County and district judges will continue—

Mr. Lewis: We should have elections more often—every six months.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Hon. Mr. McMurtry: —to adjudicate landlord and tenant matters to ensure that justice is served in this complex and contentious area. The excellent record of the judiciary on these matters deserves our continued support.

I intend to review the need for additional judges to provide for any increase in case loads due to the amendments and to ensure prompt dispositions. In fact, we have already had preliminary conversations with the chief judge of the county court of the Province of Ontario.

There is more to come.

Mr. Lewis: What about Sept. 18 on an annual basis?

Hon. Mr. McMurtry: The Ontario Law Reform Commission will soon report to us on its analysis of the landlord and tenant relationship. Among other things, it will deal with the possibility of a standard tenancy agreement for Ontario. With this new report in hand we will consider the need for a new Landlord and Tenant Act.

Mr. Cassidy: There's more enthusiasm over here than there is over there.

Mr. MacDonald: Long live minority governments!

Mr. Lewis: Who would have believed it?

Mr. Reid: Here comes the bad news.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The Minister of Health has the floor.

Mr. Foulds: Is dental care next?

Hon. F. S. Miller: Most certainly a toothless opposition needs it.

Mr. Cassidy: From what we have just heard, the minister shouldn't say that.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. Will the Minister of Health continue?

Hon. F. S. Miller: I will if your opposition will permit. It is not your opposition, it is my opposition.

OCCUPATIONAL AND ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH ADVISORY COUNCIL

Hon. F. S. Miller: Mr. Speaker, in the past few years we have all grown increasingly aware of the complexity of the problems involved in guarding the people of Ontario against the hazards of health in various occupational and environmental surroundings. Historically, occupational health measures were seen mainly as routine precautions against known dangers with promptly visible consequences, but in more recent years the industrial application of new developments in the field of chemical technology have greatly increased the possibility of hidden and unsuspected risks.

It is clear to me that part of the price of remaining internationally competitive is not to be paid by a sacrifice of life expectancy. It requires greatly increased watchfulness. This watchfulness must detect new hazards and react effectively and with the least possible delay against them. Decisive precautionary measures must also be imposed in the case of known hazards. There has never been any question of the province's willingness to take ultimate responsibility for that watchfulness.

To reinforce this responsibility the Provincial Secretary for Resources Development announced in this House last April that the government of Ontario had decided to establish an advisory council on occupational and environmental health. This council will provide the formal mechanism for industry, labour and other interested parties to advise government on health standards and to recommend new policies and programmes. It will also assist government in defining how health safeguards can be engineered into new plants at the design stage.

As the Provincial Secretary for Resources Development also announced at that time, responsibility for inspecting, monitoring and enforcing health standards remains with the ministries of Labour, Natural Resources and Environment, but the advisory council will report to the Minister of Health. The Ministry of Health, and particularly its occupational health protection branch, will be the focal point for the setting of standards and for research applying to human health. The Ministry of Health will have clearly delineated responsibilities to assure that the standards are properly applied.

I have given this brief summary, really for those members who weren't here in the last session—

Mr. Wildman: There are a lot of us.

Hon. F. S. Miller: —to remind all members of this House of this background, since today I wish to announce the appointment of the Advisory Council on Occupational and Environmental Health, and these are the names:

Dr. Maurice Adelman, associate dean of graduate studies at the University of Windsor; Mr. Clifford Basken, international safety and health representative of the Oil, Chemical and Atomic Workers; Dr. Carol Burnham of S. N. C. Consultants Ltd.; Mr. P. R. Clarke, vice-president of Texasgulf Canada Ltd.; Mr. Sidney Liswood, executive vice-president of the Mount Sinai Hospital; Mr. J. H. Lumb, director of employee services, Westinghouse Canada Ltd.; Dr. R. H. Martin, medical director of Dominion Foundaries and Steel Ltd.; Mr. V. I. McCallum, executive assistant to the vice-president, nickel division, of Falconbridge Nickel Mines Ltd.—

Mr. Martel: That's like putting Dracula in charge of the blood bank.

Hon. F. S. Miller: Just hold on now, your turn's coming.

Mr. Martel: How can you have such people on it?

Hon. F. S. Miller: Mr. Larry Sheffe, international safety and health representative of the United Automobile Workers. Is that Dracula?

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: Okay?

Mr. Martel: No, it's just to correct the imbalance. You've got one—

Hon. F. S. Miller: There is an exact balance —wait till I finish!

Mr. Speaker: Order please.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: Throw him out, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Reid: Name him, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Lewis: How come all the employers are in the first half of the alphabet?

Hon. F. S. Miller: They weren't all employers.

Mr. Thomas Sloan, Canadian director of the International Chemical Workers' Union; Mr. K. Valentine, assistant director of the education department of the United Steelworkers of America; Mr. Edward Waddell, director of social services, Ontario Federation of Labour; and Mr. W. A. Webb of Telephone City Gravel Materials Ltd.

I would also remind members of this House that the council is fortunate in having as its chairman—

Mr. Roy: I think the minister has covered the whole province, yes.

Hon. F. S. Miller: —Dr. H. Rocke Robertson, whose appointment was announced last July by the Premier (Mr. Davis). Dr. Robertson was, from 1959 to 1962, both surgeon-in-chief at the Montreal General Hospital and professor of surgery at McGill. From 1963 to 1970 he was vice-chancellor and principal of McGill. Among his other distinctions, Dr. Robertson is president of the Traffic Injury Research Foundation of Canada, and a member of the National Health Grant Committee, so that he is eminently qualified to chair the advisory council.

I would add that members of all government departments and agencies concerned will, from time to time and as required, attend meetings of the advisory council.

I am well satisfied, in fact, that the council as it is constituted gives proper, balanced representation of all the many interests concerned, and it is composed of well-qualified people, capable of a co-operative effort that will show that the province's health and commercial prosperity can remain mutually compatible objectives.

The council has a major task, and I am sure all members of this House will want to join me in wishing it the fullest success.

Mr. Speaker: The provincial Treasurer.

ONTARIO CREDIT RATING

Mr. Foulds: Now for the bad news.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: In response to questions from members opposite, as I recall from the member for Grey-Bruce (Mr. Sargent), the member for York South (Mr. MacDonald), and, I believe, the leader of the third party, had certain observations about the Premier's—

Mr. Roy: That really makes you feel good, doesn't it?

Interjections.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: I believe the leader of the third party had certain observations about the Premier's luncheon habits or dinner habits or something. I thought, although this is a matter of public knowledge today in the press, that it would be appropriate, and in answer to members' questions and so that the record is complete, to put on the record the information which was contained in the Globe this morning, which is to the effect that Ontario had maintained its triple-A rating in the New York market.

[Applause]

Interjections.

Hon. Mr. Bernier: Triple-A, triple-A.

An hon. member: That's triple-A in everything.

Interjections.

Mr. Reid: You've got to have one good day.

Hon. Mr. Bernier: Don't look so disappointed.

Mr. Gaunt: Did the Treasurer rehearse this?

Interjections.

Hon. Mr. Davis: I guess you guys are really disappointed.

Mr. Cassidy: Did you set this up in caucus this morning?

Interjections.

Mr. Reid: Is this conditional on the Treasurer's resignation?

[2:30]

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Mr. Speaker, at the risk of embarrassing my friend, the leader of the third party, I think that I should put on the record an extract from the wire which was received:

> The province continues to exhibit economic strength, per capita debt remains moderate, and increases in provincial product remain substantial in a recessionary period.

Mr. Speaker, at the risk of embarrassing my friend, the leader of the third party—

Mr. Reid: We are concerned about spiralling deficits.

Mr. Nixon: Read the rest of it, Darcy; put it all on the record.

Mr. Speaker: Would the Treasurer please continue with his statement?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: I would very much like to, although I must say I'm relishing this, Mr. Speaker, let's string it out a little longer.

Hon. Mr. Davis: You guys weren't too impressed a year ago. It's amazing the way you've changed.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Mr. Speaker, I believe members on all sides will agree that we should not become in any way complacent about our credit standing.

Mr. Reid: Not as long as you are Treasurer.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: In expressing some concern, the rating agencies have identified a real problem area—the fiscal responsibility provincial jurisdictions should shoulder without corresponding revenue gathering capacity. They have recognized that we in Ontario have been successful in maintaining economic strength during the recent recessionary period. We have recognized fiscal stimulus cannot be provided indefinitely without impinging on our credit standing and general financial integrity. With this in mind, I'm confident that the programmes of restraint which I have announced recently and the collective efforts of Ontario citizens in support of the national anti-inflation programme, will help to maintain the continued confidence these institutions place in the management of this great Province of Ontario.

Mr. Roy: The minister can be forgiven.

Mr. Bullbrook: The constitution from Wall St., is that it?

Mr. Sargent: Two million dollar deficit.

Mr. Foulds: Has Lorne Henderson got a statement?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

TORONTO TEACHERS' NEGOTIATIONS

Hon Mr. Wells: Mr. Speaker, following the announcement last night of the results of the vote taken by the secondary school teachers of Metropolitan Toronto on the board's last offer and whether they were in favor of a strike or not, I have spoken with the Education Relations Commission, and they have informed me that Mr. William Dickie of the Ministry of Labour has been named to inquire into the situation, beginning immediately, and to see if he can help the parties reach an agreement. I spoke to Mr. Dickie about an hour ago and he is now attempting to arrange meetings with the parties this afternoon.

I want to say this: I believe that a strike in Metro Toronto's high schools can and should be averted, and I hope that both sides will work very diligently with Mr. Dickie over the next few days to come to a satisfactory agreement.

Mr. Speaker: Oral questions.

TORONTO TEACHERS' NEGOTIATIONS

Mr. Lewis: It has been quite a day, Mr. Speaker. I would like to congratulate the Ministers of Housing, Attorney General and Health and say that in the next election we are running on our record.

May I begin by addressing a question to the Minister of Education: Does the minister not feel that the appointment of Mr. Dickie really comes rather late in the day to effect a reconciliation at the bargaining table? Would he not, even at this point, respond to a plea for personal intervention on his part for these last five or six days, in order to avoid what seems imminent next Wednesday?

Hon. Mr. Wells: The answer to the first question is no, I do not. I might say that I count this kind of involvement as a form of personal involvement by the minister in this dispute.

Mr. Lewis: The minister is naive.

Mr. Nixon: Supplementary: Since it is quite within the realm of possibility that this House will have to deal with a continuing strike—that is, some time before prorogation in December—would the minister not agree that if he or one of his colleagues asks us to deal with legislation to end the strike some days, weeks, months from now, it would mean that his position was somewhat weakened if he had not attended a special meeting himself between the teachers and the board, hopefully in the presence of the Premier (Mr. Davis) and possibly in the presence of representatives of the Ottawa price control board before it goes to the point where the schools are closed.

Hon. Mr. Wells: Mr. Speaker, I think perhaps there is a misunderstanding of how mediation occurs and how these matters are settled. I indicated in this House the other day that I have been in contact—in fact probably every other day—with both sides in this particular dispute. They know that I'm available if they wish to use my services at any particular time. As I said, I have been talking with them several times over the past four or five days.

There is going to have to be some very determined 24-hour work by people to help avert this strike. I just said a few minutes

ago that I didn't think it should happen; I don't think it needs to happen. I count the kind of involvement that the Education Relations Commission has decided to ask Mr. Dickie to undertake on all our behalfs as the involvement that involves me in it.

Mr. Lewis: It comes too late.

Hon. Mr. Wells: If either of the parties wants to talk to me at any time and to ask me personally to meet with them, I stand ready to meet with them. Mr. Dickie is one of the outstanding—

Mr. Lewis: Mr. Dickie has had difficulty in the public sector; don't forget that.

Hon. Mr. Wells: —mediators in this province and he is ready to work on this non-stop for the next five days to avert this walkout. I think we should give him the support that he deserves.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Brant-Oxford-Norfolk.

Mr. Nixon: Mr. Speaker, a further supplementary: Would the minister not agree that his being available is not sufficient and that he has to speak for the parents and the people in this community who agree with the minister and everybody else that we do not want the schools closed? Would the minister not agree that eventually he must shoulder the responsibility of keeping the schools open or reopening them at some future date—and we have done this in this House before—and that if he allows the schools to close without some kind of personal, maybe public intervention, that it cannot be said that he has done everything possible to avert the strike?

Hon. Mr. Wells: Mr. Speaker, everything possible will be done before any strike happens or occurs in Metropolitan Toronto.

Mr. Lewis: It is too late.

Hon. Mr. Wells: Everything possible will be done by this government, this ministry and anyone who has anything to do with the situation.

Mr. Lewis: I find it very difficult to ask this question but I'm going to ask it anyway. Does the minister not think that it's rather late at this point in the day to introduce the old traditional wheeling and dealing, passing back and forth messages in the hotel corridors between parties as a last-minute effort to avert a strike in the public sector? Does he not think it would make a thousand times more sense for he himself to bring the parties together in his office or in a room with him in attendance and push them, constrain them, persuade them until we finally get a settlement? Isn't that what he now does? He knows what is going to happen if they strike.

Hon. Mr. Wells: No, I have to say with great respect to my friend, Mr. Speaker, that I do not think that is the kind of approach that would work at this particular time.

Mr. Lewis: Okay.

Mr. Roy: Mr. Speaker, I have a supplementary on the minister's answer to my leader. I wonder if I could ask the minister, in view of his comment that everything will be done and in view of his comment of yesterday or the day before that he feels that there are some special concessions that should go to teachers vis-à-vis the inflationary board in Ottawa, has he been in touch with the board? Is he in a position to tell the teachers what sort of concessions the board might look at?

Hon. Mr. Wells: Mr. Speaker, the comments which were attributed to me and which were correct in the press yesterday had nothing to do with the Metropolitan Toronto secondary school teachers and their dispute with the board.

Mr. Roy: But you have been talking to the board.

Hon. Mr. Wells: I was referring to the Metropolitan Toronto separate school teachers and their indication that they had a signed, or at least some form of agreement on monetary matters before Oct. 14 and were attempting to get a determination from Ottawa as to whether that is considered to have been an agreement under their guidelines, and that therefore the guidelines they have announced would not apply to that contract because there was an agreement before Oct. 14. That is what we've been talking to Ottawa about but not, and I emphasize, anything to do with the Metro Toronto secondary school dispute.

The line of action that will have to be followed there is that they will have to come to a signed contract and then they will have to go to Ottawa and talk to them about whether they're entitled to special consideration or not. The Anti-Inflation Review Board will have to rule on that at some time in the future.

Mr. Speaker: The Leader of the Opposition.

AUTOMOBILE INSURANCE RATES

Mr. Lewis: A question to the Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations: Now that it appears conclusive that the automobile insurance companies will be raising the premiums in the next several months, based on rate determinations of some few months ago, is the minister prepared to intervene on behalf of the consumers of Ontario to protect them against illegitimate price increases by way of premiums of 35 to 50 per cent in some cases, given the anti-inflationary guidelines to which the minister subscribes?

Hon. Mr. Handleman: Mr. Speaker, as the hon. Leader of the Opposition knows very well, we intervene all the time in rate setting.

Mr. Singer: Oh, come on.

Mr. Cassidy: We are not aware of it. You do it behind closed doors.

Hon. Mr. Handleman: The headline on which the question is based is a slight indulgence in unwarranted hysteria. These rates took effect in January and July of this year. I have to assume that somebody recently got a rate increase and suddenly realized auto insurance rates in Ontario have gone up. Speaking of rate increases, I understand the Premier of the province just west of us is not very happy about the 35 per cent rate increase on his car, and he's got publicly-owned auto insurance.

Mr. Lewis: By way of supplementary, would the minister not consider it a pig-at-the-trough attitude on the part of the automobile insurance companies—to use the minister's delicate phrasing—in view of their intent to extort from the consumers of Ontario who pay premiums more than they should take, without public justification and apparently with agreement on the part of this government despite its stand on the guidelines?

Hon. Mr. Handleman: Mr. Speaker, it is not very often that the hon. Leader of the Opposition has to borrow somebody else's phrases in order to be fairly explicit.

Mr. Lewis: That is right.

Hon. Mr. Handleman: I am flattered, I truly am. I feel that the Anti-Inflation Review Board in Ottawa may very well be shirking its responsibility in not looking at the increases. However, the excuse that they use for not looking at them is that they were all approved prior to the adoption of the price increases.

Mr. Nixon: By the provincial authorities.

Hon. Mr. Handleman: We will look at them in a continuous way, and to the best of my knowledge there has been no application put before my ministry for rate increases since the adoption of the guidelines.

Mrs. Campbell: Look at them is right. But they do nothing.

Mr. Martel: That will only be three this year.

Mr. Singer: Would the minister not agree that the time has come for this government to publicly examine insurance rates and in public, so that the people can see just how it happens? And could he explain to us what kind of application is ever put before him for increasing the rates? It is done unilaterally.

Hon. Mr. Handleman: Mr. Speaker, the question has been asked before, and the answer is the same. I do not believe this is the right time to start intervening in rate setting in the private sector.

An hon. member: When is the time?

Mr. Nixon: This is the time.

Mr. Lewis: On wages it is all right; but premiums, no.

Mr. Moffatt: In light of the answer the minister gave to the leader of the official opposition, I would like to ask him whether he really intends to investigate the complaints which have been lodged with his ministry with regard to exorbitant rate increases in the taxi cab industry, which is apparently controlled by a monopoly?

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: That is not a supplementary.

Hon. Mr. Handleman: Mr. Speaker, certainly we investigate every complaint that is lodged with the ministry. As to specifics, I've had one letter on taxi insurance rates. As far as I know that particular situation has been favourably resolved. There are some increases, and they are due to cost increases and repairs. There is nothing secret about the method whereby rates are established. If costs go up, rates go up—and that's a natural thing.

Mr. Speaker: This is the final supplementary.

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Minister, in view of the fact that Ottawa has stated that there would be no rollback in this case—and this is just as important as the price of gasoline, because

everyone has to pay it—when is the time that the minister will review this? When will he make them open their books and show cause why they have these increases of 25 to 50 per cent; when is the time?

Hon. Mr. Handleman: As I have already said, if a new application for a rate increase comes before my ministry, we will deal with it in the same way that any price increase is dealt with in this province.

Mr. Singer: There doesn't have to be an application at all; they do it unilaterally. The minister knows that.

Hon. Mr. Handleman: We have opted into the Ottawa guidelines and we think that the Anti-Inflation Review Board should be looking at these things. That's their responsibility.

Mr. Singer: Point of order. Surely the minister has to recognize there doesn't have to be, there is never an application for a rate increase.

Mr. Speaker: That's not a point of order.

Mr. Singer: He is misleading us. He is misleading the House.

Mr. McNeil: The member for Wilson Heights is speaking to the gallery.

Mr. Singer: No, I am talking to you, so that even you will understand—that is, the member for Elgin.

[2:45]

AUTOMOBLE INSURANCE RATES

Mr. Lewis: A question of the Treasurer: Is not his statement of last Thursday reduced to travesty when the government of Ontario refuses to intervene to govern the rate-setting of the automobile insurance companies, which clearly exceeds dramatically the guidelines which the government would otherwise wish to enforce?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: No, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Lewis: By way of supplementary, does the government intend this particular price increase for the consumers simply to be imposed by the automobile insurance companies —with no books open, no questions answered, no accountability—and maintain its position that wages should be tightly controlled?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Mr. Speaker, this question has already been answered, and very adequately, by my colleague.

Mr. Lawlor: It's a rubber stamp.

PAYMENTS TO DOCTORS

Mr. Nixon: Mr. Speaker, I would like to put a question to the Minister of Health. Would he report to the House the present situation in his negotiations with the medical practitioners on an increase in payments to them under the provisions of our provincial legislation? Can he assure us that the negotiations that he says are close to fruition are not going to be based on any increase which would give the doctors more than $2,400 a year extra or would break the guidelines that have been referred to so frequently by the Treasurer?

Hon. F. S. Miller: Mr. Speaker, the discussions have been going on and, as in the case of many discussions that are closing in to an agreement, there has been virtually a news blackout on them. I think it is wise that this should be maintained. I only point out that I have been encouraged by the fact that in the negotiations the people on both sides of the Clawson committee have been trying to interpret the government's guidelines and to live within them. That, as I said yesterday, was a refreshing change.

Mr. Nixon: A supplementary to the minister: Has he naturally put a rider on his negotiations with the doctors that whatever the agreement might be, it would be referred to the wage and price control board in Ottawa under the circumstances we've been talking about?

Hon. F. S. Miller: As I understand it, I wouldn't need to put that rider on; whether I wanted them referred or not, they are subject to that referral.

PAYMENT FOR CATTLE PURCHASES

Mr. Nixon: I would like to put a question to the Minister of Correctional Services. Can he now give us a fuller statement in this House as to the relationship between the government and Essex Packers, since there continue to be reports from farmers who have supplied livestock to Essex Packers at the facilities at the Guelph Correctional Centre that the livestock have not been properly paid for?

Would the minister not agree that under those circumstances there is almost inherent in the business relationships between the farmers and Essex Packers a relationship involving the government of Ontario, since for so many years livestock did go into the Guelph Correctional Centre and was paid for directly by the government?

Hon. J. R. Smith: In responding to the question, I think the leader of the Liberal Party should be aware that it is a licensing agreement between the Ministry of Correctional Services and Essex Packers of Hamilton. Through this agreement the farmers are selling directly to Essex Packers, who in effect are operating the abattoir at the Guelph institution. They are not selling their cattle to the Ministry of Correctional Services.

Mr. Good: Supplementary: In view of the fact that most farmers feel that because the cattle were going into a provincial institution, and since a million dollars of provincial money was going into the abattoir to update its facilities, does the minister not agree that there is some kind of moral obligation on the part of government to have an investigation to see what some of the facts are?

Would the minister comment first on the rumour or report that before the receivers went into the operation, people from the bank that forced the receivership were in there saying selectively which farmers should be paid and which farmers should not be paid prior to the receivership? Would the minister ascertain whether there is any truth to the report that the farmers who were paid were those farmers who owed the bank that forced the receivership?

Hon. J. R. Smith: I am also concerned about the farmers who have received NSF cheques. As to what the hon. member has said, the receiver appointed by the Bank of Nova Scotia, Laventhol and Horwath, in fact did not go into the plant and make any such determinations. The only involvement of our ministry is that, in co-operation with the Minister of Agriculture and Food (Mr. W. Newman), we did obtain a legal opinion as to whether or not we could force Essex Packers or the receiver to pay the $165,000 which has been approved for the overall cost of equipment on the total installation to the farmers for their cattle. We understand and have been told that legally there is no way they can be bound to use that money to pay the farmers for these cattle.

Mr. Gaunt: A supplementary question: May I ask the minister when this legal opinion was rendered?

Hon. J. R. Smith: Last week.

Mr. Gaunt: Supplementary: May I say the Minister of Agriculture and Food wasn't aware of it. Did the minister pass along this opinion to the Minister of Agriculture and Food?

Hon. J. R. Smith: I wish to assure the hon. member that the Minister of Agriculture and Food is very much concerned with this and has done everything possible to try to get payment.

Mr. Roy: The minister didn't answer the question.

Interjections.

Hon. J. R. Smith: Yes, he was aware.

Mr. Worton: In view of the fact that the minister indicated that all persons who supplied beef after Oct. 17 were receiving their payment for their steers or their cattle, and an individual who sold on Aug. 23 had his cheque returned NSF, would he not agree that somebody was selective about who got paid and who didn't?

Hon. J. R. Smith: I have not had an opportunity to receive a statement from the receiver or the management of Essex Packers as to which farmers were paid.

Mr. Roy: Would the minister look at it and report back to the House?

Mr. Speaker: Does the hon. member for Brant-Oxford-Norfolk have any further questions?

Mr. Nixon: Not at this time.

MISSISSAUGA INQUIRY

Mr. Gregory: I'd like to direct a question to the Attorney General. In the matter of the judicial inquiry into the affairs of the city of Mississauga and in view of the decision by the divisional court yesterday, is it the intention of the Attorney General to take a look at section 240 of the Municipal Act which permits a municipal council to direct a judge of an adjoining county to conduct an inquiry?

Hon. Mr. McMurtry: As I recall the decision of the divisional court, they stated that the attempted use of section 240 in these circumstances was, to quote the divisonal court, "unnerving". In the circumstances, we are going to review the matter thoroughly to determine whether or not any amendments to the Act would be appropriate.

Mr. Singer: A supplementary.

Mr. Gregory: A supplementary.

Mr. Speaker: Since it is the member for Mississauga East's question, he should be allowed a supplementary first.

Mr. Gregory: Further to the same question, in light of the ruling and the resultant cost which is being assessed against the city of Mississauga, would the Attorney General consider requesting the Ontario Provincial Police or the Peel regional police to investigate the motivation behind the calling of the inquiry?

Hon. Mr. McMurtry: Such a request would fall clearly outside the jurisdiction of the Attorney General. I think that if there are any parties to these proceedings who feel they have been abused there are civil remedies that are available.

Mr. Singer: Is the review that the Attorney General talks about likely to be retroactive in its effect, if he comes to the conclusion that the statute should be changed, or is it henceforth and forever more?

Hon. Mr. McMurtry: Generally speaking, I don't think in these circumstances I would support any principle of retroactivity.

TELSO STRIKE

Mr. Mackenzie: To the Minister of Labour: Would the minister consider a quick appointment of a disputes advisory committee as provided for in the recent amendments to the Labour Relations Act to try to deal with the difficult strike at Telso in Tillsonburg, which involves some 48 women, mostly making about $2.60 an hour, and is now the longest strike in the Province of Ontario, over 14 months' duration?

Hon. B. Stephenson: Mr. Speaker, my predecessor in this office was asked that question and did consider the appointment of a disputes advisory board and decided that because of the length of the strike and the character of the strike the disputes advisory board mechanism would be unlikely to be useful. Therefore, a specific individual with much experience in labour relations—who was, at that time, the retired president of one of the major unions in Canada—was appointed to investigate this problem. This he has done. He has reported directly to both parties but we have not as yet had the report from that gentleman. When we do, we hope we shall also hear something from the parties to the dispute.

Mr. Mackenzie: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker: Is the minister aware that as of right now employees are being called up individually by the company in this dispute and given two weeks to make up their minds whether they are going to stay with the company or be finished once and for all?

Hon. B. Stephenson: No, I was not aware.

HYDRO EXPLORATIONS

Mr. Peterson: I have a question for the Minister of Energy. Was he consulted and did he approve of Hydro's excursion into the exploration business, by way of joint venture, to the tune of about $9.5 million?

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: I fully concurred.

Mr. Peterson: Is it the minister's understanding that Hydro has unfettered discretion to enter into exploration agreements, in view of the fact that Ontario Energy Corp. was formed for this purpose?

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: No, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Mancini: Energy at cost?

Mr. Sargent: What did he say? We can't hear him.

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: If the member wouldn't babble so much, he would hear.

I said no.

Mr. Cassidy: The minister is suggesting he knows what he is talking about.

Mr. Lewis: Ontario Hydro is going to hang him yet.

HOUSING ACTION PROGRAMME

Mr. Williams: Mr. Speaker, a question of the Minister of Housing: As part of the government's housing action programme whereby his predecessor directed the appropriate government departments involved in land use planning and private and public housing projects to expedite the processing procedure, could he advise the House as to the manner in which the directive was implemented, the degree of success experienced to date and the areas in which this directive could be expanded and further improved upon?

Mr. Roy: That's really of urgent public importance.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: Mr. Speaker, I cannot tell the hon. member what the degree of success has been. I am familiar with some of the—

Mr. Sargent: Why don't you buy him a coffee, John?

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: —directives which were issued by my predecessor. I can't tell what degree of success there has been. I do know there has been an improvement in the expediting of material through the ministry to get decisions on planning for subdivisions and severances. That has been increased. The only thing I can say is that we will be meeting the various ministers in the policy field involved with land in particular to see if we can speed up the process even more.

Mr. Speaker: The Minister of Transportation and Communications has the answer to a previous question.

KRAUSS-MAFFEI SYSTEM

Hon. Mr. Snow: Yes, Mr. Speaker: In response to a question concerning my predecessor's commitment to table before this Legislature the final cost and settlement concerning the Krauss-Maffei programme, I would like to provide this summary. During the contract, MTC paid Krauss-Maffei—

Mr. Sargent: Take the marbles out of your mouth. We can't hear you.

Hon. Mr. Snow: Take the hay out of your ears.

Interjections.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. There is too much noise in the chamber.

Hon. Mr. Snow: I might point out, Mr. Speaker, that these figures were published about two or three months ago but I am only too happy to give them again. During the contract MTC paid Krauss-Maffei $6.4 million. We now have that amount repaid to us, and in addition we have been paid another $2.8 million which covers the complete cost of staff salaries, MTC legal costs, travel and housing in Germany and all other costs directly related to this contract.

[3:00]

In addition, all subcontracts were settled at no cost to the ministry and all restoration of the CNE was accomplished to the unanimous satisfaction of the CNE officials.

Mr. Cassidy: As if it never took place.

Hon. Mr. Snow: As a result of this settlement, the ministry received repayment of all its costs, and the Krauss-Maffei project has not resulted in any cost or expenditure by the Ontario taxpayers.

I am advised that this summary includes all travel and expenses associated with the contract on behalf of both MTC and the Urban Transit Development Corp. However, to avoid any confusion, it does not include the cost of the ministry advertising campaign in 1974.

Mr. Reid: That's a big one. That's a biggie.

Hon. Mr. Snow: This campaign included the promotion of the new capital subsidy policy, the dial-a-bus experiment, the staggered work hour programme, the GO Transit programme, the transit fare stabilization programme, driver safety and the TATOA initial expenses. The total cost for promotion of all aspects directly related to the CNE GO-Urban project is estimated at $67,157.

Mr. Good: That wouldn't even pay for the trees.

Hon. Mr. Snow: I would point out that the total costs of the payouts for this programme were $9,186,880. The receipts were $9.2 million. Taking into consideration the $67,000 in promotional costs for the GO-Urban project, and taking into consideration $48,657 received in provincial sales tax, including all the promotion expenses, the net cost to the taxpayers of Ontario was $5,379.

Mr. Reid: Little more than a thin dime.

Mr. Singer: A supplementary: Could the minister tell us if the cost of the Scarborough route study is included, if Mr. Foley's salary is included and if the costs of all of the people assisting Mr. Foley are included, and the extent of those costs?

Hon. Mr. Snow: I have the complete information here, which I will table and send over to the member. He can examine these figures, and if he has any further questions after that, I'll be pleased to answer them.

Mr. Germa: A supplementary: Could I ask the minister if all our engineers have been returned from the Krauss-Maffei plant in Germany? In other words, have all expenditures ceased as they relate to the Krauss-Maffei project?

Hon. Mr. Snow: Certainly all expenditures relating to the Krauss-Maffei magnetic levitation system are included in this, and there is no further work going on regarding that project.

Mr. Singer: When did it stop?

Hon. Mr. Snow: We do have other research projects going on at the present time in research and development work regarding the

light rail system and the linear induction motor.

Mr. Roy: The Premier (Mr. Davis) should send his medal back to Florida.

Mr. Singer: Could the minister tell us when the relationship with Krauss-Maffei stopped? That isn't the last thing the Premier told us. When we stopped the present experiment he said we were continuing a relationship with Krauss-Maffei. When did it finish?

Mr. Nixon: Because we had North American rights to this great programme.

Mr. Roy: Yes, you considered putting wheels on it.

Mr. Singer: When did it finish?

Hon. Mr. Snow: I don't have the exact date here, but I will get it for the member.

Mr. Cassidy: Would the minister not agree that even if we got almost every nickel back, money alone will not buy the three years of initiative and time we have lost, which could have been used in developing an adequate transit system for the needs of the Province of Ontario?

Interjections.

Hon. Mr. Snow: No, I would not agree with that at all, because research and development on other projects has been under way all this time; there has not been time lost.

Interjections.

INJURED WORKMEN'S DEMONSTRATION

Mr. di Santo: Thanks to my friends on my right, Mr. Speaker. I have a question of the Solicitor General. In view of the fact that some police officers who are qualifying themselves as community relations officers, are visiting some injured workers who took part in the demonstration at the opening of the Legislature, would the minister tell us what is the purpose of this investigation, which seems not to be part of the official investigation held by the Speaker of this Legislature?

Hon. Mr. MacBeth: Mr. Speaker, I am afraid I don't understand the question. Is the member suggesting that there are two investigations going on?

Mr. Foulds: Among other things.

Mr. di Santo: There is an official investigation which is conducted by the Speaker of this House, but I have been informed that police officers are visiting injured workmen who took part in the demonstration and asking some peculiar questions, and this is the reason I am asking the Solicitor General the purpose of this parallel investigation.

Hon. Mr. MacBeth: Mr. Speaker, I don't know how many investigations are going on. I know the Premier had announced that he has asked for an investigation and I assume the various security forces involved, including the Metropolitan Toronto police and our own forces here, will be questioned as to what did happen.

I know that investigation is going on. I haven't seen the report as yet. We will follow it up as quickly as we can so that we can get that report into the hands of the members, but I don't know that there is any more than one investigation going on. There are probably many inquiries, but all part of the one investigation.

Mr. di Santo: A supplementary: Since the Speaker of the Legislature has assured me that he has never asked a police officer to get involved in his investigation, would the minister investigate this matter and report to this Legislature, and if so, when?

Hon. Mr. MacBeth: Mr. Speaker, I will do my best, sir.

LIQUOR BOARD APPOINTMENTS

Mr. Conway: Mr. Speaker, a question of the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs: Given the recent announcement from Mr. Mackey about his impending retirement, is the minister about to avail himself of what is clearly a splendid opportunity to modernize that medieval mockery that we all know to be the LLBO? Further to that, would the minister consider the appointment of an erstwhile cabinet minister and Hanover haberdasher as the right place to start with such a reorganization and modernization?

Hon. Mr. Handleman: If I may answer, Mr. Speaker—

Mr. Lewis: He'll last about as long as Paul Taylor.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Hon. Mr. Handleman: If I may have the opportunity of answering a question addressed to the Hon. André Ouellet, I would be glad to do so.

Mr. Roy: Oh, don't get smart. It is pretty close anyway.

Hon. Mr. Handleman: If the hon. member had been here a few months ago he might have heard the debate in which many members participated—

Mr. Roy: The minister didn't know the name of the ministry until two weeks ago.

Hon. Mr. Handleman: —in the modernization of the Liquor Licence Act and the Liquor Control Act. Those Acts have been passed, they will be proclaimed shortly, and appointments to the boards will be announced shortly.

Mr. Conway: Appoint Winkler, I dare you. Appoint Winkler. You will be sitting ducks all right. Just try it. Go ahead, boys, just try it.

Interjections.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. Will you show a little courtesy to the member who is trying to ask a question?

VIOLENCE IN HOCKEY

Mr. Jones: Mr. Speaker, a question of the Attorney General: In view of the shocking circumstances that we saw at Maple Leaf Gardens last night, in view of those shocking incidents, and in view of the comments that he has made as to what his direction would be in such an occurrence, could the Attorney General please advise us as to what action he may be taking or might tave taken?

Mr. Givens: He can ask that in his own caucus, Mr. Speaker.

Hon. Mr. McMurtry: Mr. Speaker, with respect to the game at Maple Leaf Gardens last night, I can advise my colleagues that a charge of assault causing bodily harm has been laid by the Crown attorney of the county of York against a Detroit hockey player by the name of Dan Maloney.

Mr. Roy: Is the Attorney General going to proceed by way of summary conviction or indictment on this charge?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Is the member his counsel? Is he trying to get a ruling?

Mr. Roy: No I just want to know. It's the minister's election.

Interjections.

Hon. Mr. McMurtry: I think the question is a good one.

An hon. member: It will be the first one.

Mr. Roy: Tell the Premier that.

Interjections.

Hon. Mr. McMurtry: I just have to advise my hon. colleague that I am not in receipt of sufficient enough information, and I don't know if the Crown attorney is yet, to make that determination at this time. I can tell members that the investigation is not yet complete and it's only when the investigation has been completed that the Crown attorney, who has conducted the case, will be able to make the determination whether to proceed by summary conviction or by indictment.

Mr. Good: Check it out with Harold Ballard, too.

Mr. Roy: Doesn't it seem strange that the minister would lay charges before completing the investigation?

Mr. Renwick: Not at all—not at all.

Hon. Mr. McMurtry: No.

Interjections.

HOMES ON TORONTO ISLAND

Mr. Cassidy: I have a question of the Attorney General, although he may wish to transfer it to the House leader. In view of the support of the majority of this House for the preservation of the homes on Toronto Island, including the new Attorney General, and in view of the fact that a private member's bill would not normally come to a vote in this House, will the minister commit the government to make such a bill a government order in order that is can be passed, and will he also commit the government to ensure that royal assent will be given if the bill is passed by the House?

Interjections.

Mr. Roy: Ask him if he is going to move back.

Hon. Mr. McMurtry: My support for maintaining the island community is well known and certainly predates my election to this House, and my views have not changed, but of course I am in no position to commit the government to any particular course of action at this time.

PAYMENT FOR CATTLE PURCHASES

Mr. Gaunt: I have a question of the Minister of Agriculture and Food. When did the minister become aware of the legal decision rendered in connection with the Essex Packers matter? Does he agree with it? If so, what steps is he taking in order to guarantee the payment of the farmers?

Hon. W. Newman: I did have an opinion yesterday. That doesn't necessarily—

Interjections.

Hon. W. Newman: It doesn't necessarily say that I particularly agree with it, and at this point in time I'm still looking at the matter to see what can be done to make sure the farmers do get paid. We are still holding the cheque that the Province of Ontario is owing at this point in time.

WATER POLLUTION TEST RESULTS

Mr. Angus: I have a question of the Minister of the Environment. What conclusion has his ministry made in the astounding results of the many water quality studies conducted downstream from the pulp and paper mills that are at present shut down in Thunder Bay? Secondly, has the ministry not done the same intense examination of the water downstream from the many other mills in this province? If he has, could we please have those results? Thirdly, would the minister advise me why the testing related to the Great Lakes Paper Co.'s pulp and paper mill—

Mr. Sargent: Question.

Mr. Angus: —is done a mile away, while others are done as close as a quarter of a mile with almost similar results—

Mr. Sargent: Question.

Mr. Angus: And finally, in light of these remarkable revelations, what is the government prepared to do to correct the situation?

Mr. Cassidy: Good question.

Hon. Mr. Kerr: My first conclusion is that if you don't have any pulp mills in the province, you won't have any contamination downstream from those mills.

Mr. Lewis: That's great.

Interjections.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. There's very little time left in question period.

Mr. Bullbrook: Thank God.

Hon. Mr. Kerr: As far as other mills are concerned, yes, we have the same type of surveillance and continuous analysis of the waters downstream. That information is on file at the various regional labs, as well as the ministry offices here. The analysis of the Great Lakes Paper Co. mill was made a mile away, as the hon. member said, and also closer—although a mean average was given for results of that particular mill. If the hon. member wants some specific information closer, that is available to him. As far as correcting these situations is concerned we will continue to enforce the orders we have against these mills to make sure, particularly when they start up again, that their abatement programmes are on time.

[3:15]

Mr. Angus: Could the minister advise the House what those regulations and requests have been and what those pollution abatement programmes are of those mills?

Hon. Mr. Kerr: These are long-standing orders. They have been in effect now for four or five years. It's a matter of making sure that they are on schedule; that they are complying with the staging requirements and if possible are even ahead of that in the event that there's extraordinary contamination of the receiving waters.

Mr. Sweeney: Like Dow Chemical—four or five years.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Rainy River.

Mr. Givens: I've been getting up for ages. Can you see this far back?

Interjections.

Mr. Lewis: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, may I make an appeal on behalf of the member for Armourdale? He has been excluded and should surely take priority.

Mr. Speaker: You are wasting the question period.

EXPANSION OF GO-URBAN

Mr. Reid: I have a question for the Minister of Transportation and Communications. Can the minister indicate to the House how much his ministry is spending this year in the expansion of GO-Urban, bringing commuters into downtown Toronto? How much is it cost-

ing the Treasury and how many more people does he feel are going to use this expanded service?

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: Trying to establish an urban base?

Hon. Mr. Snow: I'll have to get those figures of course, Mr. Speaker. I would like to know whether the hon. member wants those figures for the last 12-month period, for this current calendar year on this current fiscal year, and which lines he is referring to.

Mr. Reid: A supplementary: How does the minister square his policy of expanding GO-Urban to bring people into the downtown core of Metro Toronto when other government studies, COLUC, the Toronto-centred region plan, and even the city of Toronto are trying to decentralize? His policy is to centralize everything in downtown Toronto. How does the minister explain that conflict?

Hon. Mr. Snow: That's very easy to explain, Mr. Speaker, because I don't think the hon. member understands that these trains run both ways.

Interjections.

Mr. Morrow: Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that time is running out I'm willing to surrender my time to the hon. member for Armourdale who seems to have an urgent question.

Mr. Givens: Thank you, no.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Sudbury East.

Mr. Martel: A question for the Minister of Culture and Recreation.

Interjections.

Mr. Morrow: If the hon. member for Armourdale is not to take my turn I will take it myself.

Mr. Speaker: The time for oral questions has expired.

Interjections.

Mr. Speaker: Petitions.

Presenting reports.

Mr. Edighoffer from the standing estimates committee reported the following resolution:

Resolved: That supply in the following amounts and to defray the expenses of the Ministry of Industry and Tourism be granted to Her Majesty for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1976:

MINISTRY OF INDUSTRY AND TOURISM

Ministry central office	$ 705,000
Industry development	7,034,000
Trade development	2,578,000
Tourism development	7,326,000
Operations	6,501,000
Communications	860,000
Administration	1,601,000
Ontario Place Corp.	3,795,000
Industrial incentives and development	15,550,000

Mr. Speaker: Motions.

Introduction of bills.

RESIDENTIAL PREMISES RENT REVIEW ACT

Hon. Mr. Rhodes moved first reading of bill intituled, An Act to provide for the Review of Rents in respect of Residential Premises.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Mr. Foulds: Seconding that bill is the best thing the Minister of Natural Resources (Mr. Bernier) has done.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: The great northern legislation bill.

Mr. Martel: Not his greatest hour.

Mr. Singer: Whatever happened to the Unconscionable Transactions Act? We didn't hear a thing about that this afternoon.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: It was just a thought.

Mr. Singer: No Act to amend the Unconscionable Transactions Act?

Mr. Lewis: But the minister told me in that debate that it meant everything.

Mr. Speaker: Orders of the day.

JUDICATURE AMENDMENT ACT

Hon. Mr. McMurtry moved second reading of Bill 1, An Act to amend the Judicature Act.

Mr. Speaker: Does the minister have a statement?

Hon. Mr. McMurtry: No.

Mr. Lawlor: This is a housekeeping bill. It won't take a great deal of time. It's a missed cross-reference under the Judicature Act, subsection 5, referring over to section

20 of the Financial Administration Act. Section 20, as it presently stands, has to do with guarantees of government investments only and substituting section 12 of that Act which has to do with the range and types of investments which the Treasurer has power over. It brings the Judicature Act and the moneys paid into court under this particular head.

One other point that I wish to mention is that the Financial Administration Act itself has been amended in 1973 to extend and elaborate the powers of the Treasurer, so that there are very wide investment powers indeed. I don't think the matter requires any further particulars.

Rather than send it into committee, as far as I am concerned I would ask the minister to tell me who the three people are who are on the finance committee touching the matter of the investment of court funds. That's the only question I wish to know about.

Hon. Mr. McMurtry: I am sorry I can't answer that question as to the identity of these people, but I will have that information for my friend by tomorrow morning.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I might just point out that the hon. minister introducing the bill and moving second reading will have the opportunity to reply to any questions, propositions or proposals made by any of the members. In other words, he will speak last.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Speaker, I want to commend the Attorney General for discovering the necessity for this bill and bringing it in. It certainly effects a major change in the law. I would have thought that he would have been talking this afternoon about amendments to the Unconscionable Transactions Act but instead he chose to amend the Judicature Act in such a meaningful way that we can nothing else but support the bill before us.

Mr. Renwick: Mr. Speaker, I rise only because I'm delighted to see the correction which he has made, but I regret that there is a further error in the bill. I understood that this was the first session of the 30th Parliament and his bill provides that it will be known as the Judicature Amendment Act, 1975, second session.

Mr. Singer: Ah! That is so they can have the bill for February.

Mr. Speaker: Do any other hon. members wish to speak to this bill?

Mr. Deans: The bill surely can't go ahead.

Mr. Renwick: The bill must go to committee, obviously, for amendment.

Mr. Speaker: I don't have a copy of the bill. Is there a technical error in it?

Mr. Good: No, it says "first session".

Mr. Singer: They want a technical error so they can amend it next time.

Mr. Speaker: Apparently it's in order. Do any other hon. members wish to speak? The hon. Attorney General?

Hon. Mr. McMurtry: No, I have nothing further, Mr. Speaker.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

Mr. Speaker: Shall this bill be ordered for third reading?

Mr. Renwick: No, it will have to go to committee to make some corrections.

Mr. Speaker: I haven't been informed. Is there an error?

Interjections.

Mr. Speaker: The clerk advises me there is no error in it. He mentions that it refers to the 2nd session of 1975. I don't see it myself, just glancing at it quickly.

Mr. Good: It is in section 3.

Mr. Singer: Yes, but it doesn't say 30th Parliament.

Mr. Renwick: On a point of order; on the front of the bill we have the first session of the 30th Legislature and I am going to be told now that this is the second session in 1975. Is that rational? All of the bills that are before us today have this error. I don't mind how they are corrected but let's not quibble about it.

Mr. Speaker: It's not exactly contradictory. It's a little unusual; I think I agree with that.

Mr. Singer: Let's have an election on this important issue.

Hon. Mr. Davis: This is as relative as the member's amendment.

Mr. Speaker: I am advised by the clerk, who is the expert in protocol and procedures here, that it is in order.

Shall this bill be ordered for third reading?

Agreed.

HIGHWAY TRAFFIC AMENDMENT ACT

Hon. Mr. Snow moved second reading of Bill 2, An Act to amend the Highway Traffic Act.

Mr. Wildman: Mr. Speaker, our caucus agrees with the principle of the bill which prohibits the operation on a highway of a vehicle of a class prescribed by a regulation unless a sticker evidencing compliance with the inspection and performance requirements is displayed. We don't feel it should be referred to a committee, but we have serious reservations about some of its applications as they affect the dump truck industry. We would like to know, or have the minister explain, what leads him to license dump trucks on a regional basis rather than having province-wide control of entry into the industry. Surely in order to make a living drivers should be able to operate and to move about the industry to follow available work.

Mr. Reid: Mr. Speaker, probably we should be dealing with Bills 2 and 3 at the same time. We have no objections to the bill. We might be interested in the details, exactly how these inspections are going to be carried out, and how often they are going to be carried out. But this has been a move for which the trucking industry itself has been asking for some time and we are in agreement with the principle of the bill.

Mr. Moffatt: Mr. Speaker, the bill is the result of the inquiry into this particular industry. The report of the inquiry has 47 specific recommendations and the ministry has responded by including four of those recommendations in this particular legislation. While the four are valid and are certainly necessary, it seems to me that one of the things we should really be doing is making sure that when we bring forth legislation, such as that called for in the particular bill, it should not be passed in isolation, when there are other ministries which of necessity must take action to guarantee there will not be hardship as a result of the action of the government. I suggest to the minister that is what is going to happen.

With this particular bill all of the items in the report which dealt with limiting the activities and actions of the trucking industry are in some way dealt with. But the trucking industry in its brief and the many briefs that were submitted to the inquiry specified and detailed the fact that if legislation, for instance, is brought forward which requires that all loads carried in open dump trucks should have a tarpaulin attached when that load is being transported over a hard-surfced road, then obviously 10 to 12 minutes will be added to the delivery time for that particular load. What will happen is that the truck driver over the course of a day, because he works on a fee-per-load basis, will find that he is short one load or more each day; he is going to be penalized for complying with this particular act.

[3:30 p.m.]

I submit to the minister that the whole business will result in a lot of cheating by the operators unless they are given some way by which they can recoup those particular financial losses. What obviously will happen is that, for the first week of enforcement, every load will be covered with a tarpaulin; in the second week some of the loads won't be; and by the third, fourth or fifth week, all the loads will be back where we are right now.

It would seem to me that it would be in the interests of the minister and of the industry to make sure, if regulations are placed upon the operators, that the regulations are reasonable and do not impose the kind of financial hardship that this particular one is going to.

I checked with operators in this particular industry and they informed me that it takes 10 to 12 minutes to tarp-cover the average kind of gravel truck. Larger ones will take significantly longer and, of course, smaller trucks will take a few minutes less. But over 10 or 12 loads, an hour and a half will be added to the working time or that amount will be subtracted from delivery time.

What seems to me also to have happened on this particular bill is that it has ignored the request of the industry itself to make sure there is recognition of the fact that overloading has been encouraged by previous legislation and that operators have purchased licences which are in excess of the safe limits for their vehicles; but that was provided for in the previous Act. Because they have overloaded and overloaded, the price per load has gone down. What is going to happen is we are going to impose these new limits and the price per load is going to stay where it is. That's going to work a hardship on those people because, by virtue of Bill 111, they are prohibited from taking collective bargaining action.

It seems to me that through his connection with this government, the minister really should have made sure that particular action by his ministry was not in conflict with what

another ministry was saying. I plead with the minister and encourage the Minister of Labour (B. Stephenson) to deal with that particular clause at the earliest possible moment, because it is going to cause the kind of hardship in that industry that will see a number of small, one-unit operators go into bankruptcy. I am not trying to tell horror stories, but I am advised by a significant number of single-unit owners that is exactly what will happen. Those people, without benefit of any kind of collective organization or any ability to negotiate fair prices, are at the mercy of the construction industry on the one hand and of the aggregate industry on the other hand. The person in the middle, the small businessman in the middle, is the one in this case who is going to be penalized.

It is not by accident that those particular points were the first ones raised in every brief that was submitted to this inquiry by the aggregate industry itself. The people in the aggregate industry know full well that if collective action by the dump truck operators is allowed, the aggregate industry will be faced immediately with higher rates, because those kinds of higher rates will be necessary as a result of the provision that is included in this bill.

Further, nowhere in the bill is there any kind of provision which will cover the brokers who deal in aggregates at this time. The brokers are not controlled in any fashion at all. It is not required that they post any kind of bond. It is not required that they have 30 days' payment time or anything like that—and some of the payments for work done in the spring are not made until December of the same year. I realize it's not part of the job of the Minister of Transportation and Communications to pass that legislation, but it seems to me that kind of concerted effort by the government should have been taken in this case.

Also, the whole question of the boundary crossing between Ontario and Quebec, which was one of the major points of the operators in eastern Ontario, has not been investigated at all to my way of thinking. Obviously, we need some kind of agreement between the provincial government in Quebec and this government, but nothing has happened. It's fine for operators to come in from Quebec, as long as reciprocal arrangements are provided the other way. But, because of the licensing in Quebec, that cannot be done.

Just in conclusion, what I would like to say to the minister is that I think the legislation he has proposed is a good first step. Let's bring the other shoe down as quickly as possible so that this particular legislation will be the kind with which the operators can comply. I suggest to him that if he doesn't he is going to have tremendous difficulties in enforcement, and I think that will lead to greater cost over the long run.

Mr. Speaker: Do any other hon. members wish to speak to this bill?

Mr. Young: This bill is the culmination of years of difficulty in this whole industry. Those of us who have been in this House have seen over the—

Mr. Ruston: On a point of order please. Would you advise me; I understood that we called order No. 3, which is Bill 2—was that correct?

Mr. Speaker: Bill No. 2.

Mr. Reid: The previous speaker was speaking about Bill 3. Which one are you on?

Mr. Martel: Why doesn't he wake up.

Mr. Young: As I was saying before I was so rudely interrupted—

Mr. Reid: The member was talking about Bill 3 wasn't he?

Mr. Martel: Two bills and they are mixed up.

Mr. Young: This bill is the beginning of the culmination of a long process of struggle.

During the past few years those of us who have been here have seen dump trucks parked outside this building on several occasions and we have seen the frustration and the desperation of those men who drive those trucks as they faced bankruptcy.

Mr. Reid: On a point of order. I hate to do this, but I am confused. I listened to the previous member speak; he was speaking about Bill 3. Now it appears my hon. friend is also speaking about Bill 3. Are we on Bill 2 or are we on Bill 3?

Mr. Speaker: We are on Bill 2; I had difficulty at first. I did find the section which the hon. member for Durham East was speaking on, so I presume he was in order dealing with the covering of vehicles and so on, which is covered here.

Mr. Reid: We are talking about safety specifically.

Mr. Speaker: This has to do with further safety inspections and so on; I haven't considered that the hon. member for Yorkview was out of order.

Mr. Deans: He's not out of order at all. He is perfectly in order.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Yorkview may continue.

Mr. Reid: He was on Bill 3.

Mr. Deans: If the member for Rainy River would read the bill before he stands up.

Mr. Reid: Oh, shut up Deans!

Interjections.

Mr. Reid: Take your pomposity somewhere else, and let's deal with the business of the House.

Mr. Young: There is obviously great frustration in the party to my left.

Mr. Martel: The aspirant to the leadership.

Mr. Young: That may well be.

Mr. Martel: Where's Bob?

Mr. Young: In any case, as far as this party is concerned, we welcome this beginning in the implementation of the Rapoport report. This was the man who was appointed as a commissioner to look into the whole problem of the dump truck industry, and this bill is right on that problem.

Mr. Good: Nothing to do with Bill 2; it is Bill 3 you are talking about.

Mr. Speaker: Order please, there seems to be a difference of opinion. I suggest there is quite an overlapping of the two bills having to do with the various loads, and so on. I would think that with the approval of the House you might be allowed to stray from one to the other. We can only deal with one at a time, but since they are overlapping I don't see how you can completely separate them in your discussions. If the hon. member will continue, we will try to ensure that there will not be repetition by the same member in the second Act.

Mr. Reid: We are going to get the same thing on the next bill.

Hon. Mr. Handleman: But we hope it will be different, fair enough.

Mr. Young: I did not intend to speak at any great length. I think what has been said already is fairly adequate. However, I do want to add my urging to the minister that he speak with his fellow ministers in this government and that a bundle of legislation be brought in to supplement this particular bill; the legislation which will deal with fundamental problems dealt with the Rapoport commission, problems dealing with bonding and with pay with the matter in Bill 111.

Hon. Mr. Snow: Sorry. I didn't get the member's first remarks.

Mr. Young: Problems dealing with bonding, with the brokers and the bonding, because this is all part and parcel of this whole problem. As the hon. member for Durham has pointed out, if we implement this suggestion and tarps are used, then of course the bargaining position of these people who must use the tarps is seriously affected. We would hope that the Minister of Labour will bring in supplementary legislation to clear up that particular point.

The thing that disturbs me just a bit; the Rapoport commission makes certain recommendations but the hon. minister's bill, in respect to inspection for example, simply says that "the Lieutenant Governor in Council may make regulations;" the commission recommended some annual inspections.

We also know that the tarping of a load was recommended, but again the bill simply said: "the Lieutenant Governor in Council may make regulations," prescribing this thing. I would hope that the minister will indicate to us, as he replies, what his plans are to make these matters of regulations effective and to bring them to a logical conclusion.

I would simply like to point out too that the matter of transportation and loading is not covered in this bill. Perhaps I'm just a little bit out of order here. As far as the Minister of Transportation and Communications is concerned, unless the Rapoport commission and its recommendations are looked at and unless this minister thinks seriously in terms of shared responsibility as far as overloading is concerned, then again his legislation is frustrating.

There is no question that at the present time the aggregate owner, loading the truck, overloads all too often. If the truck owner objects, then he's told to go home, there is no work; this is a matter of knowledge in the dump truck industry. While the hon. minister may shake his head, the fact is that this often has happened according to information that I have received and the information that the commission received. So I would hope that matter of shared responsibility can be faced up to, or in lieu of that that very stringent inspection be undertaken so that overloading does not take place at the expense of the man who owns the truck

and who in desperation may overload because he has a $30,000 or $35,000 investment upon which he must meet payments.

So we do hope this bill will be taken to the committee of the whole House, not outside to the standing committee. We do want to offer certain suggestions at that time, so we recommend that the bill go to the committee of the whole House.

Mr. Good: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. There is one aspect of this bill to which I would like to make reference and that is section 8, dealing with the covering of loads and prescribing the roads on which the various regulations must be enforced.

For eight years we've been talking in this Legislature about the hazards to 401 traffic coming towards Toronto with the blowing sand and the dropped gravel along that highway. Any vehicle that travels that road any distance, with any consistency or regularity, normally has the paint chipped off within a very short time because of the dropping of loads.

We've been told by former Ministers of Transportation and Communication that regulations were being drafted. They were being drafted. We kept being told they were in effect; that the loads would have to be covered. I think at that time the ministry was putting its whole case on the fact that no vehicle was allowed to drop part of its load on a highway and if they did they would be subject ot a fine. Finally, the ministry told us last year that, ah hah, they did catch one load that was dropping things on the highway. It happened to be a farmer taking some corn into market down in the London area.
[3:45]

The big problem has been with the aggregate business hauling gravel into Toronto. We know that they have to do it. If one travels that road it is just unbelievable the number of gravel trucks, tandem trailers, pup trailers and trains coming in on 401 and going back empty; and believe me they move. They are not required by law to stay in one particular lane; and as a traveller of that highway, quite often I have been frustrated more than once with two trucks going abreast down the 401 trying to pass each other and neither achieving his objective.

I would like to just ask the minister if the regulations will be drafted in such a manner that the motoring public can finally have protection from the gravel trucks going down the 401, especially from the areas around Campbellville where the aggregate business is thriving at the foot of the Niagara Escarpment? If this is going to accomplish what the ministry has been pretending it has been enforcing for the last eight years, I will be more than pleased.

Mr. Germa: Mr. Speaker, a few words on this bill. I would like to make reference to the safety certification section which provides that by regulation the government will require these vehicles to meet certain specific safety standards as they prescribe them.

It has been brought to my attention by the truckers' association, and I am sure the minister has been made aware of how some vehicles are expanded so that their load limitations can be exceeded. In my mind, and in the mind of the professionals who drive these trucks, the front axle weights allowable are being extended by attaching larger size tires to the front axle—despite the fact the axle has not in itself been reinforced to take the added load. Neither has the braking system been expanded to restrain the added load capacity that vehicle can take.

The minister is certainly aware that by spreading the distance of rear axles, the load limitations of any particular vehicle can be expanded to a dangerous degree. In the opinion of certain trucking associations they are expanded to the degree that some of these trucks are absolutely unwieldy and their load limitations far exceed what the original vehicle was designed to do. The braking system particularly has not been expanded to accommodate the increase in load which the spacing of axle and the larger tires on the front axle can accommodate.

I would like the minister to respond to this hazard because I am sure he has been made aware of this. Of course the thrust of this legislation will come from regulation. Regulations will prescribe axle distances and tire size and load limitations on the highway, but I think there should also be some regulation as to braking power in order to restrain a vehicle which has been overloaded by these various devices which are used so that it stays within the regulations.

Mr. B. Newman: Mr. Speaker, I want to follow up on the comments made by the member for Waterloo North (Mr. Good) because I am one of many in the public who happen to have had a cracked windshield as a result of an uncovered gravel truck.

I would like at this time to bring to the minister's attention one of the approaches used by the state of Michigan in an attempt to resolve the issue. Simply having the truck covered may not necessarily solve the problem if the truck is overloaded in the first

place. Furthermore you may have gravel that will fall from the dump body along the side of the covering, especially if the covering isn't secured properly, and then you can still have gravel dropping.

In the state of Michigan they will not allow the vehicle to be loaded higher than six inches from the top of the body itself. You will say the gravel truck operator wants his vehicle to carry the maximum load. Well, he can extend the body another six inches, but have sort of a tide line like you have on beer glasses in our taverns so that the gravel will not be above that specific line. It would be fairly easy to check, or I think it would be easy to check. I know in the motion of the vehicle some of the gravel may eventually collect at the back end of the body rather than stay evenly dispersed, but I think this suggestion could be followed in the regulations which permit the loading of the vehicle to within six inches of the top of the body. It apparently seems to be solving the problem satisfactorily in that jurisdiction.

Mr. Speaker: Any further comments on this bill before the minister replies? The hon. minister.

Hon. Mr. Snow: Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker, and thanks to the hon. members for their contributions. The first member to speak, I believe was the member for Algoma (Mr. Wildman) and the matters he spoke to related to Bill 3, I believe, so we can work on that when we get to the next bill.

The member for Rainy River (Mr. Reid) was concerned regarding the inspections. The regulations which will follow this bill, of course, define the inspections, the different items which must be inspected, who will be qualified to do these inspections and the fact that the regulation will call for the inspections, of course, every six months. A vehicle, to be legal on the road must have on a sticker dated within a six-month period.

Another change in the bill requires the trailer to have the same sticker. Formerly, any mechanical fitness referred only to the motor vehicle. Now, one of the trains we see would actually have to have three stickers. It would have to have one on the truck—or tractor shall we call it—one on the main trailer and one on the pup trailer. The regulations and this legislation will give us the necessary authority to require mechanical inspections of the complete unit.

The member for Durham East (Mr. Moffat) was concerned about the fact that we were not covering all the recommendations of the report. Of course many of the recommendations do not need legislation to be implemented. Some will probably need additional legislation but in order to get the major recommendations of Mr. Rapoport into force as quickly as possible this fall session, we have dealt with the matters which were most important.

He was concerned about the covering of the truck, who was going to pay for it and the cost that would be involved. I can only say that obviously there's going to be a very nominal additional cost to the operator of the unit. He suggests it's going to take 12 minutes to cover a truck. I think he's grossly exaggerating.

I'm sure within a very short time some very ingenious invidual or private entrepreneur will come up with a mechanical system whereby all the truck driver will have to do is press a switch or pull a string and a tarp will roll out or roll back on top of the truck.

Mr. Bain: It will freeze in winter up north.

Hon. Mr. Snow: It will be very simple to do. We have a very simple system right now on many of the trucks which haul asphalt. It's required to cover the asphalt trucks for a different purpose; it's not so it won't fall off or blow off, but it's to maintain the heat. It's strictly a tarp rolled up and they roll them back and forward; I'm sure it doesn't take two minutes, let alone 12. I'm not saying there won't be a minor increase in the cost and, of course, this will have to be built into the rates.

The hon. member spoke about the overloading aspect. This is something we are looking into. Our legal officers are having some problems regarding the joint responsibility for overloading. I'm sure we will be able to come up with a system. It's very fine for the majority of the loads that would be hauled, because they are hauling from a pit or a plant where there are scales.

Mr. Moffatt: Would the minister permit a question?

Hon. Mr. Snow: If the Speaker will I will.

Mr. Speaker: Normally debate on second reading is on the principle of the bill. If there is a short question for clarification, it would be in order. I understand it's going to committee of the whole, which means there will be many questions back and forth.

Mr. Moffatt: Just a brief question; I don't intend to be argumentative. I simply would

ask the minister if he is talking particularly about gravel trucks which are now in existence or new ones which are coming into the industry. I think there is some problem, Mr. Minister, with—

Hon. Mr. Snow: With all due respect.

Mr. Speaker: Any further questions can be asked in the next stage if it goes to committee.

Hon. Mr. Snow: Mr. Speaker, where were we? Overloading.

When a truck is hauling from a pit or quarry or a plant where there are scales, then I think it would be relatively easy to determine whether the truck is overloaded or not, of course, and make both parties responsible. But in many cases these types of trucks do not haul from a site where there are scales.

They may be hauling snow off a street—and, of course, it's very unlikely that hauling snow or ice could overload a truck but it could, depending on the licence they were carrying; it's not that heavy. But many times they're hauling excavated material. We see them here on the streets of Toronto every day hauling material out of these excavations. There are certainly no scales available there to check the load.

When they are hauling rubble from the demolition of buildings; when they're hauling farm products, and many things such as that, I think the truck driver is in a better position to judge his load. He is used to his own vehicle and able to judge whether he has a sufficient load on or not. Those are technical problems; we're trying to come up with answers to that and that will probably be dealt with at a later date.

A couple of the members mentioned Bill 111, suggesting that the Ministry of Labour might consider amending Bill 111—I believe this is what they were saying—to bring the independent truckers into the collective bargaining. I just say that at our last out-of-town cabinet meeting at Sault Ste. Marie we had two trucking associations appear before us. They spoke to both myself and the Minister of Labour (B. Stephenson) and were very concerned in the other direction. These were independent truckers' organizations from Sudbury and other areas of northern Ontario. As I understand it, they wanted the legislation clarified so that they would be exempt, not brought in.

The matter of brokers is another one that was recommended and which we're looking at. We have not got the total answer for that one immediately, but we don't feel that the number of brokers involved in this is really significant, although there are no doubt some.

The hon. member for Durham East also was complaining about the Quebec border. I don't know whether he expects me to put a barrier up there or not. But one of these two Acts—incorporating the mechanical fitness requirement we will have—means that if a truck does come across the border to work in Ontario, it will have to have mechanical fitness certificates before it would be able to operate in this province. So that would be some deterrent.

When we get to the other bill, the truck operator would have to have the necessary public commercial vehicle licence; and of course under that bill he would have to show Ontario Highway Transport Board the need for the service. So what more do you want me to do than what has been done in these two bills?

[4:00]

The member for Yorkview (Mr. Young) mentioned, again in Bill 111, the suggestions of payment. I am very interested in that recommendation of Mr. Rapoport's that everybody be paid in 30 days. I think every businessman in Ontario would love to have some legislation that would say his creditors must pay him in 30 days. It's a noble objective, but I would say unattainable.

Again, that member was inquiring as to the regulations on inspections and, of course, I have already said that they will be semi-annual and what the regulations will cover. The regulations regarding the tarping will define the covering of the loads and will define the types of road that they must be covered on.

Under certain circumstances they will not have to tarp their trucks, and this is mainly where they are working on construction sites and where they are having very short hauls on gravel roads, and we are mainly thinking of a truck working on a bush road or something in northern Ontario.

Any truck hauling a load here, even though the pit may be on a gravel-surfaced road, it's unlikely that the truck would be able to travel from the pit to the point of delivery without at some time travelling on a surface-treated or asphalt or concrete roadway, which would of course mean that the load would be covered even though it was travelling on the gravel road.

I think I covered the overloading aspect in replying to other comments. I know how concerned the member for Yorkview—having

heard him discuss matters for the past eight years in this House—is for safety, and I have to agree with many of the comments he made about the axle weights and so on, and also the member for Sudbury about the beefed-up trucks. This is a matter that has been of concern to me and I assure you this is under consideration at the present time. I am very concerned about the fact that a person who buys a strong, heavy, rugged truck is penalized in his earning capacity because it is a heavier unit, with heavier brakes, heavier axles—it is a safer truck, but he is penalized because the truck weighs more and it won't haul as much payload legally as someone who buys a light duty truck and puts big tires on it and so on. This is a matter that we are looking into.

The member for Windsor-Walkerville (Mr. B. Newman) mentioned a regulation that might only allow a truck to be filled up to a certain height within the body. I think in most cases this is the case, but sometimes you will see them filled to the state where they are overflowing and, of course, this will be covered in the regulations. I don't know whether we will be prepared to regulate a 6-in. draught line, as he was referring to, but we'll certainly look into that when drafting the legislation. I think that answers the comments of the members.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

Mr. Speaker: Shall this bill be ordered for third reading? Committee of the whole House?

Hon. Mr. Snow: If the members wish it to go to committee, fine. I will say I have to take the next bill to committee. I have a minor amendment in it.

Mr. Speaker: It is ordered, then, to committee of the whole House.

PUBLIC COMMERCIAL VEHICLES AMENDMENT ACT

Hon. Mr. Snow moved second reading of Bill 3, An Act to amend the Public Commercial Vehicles Act.

Mr. Wildman: Mr. Speaker, I thank you for your indulgence in allowing the members to discuss both bills. I would hope that the minister would answer the question I pose regarding the reasons for licensing on a regional basis rather than a province-wide basis.

In general we agree with the principle of Bill 3 in repealing the right of the minister to license for transportation without a certificate issued by the board in section 1. But it seems to contradict itself, in that section 6 seems to give back what section 1 removes. I'd like the minister to clarify this. If section 6 is to be transitional, how long is it to last? What are the reasons for it?

Mr. Reid: Mr. Speaker, much of what I was going to say on this bill has been said by my friends to my right, of all places, in regard to the Rapoport commitee and others.

I have a number of questions. Probably I should indicate my primary concern which is the same as that of the last speaker. That is the fact that by the bill we are going to have the truckers regulated by the five regions in Ontario. I've read the Rapoport report and his reasons for recommending it, but I don't feel, quite frankly, that they are valid.

I see a number of very serious problems if we proceed to have a register, as the report suggests, of those who are available with trucks. For instance, what happens in the city of Toronto when the demand for such vehicles comes to a sudden end? Does this mean then that those trucks are not able to go into section 4, or region 4, or even so far as northwestern Ontario, if they wish to do so? I want to make it clear that I think the truckers in the region, the local truckers, should have first chance at any available contracts, whether it's road building or whatever it is. I think the local contractor should get first choice. But I really fail to understand how compartmentalizing into five regions is really going to solve the problem of a possible oversupply of dump trucks in the Province of Ontario. I would think that surely, in some cases, in some region there may be a demand for more trucks. As I understand the Act, it's going to be impossible for trucks from other regions to move in.

The other side of the coin, of course, is that if you are in a region and you're on the register in that particular region and your workload comes to an end—there is no further work—what do you do then? Are you idle for eight months or six months or whatever it is? Just what are the constraints actually going to be? In fact, are you not circumventing and constraining the trucking industry too much by regionalizing it in this way?

The Ontario Highway Transport Board requires a hearing of necessity and convenience. Surely they have the power them-

selves by way of these hearings to regulate the number of people who actually enter the dump truck—particularly the dump truck-field. Surely the responsibility should lie with the Highway Transport Board, rather than some kind of regional setup which is going to work, I think—

Hon. Mr. Snow: Who do you think is going to issue the licences?

Mr. Reid: All right, but why not leave it with them to do it on a numbers basis rather than a regional basis, which is what I understand you are going to do?

If you've got, let's say, 200 in region 1, the Highway Transport Board feels that's all for region 1.

People in region 2 cannot go into region 1. Am I mistaken on that?

Mr. Renwick: Only if you get a certificate.

Hon. Mr. Snow: It is not automatic.

Mr. Reid: Am I mistaken on that? I think my friend who spoke before me, and I, would like that cleared up. May I ask a question? If one is given a licence under necessity and convenience, for region 1, is one allowed to operate in region 2, 3, 4, or 5 if there is a demand for the services?

Hon. Mr. Snow: No, not automatically.

Mr. Reid: One has got to go back to the board and have another hearing of necessity and convenience? How long is that going to take? Can this be done on a daily or on a weekly basis? What is going to happen? Are we going to make this whole procedure so rigid? I quite frankly don't have any solutions to this. Obviously, it's a tough proposition but should we be running back and forth to the transport board to get a new hearing and, supposedly, a new charge? I assume there would be a new charge, a new licence fee, for wanting to operate in another region.

The Ontario Haulers Association has spoken to me concerning this and regionalization is their largest concern. Like other speakers before me, I'm most concerned that the Rapoport report which covers—it is a fairly lengthy report; including the bibliographies it is 204 pages and encompasses something like at least 50 recommendations. After this report and the work that has gone into it—it came before us last June and there has been a great deal of work done. It's a thick report with many recommendations yet we seem to be dealing with very few of them and perhaps, in some cases, not the most important.

We haven't touched upon rates. The Rapoport report suggests there should be a minimum rate; a floor rate; the lowest rate or the minimum rate paid by MTC on any contracts in which they require haulers. This, to me, seems a logical programme for the ministry and the minister to follow.

I have many people involved in the trucking industry in my area. Mostly they own one truck; some have two or three, but mostly they're small haulers as are most of the haulers in the Province of Ontario. When the crunch comes, when they're not working or when there is very little work around, it becomes very cannibalistic and very suicidal. They go around cutting each other's throats to get any available work. Surely, there must be some kind of minimum which will at least guarantee them a wage and some kind of capital return so they can pay off the cost of the vehicle. That's one point.

My friend spoke about the recommendations in regard to the border crossings. The minister said, "Perhaps we'll solve some of those problems with a safety inspection." I don't know whether that will do it.

We seem to be getting away from really solving the questions which were raised in this report. I find it strange that the minister would come in with such a weak bill and not touch on many of the problems raised in the report.

We've also talked of the responsibility for overloading, whether there should be shared blame between the shipper and the carrier. It's something the minister hasn't dealt with. The minister indicates that the bonding provisions perhaps aren't that bad. There aren't so many that they are going to cause a problem and so forth but he hasn't really addressed himself in this bill to many of these problems.

[4:15]

I would like to draw the minister's attention directly to page 2 of the bill, section 2, subsections (c) and (d). It seems to me those two paragraphs are somewhat contradictory. The minister is indicating there will be a regionalization of the problem and actually restricts the trucking industry by regions and by the maximum number of vehicles which may be operated. In (d) it goes on to say the board:

> shall not limit the rights conferred by the licence to the operation of public commercial vehicles to the transportation of

materials of specific consigners or consignees.

So in one way the minister is restraining the number and area and in another way he is saying these operators can haul anything that they please. It seems to me somewhat contradictory.

We come to Bill 111 on which we had quite a full discussion in the last session of the Legislature and on which the minister again has touched. It is my feeling that most of the truckers prefer to be classed, or consider themselves, as independent operators or entrepreneurs. They do not feel themselves to be captive of a company where they may have a long-term contract. They do not wish to be put in the position where they may be forced to join a union in those areas where this could be so under Bill 111. It seems to me that the majority of them prefer to be in the position of independent entrepreneurs and do not wish to have the provisions of Bill 111 place them in a position where they might have to join a union.

There are other matters that we will raise in committee. The minister has indicated that he has a minor amendment. I would have thought that he would have indicated what that amendment was when he moved the bill for second reading. Perhaps he can tell the House before we get to the committee stage what it is.

Mr. Germa: Mr. Speaker, this bill has come about as a result of long years of frustration by people in the aggregate hauling business. I think the whole problem was created when the government for some unexplained reason decided to deregulate entry into this business. I think it was in 1968. Up until that point in time, the right of entry was controlled by the transport board. Then they deregulated the right of entry and every second person has entered the business. I don't know why so many people have a desire to own and drive trucks, but since that time we know what has happened. People have entered and there has been great financial hardship. Bankruptcies by the hundreds have been recorded even in the past year. And now the government, at long last, has come in with this bill to regulate the right of entry into the industry.

I would say that eventually it will get control of the matter but what I am wondering about, and my question to the minister is, about the surplus number of trucks presently in the industry. At what point in time are they going to be phased out and how does he plan to assimilate them in or reduce their numbers without causing further financial hardship? Given the price of a truck these days, very many people are deeply in debt. If they do not have the right of entry, just what provisions are there to soften the blow as far as they are concerned when they find that they cannot continue entry in the industry?

Mr. Moffat: Mr. Speaker, just briefly, subsection 7 of section 2 specifies that an operating licence will be given subject to various qualifications, and the right to set maximum numbers is apparently based upon last year's particular number of vehicles.

What I would like to ask the minister is, in the event that a significant increase in the number of vehicles required becomes evident during this year or next year, how will those new licences be granted? Will they be granted on the basis of application or by lot or by some other less well advised method? I think that there are certain people in the industry who are rather concerned that there may be a gravitation of licences to one or two individuals in each region. I don't think that would be conducive to the kind of industry that we would like to see.

As for the certificate of mechanical fitness which is being replaced by a safety standards certificate, I assume that—

Hon. Mr. Snow: It is not in the bill.

Mr. Moffatt: Are we on Bill 3, Mr. Minister?

Mr. Reid: The last page of the bill.

Interjections.

Mr. Moffatt: Part 3 changes that wording. I just wonder why the wording is changed and what sort of standards are going to pertain. Will they be the existing standards or will it be rewritten? That whole section appears to me to be rather loose and vague, and I would ask him to explain that in his remarks.

Mr. Speaker: Do any hon. members wish to speak on this bill?

Mr. Young: Again, I think that by and large what needs to be said has been said. I would want to call to the minister's attention and simply reiterate the problem that we are facing in this whole matter.

He mentioned that in Sault Ste. Marie certain truckers there had not wished bargaining rights and, of course, we do hear a great deal from other truckers who want them. I suppose fundamentally the people who don't want the

bargaining rights are the people who own large fleets of trucks.

Mr. Good: No, that's wrong. I am going to say something on this.

Mr. Young: Individuals, by and large, are finding themselves at a disadvantage because the broker situation comes in there. Very often the broker owns a fleet of trucks; he gets the contract and he does the work—the clean work with his own trucks—and then he hires the others as he needs them at a much lower price than his own figuring would indicate. This is one of the irritations. But I suppose this is the fundamental problem. You have some groups of truckers with very large fleets under their command, and in some cases individuals who have one truck—and you get a division there.

In connection with this matter of regional licensing, I do want to refer to a map on page 18 of the Rapoport report. I think this is the one that has been accepted. The regions are outlined here and they are large enough to make the matter practical, if it can be practical. But there are certain problems. For example, trucking into the central area—into the Toronto, Hamilton and Metropolitan regions—certainly must come in large measure from the southwestern area. It may be that the minister will simply say that people hauling from the southwestern into the central area would get licenses in both. I don't know, this is an answer we are looking for.

I do want to put on record part of the submission to the minister, from the Ontario Haulers Association, which has some strong opinions about this. They say on page 2 of their submission:

> If licences are issued only on a regional basis, the result is that within each region at some times during the year there will be a surplus of licensed haulers available, and at other times the supply will be inadequate to meet the demand. Rather than license an excess for each region, creating a situation where for many parts of the year there will be an inadequate work to supply haulers who, on the strength of their licence, invest in the purchase of a truck, a province-wide licence issued out of a particular region, so that the persons within a region have a priority in awarding of work within that region, would be a much fairer system.
>
> Where the work in a particular region exceeds the number of haulers available, the haulers could then be supplied from another region which has an excess at that time. It is true that such a system would require some co-ordination by an agency to obtain information as to whether drivers are required and where drivers are available in each region, so that drivers from other regions could be directed to the area where the need occurs.

That is the opinion of the Ontario Haulers Association, which may not be the opinion of all the truckers in Ontario, but I did want to put that on record at their request. Again, we are looking for an answer from the minister why he feels that this regionalization must take place.

Mr. Good: I would like to speak to one aspect, and that is dealing with the Rapoport report. It brought forth a great many recommendations which should, if carried through to their finality, bring some order out of the chaos that has resulted in the dump truck industry across the province.

I would like to deal basically with the opinion of the Ontario Trucking Association last July, which appeared to be that the provisions of Bill 111, proposing amendments to the Labour Relations Act, and especially section 3 dealing with dependent contractors, would in fact wipe out the whole effect of the task force report. They held that the inclusion as dependent contractors of about one-third of their association would immediately destroy the effectiveness of their association and of the independent operators.

The argument was put forth that an individual owning a dump truck going to a job was no different from a carpenter who owned his hammer and tools and went to his job. The independent truckers, in my area particularly and those to whom I've spoken, certainly didn't agree with that proposition. This was the proposition put forth by the then Minister of Labour, who happens to be in the House at the present time and who I felt was being led down the garden path by his senior civil servants and some of the other high labour officials, including Mr. Archer who is sitting in the gallery.

The individuals who are doing work mainly for one firm during the year would be considered dependent contractors and employees of that particular institution to whom they were contracted for a year. People owning those dump trucks—the ones who spoke to me—didn't want to have any part of being classified as dependent truckers. They felt that if the recommendations of this task force report were carried through, they would indeed arrive at a beneficial position far in excess

of what could be achieved by being declared as dependent contractors.

I'm given to understand that that particular section of that bill has not been proclaimed, even up to the present time. The minister did promise a 30-day or 60-day delay until they looked at it again because, for unfortunate reasons, discussion was cut off very abruptly at the end of that partcular bill.

I would hope that the Minister of Transportation and Communications would weigh very thoroughly and give very serious consideration to the implementation of this task force report and, in doing so, consider very carefully what side effects might accrue if the sections of that labour relations bill should ever be proclaimed.

Hon. Mr. Snow: Mr. Speaker, I think most of the comments of the hon. members express pretty much the same concerns. Many of them mentioned the setting up of the five regions. Of course, the five regions are to be the regions of the Ministry of Transportation and Communications, as set up.

The grandfather provisions of the Act will provide for a licence to be issued to every operator who was operating as of the date established in the Act—I believe it was Oct. 31—for the number of vehicles that that operator was operating.

The operator will be able to be licensed in the region of his or her choice. In the case of an operator who happens to have his office or home in one area, but most of his work is across the road in another region, he would have his choice of region. Of course, if he also wishes to work in the other region, he can apply to the Highway Transport Board for licensing in one or more of the regions. As a matter of fact, and the member for Rainy River (Mr. Reid) mentioned it, it would be possible if there is the need for an operator to be licenced in all five regions. It may be quite unlikely, I think, in this business that an operator that works in Ottawa is going to want to work in northwestern Ontario too, but I suppose it would be possible.

[4:30]

The concern was raised regarding periods when there is a lack of work in one region and a lot of work opens up in another region. In the Act there is a provision for the board to grant temporary authority for an operator to operate in the other region without any major delay. If a contractor has a job and needs 50 dump trucks immediately and they're not available in that region, they're available in the central region say, they can grant temporary authority very quickly to let those trucks move in.

The member for Algoma mentioned something about section 6. I haven't been able to—

Mr. Wildman: There are two sections.

Hon. Mr. Snow: Pardon? There's no section 6 in the bill, I don't believe. It ends with section 5.

Mr. Wildman: Subsection 6 of section 2.

Hon. Mr. Snow: I'm sorry, subsection 6 of section 2. I'm getting to where you are now.

Mr. Singer: Yes, it comes after subclause 5.

Hon. Mr. Snow: The Highway Transport Board approves the operating authority. The ministry issues the licence and this allows the minister to issue operating licences for these materials to all those who had an operating licence in the region of the applicant's choice without a certificate from the board.

Mr. Good: A sort of grandfather clause.

Hon. Mr. Snow: This is the grandfather clause to which I referred. If a man in Algoma has five dump trucks he may want to be in two regions in that area because it's not too far from the boundary. He would probably apply and be licenced for his five dump trucks in the northern region and then apply to the board for authority to operate in the northern region if he can show that he had substantial business there. I think this is the only way we're going to keep reasonable control of entry into the business.

I believe there are something like 10,000 trucks now; 10,000 vehicles now operating, and something like 6,000 operators. So you can see with this ratio of vehicles and operators there are not many cartels with great fleets. I'm not concerned that this will happen, but when there are new licences required, if there is a need in a particular area or the province as a whole for additional licences, then of course the applications will be considered by the board. The board will sit in the different regions to hear local applications and if there is sufficient need and public necessity for additional trucks in that region and they're not available, I think the first thought would be to allow truckers in other regions to expand their licences. Then their next priority, I would think—but I can't instruct the board as to what their policy

should be—would be to give small operators with one truck the opportunity to expand and get another one.

The member for Waterloo North talked about Bill 111, which doesn't come under my jurisdiction. I'm not totally familiar with the problem in that bill. I know there is some concern as to whether the independent truckers would be included or not. The hon. member for Yorkview said he had great representations from those who wanted to be included. I can't say for my staff, but I certainly have not heard from anyone who does want to be included, but I did hear from two trucking associations in northern Ontario that certainly did not want to be included. This is a matter that will have to be dealt with by the Ministry of Labour. I would say to the member for Rainy River that I'm sorry I didn't mention what the amendment was. It's just a housekeeping amendment adding asphalt mixes to clause (a) of subsection 3. We'll add that amendment when we go into committee.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

Mr. Speaker: Shall this bill be ordered to the committee of the whole House?

Agreed.

ONTARIO ENERGY BOARD AMENDMENT ACT

Hon. Mr. Timbrell moved second reading of Bill 4, An Act to amend the Ontario Energy Board Act.

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: Mr. Speaker, in my statement on first reading of Bill 4, I dealt with the factors which led the government to propose this legislation at this time. The hon. members may recall I stated then:

> This decision was based on our perception that available supplies from existing areas of production would fall below our requirements before a supplemental supply source, such as frontier areas or coal gasification, was available.

I noted this view has recently been—

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. I don't want to complain again, but there is something wrong with the sound system in this place because we can't hear what the minister is saying. They should talk into the mike or something. We can't hear what he is saying back here.

Hon. Mr. MacBeth: We put up with this for years; we thought we were lucky.

Mr. Speaker: Perhaps the hon. minister would move a little closer to one of the microphones.

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: They're both on now. Can the member hear?

Mr. Sargent: That's better.

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: I noted this view has recently been confirmed by the exhaustive review of Canadian natural gas supply and requirements conducted by our National Energy Board.

The government has been guided by several principles in the preparation of this legislation. First, the jurisdiction to supervise the order and the allocation of natural gas should be placed in an independent government agency.

Second, because the question of allocation has implications for both the rate and facility aspects of the regulation of natural gas distribution in Ontario, which are presently regulated by the Ontario Energy Board, that independent agency should be the Ontario Energy Board.

Third, the only sensible mechanism by which to implement natural gas allocation is the natural gas distributors who have purchased contracts with federally-regulated suppliers such as TransCanada Pipe Lines and who have sales contracts with the ultimate consumers.

Fourth, a matter which I dealt with on introduction of the bill, every person affected by a proposed allocation plan should be able to file an objection or otherwise comment on the allocation plan.

Fifth, the responsibility of natural gas distributors to continue to contract for adequate supplies for consumers should be maintained, and one distributor should only be required to share his contracted supply with another distributor after a public hearing into the reasons for the proposed sharing.

Sixth, all consumers of natural gas, with certain limited exceptions, should, once allocation plans are approved, be required to use gas only in accordance with an allocation plan. Large and economically powerful users should not be able to get around the allocation procedures by purchasing natural gas for themselves directly from producers and solely for their own use.

This latter principle reflects the frequently-stated position of this government that the interests of Ontario consumers in adequate supplies of natural gas can best be protected by the present system which consists of TransCanada PipeLines purchasing substan-

tially all of the gas for Ontario markets and having that gas sold to the ultimate consumers by regulated natural gas distribution utilities. This position has become increasingly important at a time when it is widely recognized that natural gas allocation on both inter and intra provincial levels is necessary. The exceptions to this principle, which will be reflected in the regulations, will be rural residents who have their own modest natural gas production, and refiners and other manufacturers who manufacture gas as one part of an industrial process and who utilize it in another integrated part of that industrial process.

These are the major principles contained in Bill 4. It is my intent at the committee stage to discuss the government's present thinking on the detailed application of these principles.

Mr. Burr: Bill 4, an Act to amend the Ontario Energy Board Act, is designed to make provision for the fair rationing of natural gas supplies. Inasmuch as planning has always been a cornerstone of this party's social and economic philosophy, we support the principle of this bill.

The minister used the expression "the orderly allocation." During the Second World War we had an orderly allocation of available supplies of such things as gasoline, tea, sugar and meat; but in those days we used the term rationing.

The main principle of this bill seems to be rationing if necessary, but not necessarily rationing. This leads one to feel that this is a Liberal bill in the Liberal-inspired tradition of Mackenzie King. Nevertheless, we have some—

Mr. Singer: But you could still support it?

Mr. Burr: Oh yes.

Mr. Singer: That's good. We were worried about you.

Mr. Burr: Nevertheless, we have some misgivings about the secrecy of the hearings that will be permitted under section 37(g).

We feel also that public disclosure of the coming shortage should be made now in order that the public should be taken into the minister's confidence. Few individuals in today's affluent society will take the need for conservation seriously unless and until that need has been demonstrated convincingly and perhaps even dramatically. Until we have some government direction, such as a speed limit of 55 miles per hour on Highways 400 and 401, few people in Ontario will believe that there is a gasoline or oil shortage imminent.

If the government took some action on conservation, for example through reduced speed, and talked about the possibility of the rationing of gasoline, then many citizens would begin to take energy conservation seriously. Some would reduce their travelling for pleasure and others would form car pools for going to work. Conservation of energy would become the fashionable thing to participate in; it would be the course of commendable conduct or, I suppose, the "in" thing.

This bill could have the same effect if the reasons for it are discussed publicly and if the basic facts are provided to the Legislature and the public. It is not good enough to leave the establishing of criteria, principles and guidelines to the Lieutenant Governor in Council and to hold hearings in camera. An informed public will co-operate; an uninformed public will not.

For these reasons, although we support the bill in principle, we ask that it be sent to committee outside the House so that more detailed information may be made available to the members and to the public; and so that the public may acquire a greater awareness of the need for conservation of our natural resources in general, and in this instance of our natural gas supplies in particular.

Mr. Peterson: I would like to address some remarks to this bill also and say at the outset that I am glad the minister's laryngitis at question period has cleared up this afternoon.

We are supporting this bill in principle and we support the idea of taking it to committee. We are very concerned about several areas in this bill. We are very concerned and we are dismayed that the bill is necessary. We believe that with proper planning, with proper conservation planning and with proper allocation of resources five years ago or 10 years ago, this kind of thing would not now be necessary.

[4:45]

As pointed out by my hon. friend on the right, the progress in the programmes and the performance of this government in conservation has been absolutely dismal. There is a lot of material available. There are lots of strategies available but the government continues to do nothing in all aspects of energy consumption. I refer the government and the hon. minister to the background study on energy conservation for the Science Coun-

cil by Prof. Knelman. His conclusion is that 30 per cent savings can be instituted, and indeed be operative with little social harm, with the proper planning. I would commend that to the hon. minister.

We have in addition to those concerns, the general framework in which they are made. We wish the minister would direct his ministry to those types of concerns rather than bringing in, after the fact, ex post facto, legislation to catch up on mistakes made.

We have a major concern. We believe this is a very serious bill at this particular time; we believe it is very serious when the government starts going into rationing. This is not widely done in these types of times. We believe the ministry and the government should have the power over allocation of our resources if it is necessary. But I believe and my party believes there could be very serious injustices under the Lieutenant Governor in council's regulations.

The government has a tendency to rule by regulation, that nefarious and secret part of the law which none of us has the opportunity of seeing or debating in this House. I believe there should be a full and open hearing on these regulations. The government, with help from the other parties, should clearly view all of the alternatives in this rationing procedure.

There are many ways to ration. It can be done with price; with time allocations; with metering; with off-peak usage. There are many ways to control this type of a problem. The way the rates on natural gas are presently constructed, they are incentives to use more. The more you use the less you pay; with the same pitfalls that we get into with the Hydro planning.

We support the idea of the bill, regretting very much that it is necessary. We are in favour of a full and open hearing. Our No. 1 obligation as legislators in this process is to make sure the people are not hurt by this procedure. We are against secret hearings. We are against secret priorities of any type to determine the allocation of these kinds of resources.

In closing, I would say that we will appear at committee. We will happily make our input into the regulations and into a complete hearing on this bill, but I would urge the government to act now so that this type of thing would not be necessary.

Mr. Renwick: I only have a brief comment, Mr. Speaker. I am not interested in repeating the points which have been made by my colleague and by the member who has just spoken, all of which are quite valid. We are unalterably opposed to the in-camera hearing and we are unalterably opposed to decisions being made by such boards without a hearing, which is the import of the provision of the bill which excludes certain of the general provisions of the Ontario Energy Board Act.

My concern, basically, is what is the reason the minister had in mind when he limited the application of this allocation procedure simply to gas and not to other petroleum products. I can well understand that the minister wishes, as he stated, to have an allocation system in effect at the point in time when there is the possibility – perhaps one could say the probability—there would be such a shortage of natural gas as would require an allocation plan. But everything one reads would indicate that so far as oil is concerned the same situation holds.

I may say that I base this solely upon the fact that, as I understand it, the National Energy Board in October of last year, when it issued its oil report, stated that the nationwide demand for oil would exceed domestic production by 1977. From the statements of this particular minister one would think that was optimistic and that in fact this inability on a national basis to meet our demand from domestic production in fact has already happened.

There is certainly no question that what the minister has said with respect to gas is accurate, because in reporting this year on the question of gas, the board stated that the current inability of supply to meet all requirements for Canadian natural gas is likely to continue at least until supplies in the frontier areas become available. It reinforces my concern in making it applicable only to gas, because if one uses rough percentages, it would appear that in the Province of Ontario the demands for energy which are met by oil exceed the demands for energy which are met from natural gas, and that we use more oil in Ontario than we do natural gas—at least in rough and ready percentages I understand that to be so.

Therefore, I ask the minister why it is that this allocation plan is limited to gas and if it is the intention of the ministry to provide a similar allocation system, with whatever necessary changes have to be made, to make it applicable to oil at some further date, presumably at a date when perhaps the royal commission or others have made recommendations to the government.

Mr. G. I. Miller: Mr. Speaker, I would like to make a few comments. As the mem-

ber for Haldimand-Norfolk, I would like to say that we have had considerable natural gas in our area, but over the past few years the lines have been taken up; consequently, we have lost those resources. We do have private producers in another area who do have new fields but they are unable to sell their products at a cost that would keep them in business; consequently, at the present time they are trying to negotiate better prices.

I wonder if the hon. minister is taking such things into consideration to provide more energy in Ontario by Canadians in Ontario and whether this can be considered and given more attention at this time.

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Speaker, very briefly, I would like to suggest to the minister that I'm not too clear on the all-encompassing things involved in this bill. The things I am concerned about have never come to light. Prior to the minister taking over this ministry, we were told by the former Minister of Energy that there was a budget of about $100 million for this board—these are things I would like to find out if they are factual—and he was going to allow—

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, I think that the hon. member really is referring to the Ontario Energy Corp. and its activities and not to anything dealing with allocation, unless he is talking about supply and the activities of that corporation in relation to future supply.

Mr. Sargent: I thank the minister; I didn't understand that. The things I am concerned about are things like the number of distributors involved and the secrecy of hearings; but, further than that, we were told that the government was going to open up the deal so that they would have in this area a consortium of five outside firms. In other words, the private sector is going to be involved in this whole operation in so far as the public sector will get a piece of the action. Those were the words of the former minister.

I am concerned about things like involvement of large corporations in this area. The minister is smiling and I am laughing too because—

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: On a point of order again. Could the hon. member be a little clearer? I think, again, he is talking about the efforts of my predecessor to get private sector financing for certain energy projects rather than having to have them capitalized with public funds.

Mr. Sargent: I appreciate that. The thing I am talking about is that we don't know who the five companies are. The minister has never told the House who they are and I would like the minister's answer to these questions; if he knows who these firms are that are involved from the private sector and whether they are involved as distributors for natural gas or whatever. It is pretty wide in terms of reference in this bill and I would like to know exactly the definition of distributors. Who are they? How many do you have? Let us know who is in this consortium of five firms involved in the energy picture. Whether we are pinpointing this particular bill or not, this is information that the House should know.

Mr. Stokes: I have a brief question I would like to ask the hon. minister on this bill. I am concerned about the assured supply of natural gas in areas where it isn't widely used at the present time. I would like to elicit from the minister some comment with regard to the availability of natural gas for future industrial expansion in areas of northern Ontario. We have two or three enterprises that are going to be large users of natural gas whenever their industrial capacity comes on stream. I have heard some rumours that it may not be possible for the existing suppliers to meet those needs in the future.

On an earlier occasion in the House, the hon. minister said there is no shortage—and he repeated it—there is no shortage of natural gas in the Province of Ontario at this time. This would indicate that it was going to be pretty dicey, maybe touch and go, in order to meet additional requirements of natural gas. Are you looking into additional supplies for future expansion, particularly in those areas that aren't traditional users at the present time but of necessity will have to become users if these new industrial development projects are to come on stream?

I know that it is of concern to some large corporations that are thinking very seriously of establishing in the northwest. It will be absolutely essential that they have an assured supply of this form of energy if they are to go forward and if they are to complete their plans. So if the minister might reply on the possibility of filling that need in the next two, three, four or five years, I am sure it would be much appreciated.

Mrs. Bryden: I would like to address a couple of questions to the hon. minister with regard to this bill. Since he did state quite clearly that there is no natural gas shortage in

Ontario, we would like to know why we bring in the bill at this time. He has said it is like buying a fire truck even though you are not expecting a fire. It seems to me that it would be more to the point to be pushing for a curtailment of our exports of natural gas rather than bringing in this kind of legislation, which may make people feel a sense of security and that we can go on exporting our natural gas resources. If we run short it will be rationed here in Ontario.

[5:00]

That seems to me to be putting the cart before the horse. I would like to ask the minister, has the government made representations to the federal government pressing for curtailment on a much larger scale of our natural gas exports? We are going to need the natural gas here and it seems to me that the exports that were authorized years ago should not have been authorized and should be curtailed at the present time. Has the government been pressing for that instead of just bringing in allocation legislation?

The second question is: How does the government feel about the Mackenzie Valley pipeline? Could one look at this legislation as part of the psychological buildup in favour of the Mackenzie Valley pipeline? If we have to have allocation legislation in Ontario, does that mean we have to go ahead with the pipeline?

I don't think we should go ahead with the pipeline. I don't think the case has been made that we need it at this time, but I have a feeling that this legislation may have some connection with the psychological buildup in favour of it, so I'd like to know what the government's position is on that pipeline.

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: Mr. Speaker, first of all I want to answer the comments of three or four of the hon. members where they referred to secret hearings, in camera hearings—I guess those were the only adjectives. I want to make it perfectly clear that we're not talking about secret hearings. We're talking about publicly-filed documents submitted by the companies. We're talking about representations to the Ontario Energy Board, be they in writing or be they oral, which will be public. None of this is secret at all.

The member for Riverdale (Mr. Renwick), I believe it was, expressed some concern specifically about 37G. I think the point that has to be made here is that one can anticipate, at least in the first few years that allocation plans are set and reviewed, that the board is going to hold public hearings, that there will be no other way around in at all. There will be considerable interest expressed by individuals and by corporate entities.

I think when we get into committee stage and to the point of discussing the guiding principles for allocation which we're going to propose, members will understand that probably the ones who will be most upset and who say the most will be the industrial consumers in the province.

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Speaker, will the hon. minister answer a question at this point?

Mr. Speaker: The hon. minister says he will.

Mr. Sargent: How would the hon. minister in light of his statement regarding the companies and their treatment, give fair treatment to all concerned when he has a venture capital deal with, say Shell Oil on energy? How does one sort out that deal? There must be preferential treatment for one company when one has a working arrangement with them in venture capital.

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member has succeeded again in confusing one issue with another. The issue which was raised by his colleague from London-whatever—next to the jackal from Renfrew North—had to do with a particular set of projects dealing with uranium exploration.

Mr. Sargent: Listen, don't get smart.

Interjections.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: The point there is that Ontario Hydro is involved in that project since they are the ones in this province who will be the ultimate purchasers of reserves of uranium in the years to come.

There's nothing here about preferential treatment. All of this is going to be open. Everyone will have the right to be involved, to submit their concerns in writing or to present themselves to the Ontario Energy Board at various points. There is no preference being shown to anyone. It will be a completely open process.

Going on the hon. member for—I think the name of his riding changed—is it Windsor-Riverside (Mr. Burr)? He made the point that governments could disclose the information about the pending shortages. Well if the hon. member hasn't yet received a copy of the report of the National Energy Board, dated April 1975 but released by the govern-

ment of Canada in July of 1975, I will be glad to send it to him.

In the process of those hearings a number of individual provincial governments in Canada and a number of firms in the private sector, specifically in the natural gas business, presented to the board their arguments about future supplies and demand for natural gas. I might add that Ontario was a very active participant in those hearings, and that in fact the figures which the board finally came out with were almost exactly what our consultants had submitted on our behalf to the board.

But it's all public. It's not that all of a sudden, the day before I introduced this bill, we decided there was a potential problem. In fact we've been talking about this in this country for several years and this report of the National Energy Board confirmed it in July of this year.

Several members spoke about conservation. Now I am sure we will get into this in my estimates sometime in the next week or so, but I would like to make it—

Mr. Sargent: We can't wait.

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: You can't wait? Well that's too bad.

Mr. Sargent: You may resign.

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: At that time we will get into the activities to date of the Ontario government through the energy management programme and our activities through Hydro to develop new rate structures. The report is being prepared on that right now and will go to the Ontario Energy Board for hearings next year.

We are looking at the question of speed limits. It's not a cut and dried situation. We have in this province about 800 miles of high speed highways. We have thousands of miles of highways posted at 50, 55 and 60. There is more energy wasted in this province in an hour on a morning in Metropolitan Toronto—

Mr. Haggerty: Why don't you do something about it?

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: —than in any time, day or week, on those 800 miles of highway.

And we have acted on that. Take a look at the figures of the Ministry of Transportation and Communications and the subsidies for public transit, both in terms of operating costs and in terms of capital costs. We will be addressing ourselves to that in the near future. I did meet with the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources of Canada on Monday morning and this was one of the subjects we discussed.

Mr. Peterson: Why are you always so slow?

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: I am sorry, did somebody have something to add?

Mr. Peterson: Are you always so slow to do anything?

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: Well I suppose that's the hon. member's opinion, to which he is entitled. I know how he feels. I have read from some of his speeches in the last few months—in press clippings—that everything is so simple it can be solved with the wave of the Liberal magic wand. They are not that simple.

Mr. Haggerty: It proved successful in the United States.

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: We are committed to energy conservation in this province.

Mr. Peterson: Thank you for the courtesy. I don't read yours.

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: If you will compare the record of this government and what we are doing and what we have accomplished to date, and the goal that we have set to reduce the growth in our energy consumption—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I wonder if the hon. minister would return to the principle of the bill.

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: —and in point of fact you will find that no other jurisdiction has gone as far.

Mr. Sargent: We know the record of the government. The "William Davis Hotel" right across the road. It takes a lot of monkeys to eat the peanuts.

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: I am just trying to figure out some of the points of the member for London Centre (Mr. Peterson). I think that's about all. The member for London Centre mentioned, the question of open hearings. I have already answered that point. He talks about secret hearings, secret priorities. There will be nothing secret about any of this.

The member for Riverdale raised an interesting question. That is: why are we proposing this for natural gas and not for oil? There is a very simple answer to that. We get pretty well all of our natural gas from Canada. There are some contracts with American producers and distributors to bring gas

into Canada. I can think of one in particular. Panhandle Gas supplies a fair volume of natural gas to Union Gas, which serves the southwestern Ontario area. But by and large whatever natural gas we have in Ontario comes from Canada, mainly from western Canada.

In the case of oil, we do have alternative sources of oil. The hon. member referred to the October 1974 report of the National Energy Board and their comment that in their opinion our domestic supplies of crude oil will fall below our domestic demand by 1982. What that report refers to was put into the context of the national oil policy of 1961. It refers to the fact that all of Canada west of the Ottawa Valley is supplied with crude oil from western Canada. I would suggest that when they release their next report in the next few weeks it will probably be an earlier date than 1982 when they are suggesting that the supplies will not meet the demand.

But we do have an alternative source of supply—barring such things as the Yom Kippur War and the repercussions of an event like that when everybody will be in a supply pinch. But we can buy offshore, whereas with natural gas we have no alternative. The Americans are in no position to sell any to us. There are parts of the United States that are going to be 60 per cent short of natural gas this winter.

In the last few winters there have been problems that have necessitated the closing down of some factories, and once in a while, on a particularly cold day, closing a school. It's going to get to the point this winter in parts of the United States where they're going to have to consider closing hospitals and cutting supplies for residential use.

I think it was the hon. member for Beaches-Woodbine (Mrs. Bryden) who asked why we were bringing in the bill at this time. I think it's because of the experience of those jurisdictions in the United States which wish that somebody had had the farsightedness to bring in something in their state or in the country years ago. Then they might better have coped with the situation now.

Obviously, if we're successful in this country in bringing to the marketplace additional quantities of gas—whether it be from the Mackenzie Delta, the Beaufort Sea, the eastern arctic islands, or for that matter from off the coast of PEI—although that's highly improbable at this point—if we're successful in bringing that onstream as quickly as possible, with due regard to all the proper concerns about the environment, native claims, economics and so forth, then we may never have to use this legislation.

Pray to God we don't have to. But I think it would be only the responsible thing for this government to take action now to have a mechanism in place to deal with the problem if, as and when it may arise.

Mr. Sargent: What about the consortium, the five firms?

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: The hon. member for Riverdale, I think, suggested that at some time recently I had said or inferred we had already come to the point of being short of natural gas. If I have said anything that led the member to think that, I apologize.

Mr. Renwick: No, no. What I said was you were more pessimistic than the National Energy Board.

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: It's a personal philosophy with me that—

Mr. Renwick: To be pessimistic.

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: No, to prepare for the worst. If the worst never comes, well fine, that's a bonus. If it does, you're ready for it.

The hon. member for Haldimand-Norfolk (Mr. G. I. Miller) raised the—

Mr. Renwick: I assume that you buckle up with a philosophy like that.

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: Yes, I do. It's sort of like Murphy's law, if something can go wrong it will.

The hon. member for Haldimand-Norfolk raised the question of the producers in his area. He phoned my office today or yesterday and spoke with my staff and we will be getting back to him.

I think he mentioned a particular producer who is selling at—I forget the price now, but less than the $1.25 that the local distributor in that area has to pay Trans-Canada PipeLine. I will get back to the member on that. It is really, I would suggest, not germane to this bill, Mr. Speaker.

[5:15]

He mentions more Ontario production. At the present time Ontario production of natural gas represents approximately, give or take a bit, one per cent of the quantity that we actually use. There are exploration programmes going on all the time in the area east of the Pelee line. But I would be, again, misleading the House if I didn't answer that point and say I really don't foresee at this point in any exploration plan I have looked

at, the possibility that we're going to meet much more than that amount of our needs.

The member for Grey-Bruce (Mr. Sargent) raised some points that—again he referred to a consortium. I believe that what the hon. member is referring to there—I don't recall the names of the companies involved—

Mr. Sargent: There are five companies.

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: —was the efforts of my predecessor, the present Treasurer (Mr. McKeough), to involve certain firms in the private sector in the financing of heavy water plants to take off the public Treasury the burden, the need to borrow money to finance those plants.

Mr. Sargent: It has wider terms of reference than that. There are $600 million involved.

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: That has nothing whatsoever to do with this bill nor, for that matter, natural gas, except to the member for Grey-Bruce.

Mr. Sargent: How do we know that?

Mr. Maeck: He just told you.

Mr. Sargent: Who are the companies?

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: I don't recall the names of the companies and I'm sure, since the hon. member is a member of the estimates committee, he'll raise it at that time, some time later this week or next week.

Mr. Sargent: Do you want me to read it out of Hansard?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Mr. Sargent: Do you want the facts out of Hansard? I've got them here.

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: Send them over to me.

Mr. Sargent: Do you mean to say that as minister, he doesn't know the five firms which share $600 million of our money? As a minister he doesn't know that?

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: Mr. Speaker, this is totally off the subject.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: It is totally out of order. I will be glad to discuss it with the member in estimates. He is on the estimates committee and we can discuss it at that time.

Mr. Sargent: Are they involved in this bill?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The hon. minister has indicated that it does not apply to the principle of this bill. I would assume that any further discussion on this would be out of order.

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: Mr. Speaker, thank you. The member for Lake Nipigon (Mr. Stokes) was concerned—

Mr. Sargent: He doesn't know what the hell is going on.

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: —with the question of future supplies. This is of serious concern to us. As it stands now, with the figures the NEB puts forward, we feel we can confidently say that for the next couple of winters there shouldn't be any problem. If we have a couple more mild winters such as we've had recently—and, hopefully, which this one is shaping up to be—we could be in a better position than has been suggested.

I'm not in the position, as the Minister of Energy—nor, I think, is the utility serving the member's area—of giving any firm assurance to any industrial complex that the utilities can give them contracts, with absolute 100 per cent deliverability, much beyond the next two or three years. I don't think that should inhibit any industrial concern—because, again, assuming we are able to bring frontier gas on stream by the early 1980s, then at most, one hopes, we would face one or two years of a pinch; but not in the long term.

One of the problems, of course, with the utilities in his particular part of the province is they have little or no storage, whereas the companies here in southern Ontario do have considerable storage in such places as the Don field, where they can inject it into the ground and draw it out for peak use.

The member for Beaches-Woodbine asked about curtailment of exports and had we pressed for curtailment of exports. If she will look at the remarks of my predecessor at the National Energy Board, I think on Dec. 9, 1974; if she will look at such things as my remarks to the Ontario Natural Gas Association—if she would like a copy I'll see she gets one—on Oct. 2 in London, we have agreed with the NEB that there may have to be curtailment of exports.

The federal government has indicated that it will be moving on this. We have indicated that the shortfalls must be shared between our customers and Canada. We are in a situation here where we are trading energy. I suppose that is the way to put it. Oil exports have been cut down considerably and I ex-

pect they will be cut down even more, as a result of the October, 1974, report of the National Energy Board. We do anticipate that natural gas will be cut down. But, Ontario, importing 95 per cent of its coal, for instance, from the United States, has to be a little concerned that we don't take arbitrary —ruthless I suppose is the word—moves that put us in jeopardy in terms of contracts like our coal contracts.

We know that most responsible Americans, legislators and the congress of the United States, will understand a gradual cutback, related to our own needs but also recognizing our responsibilities to our customers. We don't think it should be just cut off automatically. There are implications, which I am sure you have discussed with the Treasurer, on the balance of payments, and also just straight international relations.

You ask if this bill is in some way an attempt to create a climate for the acceptance of a Mackenzie Valley pipeline. No; what we say is that we must bring to the marketplace, at the earliest possible date, with due consideration to the factors which I mentioned before, as much of that frontier gas as is possible. We are going to need it. What we are talking about here is a problem relating to our supplies from conventional sources. What the National Energy Board is saying, what we are saying, what I hope the public will understand, is that looking at supplies from conventional sources, we face the possibility of shortages that will require allocation plans to be put into effect. I think, Mr. Speaker, that would conclude my reply.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

Mr. Speaker: Shall this bill be referred to committee?

Hon. Mr. Welch: Mr. Speaker, this bill and one other, will go to a special select committee. Perhaps if we could just stand that down for the moment until we have finished the next bill, then I can introduce a motion constituting the committee to review this bill and the other bill.

RETAIL BUSINESS HOLIDAYS ACT

Hon. Mr. MacBeth moved second reading of Bill 5, An Act to Regulate Holiday Closings for Retail Businesses.

Hon. Mr. MacBeth: Mr. Speaker, if I might just say one or two words about the bill before the opposition speaks. We do have some extra copies; the Clerk of the House has these available. I realize that there are some new members in the House who may not have seen the original green paper. If they will ask the pages to get one for them, they may have one.

I would like to speak for just a moment to the second reading on holiday closing for retail businesses. As most of the members of the House know, Mr. Speaker, back in 1969 the then Attorney General asked the Law Reform Commission to examine the matter of a common pause day. They came out with their report on Sunday observance legislation in 1971. It's dated 1970, but actually it came before the House in early 1971. The summary of recommendations is contained there on page 371. You will find when you examine this legislation presently before us, that many of the recommendations in that report of the Law Reform Commission have, in fact, been adopted.

Rather than the approach that the original Lord's Day Act took in 1906—it was a federal Act and took a religious approach—the Law Reform Commission suggested that a secular approach should be taken, and that is the approach, of course, that is embodied in our legislation. The intent of the legislation is to permit as many people as reasonably as possible to enjoy a common pause day.

I can't help but make reference to this morning's Globe and Mail. In the editorial it suggested operating six days a week, but six days of week of the operator's choice. Of course the purpose of this bill is just the opposite to that; not to suggest that everybody should have a one-day holiday each week—we have already achieved that through other types of legislation—but that there should be a day when people can holiday together. So as I have said on several—

Mr. Singer: Except for the exceptions, yes.

Hon. Mr. MacBeth: So, as I have said on other occasions, that a daughter may go out with her father or a mother and son, even though they are all working in different fields of employment. As I have said, we have taken a secular rather than a religious approach to this.

It is not easy to come up with legislation that is going to be satisfactory to everybody. I have found in speaking to people that most people feel this kind of legislation is good and desirable, but that each person has their own idea of what should be permitted and what should be excluded and how we should go about it.

The Conservative Party suggested in the recent election that legislation for a common pause day would be forthcoming and this is the legislation that is now before us. We believe that it is in the best interests of the majority of people of this province, for various reasons. One reason is cost, of course; and the other is this way of having a day that the majority of businesses will be closed.

I admit that some parts of the legislation are judgment calls, such as the holidays that are put in there. They are the holidays that are listed to comply with the Employment Standards Act. They are arbitrary holidays, that is, the non-Sunday days. Also, the figure of 2,400 sq ft is an arbitrary figure and I am ready—as I am sure all of us will be—to listen to suggestions from the members as to any reasonable changes they may want to make.

We hope to keep the intent and purpose of this Act as presented intact, but I am interested in hearing the viewpoints of the members. Eventually, when this goes to committee, there may be some common suggestions that the majority of us can agree to for some changes on those arbitrary figures and positions that are included in the bill.

Mr. Breaugh: I think in general the New Democratic Party is quite prepared to accept a principle that is, in some ways, expressed in this particular bill.

I want to document some very general observations on this. But first of all, a kind of apparent need has been well expressed all over the place, both by political parties and politicians in the midst of the last campaign, and perhaps more important by a great many organized and unorganized groups that happen to abound in the province.

It is now a matter of a good deal of controversy with both sides being rather well armed in terms of their own statistics and in terms of expressing their own opinion. It now appears in the form of some silly abuse or other in terms of rather large corporate entities opening up their stores even though they are prepared to admit that they don't want to open up those stores, that they lose money when they open up those stores, and that they are really not doing the business they ought to be doing in opening the stores. They are bound and bent that they are going to open the stores anyway; it seems to defy logic in spots.

Let me refer, as the previous speaker has already done, to the results that were tabled by the Ontario Law Reform Commission. It perhaps is one of the most thorough documents that you could care to find. The recommendations to the Attorney General at that time contained a good deal of information from most parties. I think you will find there were about 154 written submissions and something like 191 oral submissions to that particular committee at that time.

It perhaps deals with the gist of this particular legislation, even though the submission by the Law Reform Commission is entitled the "Sunday Observance Legislation," and this one rather neatly calls itself "Holiday Closings for Retail Businesses." In effect I think it deals with the same substance.

[5:30]

If you like, though, there are some rather substantial differences and perhaps simply from the point of view that the Law Reform Commission was much more thorough in its work and in its findings than this bill is. For example, if I might call your attention to certain sections of the commission report, particularly in section 9, where it deals with something which is neglected in its entirety throughout this bill and that is making very specific references to the Employment Standards Act, to the Municipal Act, and to the Industrial Standards Act. In other words, it deals with the rights of workers in a very explicit way.

One of the most explicit recommendations in that report was to deal with it from that particular perspective, the rights of the workers. In terms of attempting to deal with something that might be called essential services, it also goes on at great length to try to identify those essential services, to express mechanisms whereby you might be able to classify that to allow for some variance in terms of what is sold, and I think it takes a rather informed and intellectual approach to the whole problem. In terms of several other aspects that are expressed in the bill itself, I think you will find that the observations made by that Law Reform Commission make the bill look rather tacky in spots.

Let me deal with this kind of general, simplistic nature that I think is pretty prevalent in this bill. If you like, there are, as the minister implied, a great many arbitrary choices established throughout the entirety of the bill. In terms of goods, it's a little difficult, for me anyway, to ascertain how the noxious weed got such status that on holidays it must be sold, and on what basis antique shops are open when other shops are not open. There are a great many choices explicitly named in this particular bill, that I think would be rather difficult to defend—

Hon. Mr. Davis: Some of us like them.

Mr. Breaugh: —other than the fact that maybe historically all those shops have been open. If you go back into the early ones, where you really couldn't spit on the street on Sunday, and that kind of legislation which seems to be ridiculous in this day and age, we're very hard pressed to find solid criteria that have been transposed from ancient legislation into what's before the House today. In terms of the size of particular stores that might be left open, again someone came up with a magic number—not the magic number that the Law Reform Commission used, but their own magic number. It tends to be somewhat larger than what I would classify as being a small store.

Hon. Mr. Davis: What is your magic number?

Mr. Breaugh: I'll give you that later when I'm sitting in your chair and you're sitting over here. That's the prerogative of the government, you see.

Hon. Mr. Davis: You are already planning your leadership campaign? I will have to talk to your leader about you.

Mr. Martel: You should watch the knives, Bill.

Hon. Mr. Davis: I never have that problem.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. Will the member for Oshawa continue?

Mr. Breaugh: I think the pertinent point in attempting to view the bill, though, is that the thing is really a classic and pragmatic Toryism. It has loopholes that you could drive a dump truck through—if you could get leave from the dump truck legislation to drive a dump truck.

Hon. Mr. Davis: With a tarpaulin.

Mr. Breaugh: With a tarpaulin. I'm not sure whether tarpaulins are allowed on Sundays or not.

Hon. Mr. Davis: No, but they are required on dump trucks.

Mr. Breaugh: In short, I think what we are going to propose with this bill is some constructive surgery, which of course the minister has invited himself, and I think too that there are some obvious places in there. Perhaps we should start at the beginning and say that due to the clever research staff that we have, we have identified that first Monday in September. In most places in Ontario, that would be recognized as what is commonly known as Labour Day. I just offer the services of our research staff to the government benches and you can use that any time you want. I really think that, in deference to the working people of the province, you shouldn't be too shy about using that particular word.

Mr. Deans: It is traditional.

Hon. Mr. Handleman: There is no such thing as Labour Day.

Mr. Deans: There is. We are going to talk about it.

Mr. Breaugh: There are a number of other days that are conspicuously absent here in terms of things that are recognized as being civic holidays, which seem to me to be very legitimate—the civic holiday in August, the Boxing Day holiday, if you like, and the other one that's being considered in the Oshawa riding—Sept. 18, which is about to become another national holiday. We won't go into that just now.

Hon. Mr. Welch: Your humility is fantastic.

An hon. member: So is his skill.

Mr. Singer: Is he humble enough to be over there with you fellows?

Mr. Breaugh: In terms of some things that I would suggest to the House are rather unfair in terms of this particular legislation, section 2 does a rather neat thing in that it takes an employee of a particular store that would be allowed to be open and makes him subject to a fine of up to $10,000. Having heard the case and having accepted it perhaps in spots that there are a lot of university students and what not who need weekend employment, that is a rather stiff fine for the employee. I wouldn't want to be the manager of the store that opens up on Sunday if I am the guy who is eligible for the $10,000 fine.

That seems to be something that is at direct odds to what is being expressed by the Law Reform Commission, for example. The minister didn't make any attempt to establish a variance procedure which I really think he must do in some form or else he is really going to put the retailers into a bit of a fit. It is difficult to find a store now that doesn't sell a wide variety of goods, whether that is a corner variety store that is selling tobacco, milk, eggs, nylons and whatever, or whether that is a gasoline station that is probably selling all those things as well and in addition beach balls and lawn chairs and

a number of other items. The minister has got some problems there.

In terms of what perhaps is expressed as being the crux of the thing, that the minister would like to be able to leave small family operations at work, he has put in something that is rather difficult. He has made it explicit in terms of the number of employees who are allowed into the store, if you like, in effect saying three of them. That might be rather difficult to ascertain in a family operation in particular. Which one of the kids is going to receive the sentence because he is the fifth kid in the store at that particular moment?

There are some problems, I suggest, in the criteria that the minister has used to establish this. I think the cute one in all of this is that in effect he is saying that in tourist areas municipalities can use that option. I can't think of a municipality in the Province of Ontario that doesn't consider itself to be a tourist area. I would welcome the minister to beautiful downtown Oshawa which has beautiful Parkwood and the McLaughlin gallery. It is a tourist area, a very happy one.

Mr. Moffatt: Even Brampton.

Mr. Breaugh: Even Brampton. It has a historical site there. There are a great many tourist areas in the province. In fact, I would guess that if any of them wanted to have some substantiation that they are a tourist area, they simply go to the Minister of Industry and Tourism (Mr. Bennett), who already has a regional office set up in that area and is probably promoting it rather quickly as a tourist area. There seem to be some rather specific things in here in this particular Act that I think are going to cause problems.

Mr. Lawlor: Is the minister listening?

Hon. Mr. McBeth: Yes, sir.

Mr. Martel: Does the minister want to withdraw the bill now or later?

Mr. Breaugh: Another tough one I think ought to be expressed, because it comes right down to the matter of what is the point of it all about. This bill does not propose to say that there is a minimum fine. It does say that there is $10,000 maximum, which certainly would scare anyone, except that in practice what people have been trying to do with municipal bylaws runs into the stumbling block of the minimum fine. Is the minimum fine going to be $5? Is the minister willing to opt that out to somebody else to make that decision or is he prepared to say, as the Law Reform Commission was, that there ought to be a minimum fine that ought to be applicable? Are we going to hit somebody for $10,000 and somebody else for $5,000 and somebody else for $5? Is he purporting to say that small businesses, for example, would be as liable to the $10,000 fine as, say, Loblaws or Dominion Stores?

I think that are certainly, in the reading of the Act, a great many areas that need to be cleaned up, not the least of which is that I am not at all convinced that the government in this particular instance has made much of a case that it really is a pause day. If I might quote the letter from the Seventh Day Adventists, it really is a deodorized bill to take away, if you like, all the smell of being very sectarian legislation. It strikes me that the government really didn't make much of an attempt at that at all. I think in their letter to the Premier (Mr. Davis) they made the case that surely that great sophisticated government that we have over there could find the ways and means of doing that, that it could turn it into a pause day as opposed to Sunday legislation. In effect, that is what we have got.

We have, without question, a unique opportunity. This is the first House in something like 32 or 33 years where amendments from the other side of the House may actually become law. This may be one of those occasions—in fact it will be—where we are going to present some amendments that we think make some sense. We would also offer the government the opportunity to wisen up in the process and present its own amendments first. We are quite prepared to present amendments that might actually carry. It is an interesting phenomenon and one which is causing a little consternation on this side of the House as well. We are quite prepared to take you on. It might be a most interesting thing. Let me identify some areas that I think we want to see some substantial movement on. We want to see some effort to establish that it is, in fact, a pause day; that it is not, in fact, the old blue laws or Sunday legislation of the 1800s; that it is, in fact, a pause day. It strikes me that can be done.

The second area is in terms of the rights of those people who are employed in those stores, many of whom are not in organized labour unions. They are entirely on their own, and are subject now to some rather loose labour legislation which is quite open to abuse. This puts them in a rather difficult position of complaining and losing their jobs. But if you like, of course, you can

spend your time for the next six or eight months arguing that you really shouldn't have lost it in the first place.

So there has to be some movement in terms of the rights of the working people in those particular areas. Another interesting little side-shot is that you took a small deviation into the area of uniform store hours. One has to read the fine print and check back through the Municipal Act, but you do find that you did stick your foot in that water and we intend to drag your foot in just a bit further in terms of providing some uniform store hours.

One other area where there seems to be, I think, a rather legitimate case for people who are employed on weekends, if you like, or if you like to use the words "occasional help" – university students, perhaps some housewives, or whatever, who want to work; people who might be unemployed and could get a couple of days employment during the course of a week. It does not mention anywhere in this bill, or even recognize, that they might be classified as occasional help and given some exemptions. Perhaps it might even be a mechanism that will allow some stores to remain open, whereas the majority of them are closed.

Where I think you are going to have some difficulty, and where I think we are going to have to get our heads together, is on this matter of the enforcement of the Act. Current Acts are very difficult to enforce. In fact, if a police officer has a municipal by-law in his hot little hand, and wants to enforce it on a pause day or Sunday, all he has to do is get the Attorney General (Mr. Murtrey) to agree to it, and then romp around and try to do it.

It poses some very interesting problems in terms of how the bill that is now presented would specifically be enforced. Are we talking about a complaint system to a JP or to a judge? And nine years hence, we find somebody. Are we talking about sending police officers out to measure the 2,400 sq ft or are we asking them to write up reports on the contents of the store which, in effect, would mean the police officer would have to take stock? Are we asking the officer, in that particular instance, to make that judgement whether the two kids are actually working that day or just standing around the store? I think we need to find some mechanism in there in terms of enforcing the Act that really does work.

In summary, I think we have accepted that it is great that you actually did something after all this time. And we accept the fact that it is your prerogative to put the bill on the floor of the House and we are also accepting that in this particular House, it is our joy, pain, whatever, to try to provide some amendments. We are quite prepared to do that. I think this may be one of those occasions when you can trot out all your good speeches about accepting the responsibility of making minority government work—I call your attention to the last line of that phrase, on this side of the House, where possible.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Speaker, this debate is very interesting. I enjoyed the remarks of the hon. member for Oshawa and I think he added several important suggestions to the importance of this statute.

I must admit I was very unimpressed with the first efforts of the Solicitor General (Mr. MacBeth) in this regard. I think he has a bad bill, and I don't know really how some of these answers are going to come forward. This bill relates to a report of the Law Reform Commission that was brought in four years ago or more—a long, confusing, voluminous report that made very little sense for anybody trying to write a statute out of that report.

Then we had the green paper by the hon. minister's predecessor, now the hon. member for Burlington South (Mr. Kerr). I don't know what the green paper was supposed to do. The green paper sat firmly and squarely on both sides of the question at the same time and the minister waved it around and said: "Look what a great fellow I am. I have got a green paper that says all about closing on Sundays or not closing on Sundays. It might please some people. It might not please some others."

Now we have this and I suppose with all its faults, my colleagues and I are going to vote for it in principle because there seems to be a real concern throughout the province about having a day of pause. You don't make it secular merely because you call it secular. I think the minister makes it religious in the way that he purports to make it secular. I'm going to deal with that in a few moments.

[5:45]

I have a couple of points. The hon. member for Oshawa mentioned the $10,000 fine. I was fascinated to hear the Minister of Housing (Mr. Rhodes) or the Attorney General (Mr. McMurtry)—I've forgotten which one it was—when he was talking about fines under the Landlord and Tenant Act.

Mr. Givens: Two thousand dollars.

Mr. Singer: Apparently, if you have a square footage of 2,410 sq ft you can be fined $10,000, but if you break the provisions of the Landlord and Tenant Act and throw somebody out into the cold, probably on a stormy night when it's five below zero and there's 4 ft of snow, you can only be fined $2,000. That certainly indicates great consistency and intelligence.

If that doesn't really work, then this is a statute that certainly bothers me as a lawyer. Having gone to all of this trouble to pass a statute and apparently declare a day of pause, we have this section 4, which says that the Lieutenant Governor in Council can exempt anybody it wants for any reason. We go to all of this trouble— we have had the Law Reform Commission; we have had green papers; we have had great debates; the Solicitor General beat himself on the breast and said: "What a great boy am I"—then we have a statute that says: "Don't really pay any attention to it because if we want to, we'll exempt anybody we want." Is that any way to pass a meaningful law? I think it's nonsense.

If the law is going to mean anything, surely it must apply to the people in Ontario with certain minor exemptions or not apply at all. Why do we need a saving clause that says, in effect, "If we find somebody who we feel is being unfairly treated, we can exempt them for whatever reason and we don't have to come back and consult you people who inhabit the Legislature; we'll just do it on our own"?

Look at the exemptions. The hon. member for Oshawa makes a good point. Is the minister going to have policemen running around with tape measures saying, "Ah, 2,405 sq ft" or, "Do you really employ your son, your daughter, and your cousin, who come in on Sundays? That adds up to four and you're in breach." We can't do it. Or is it meaningful that a particular local council has passed a resolution saying, "Leave us alone. We are a tourist resort"?

With all that, there is an idea here, but I don't think it is well expressed. One of my colleagues was talking to me about some constituents of his who think it might be appropriate to sell fruit after Oct. 31. I don't really know what difference it makes whether it's sold on Oct. 31 or Nov. 1, but he's going to elaborate on that very shortly. A constituent of mine called me the other day and said, "We sell art books. Are those educational or not?"

Hon. Mr. Davis: Art books?

Mr. Singer: Art books, yes—paintings, masterpieces—

Hon. Mr. Davis: Be careful.

Mr. Singer: Not the kind the Premier is thinking of—the masterpieces. The constituent said, "People come in and they browse around our store on Sundays; it's a good day for browsing. They come in and look at our art books. Is that educational or are we breaking this day of pause Act and are we therefore going to be fined perhaps as much as $10,000?" It's really not clear.

Are we going to have a mechanism whereby somebody can come to the minister and say, "Mr. Minister, because of the peculiar character of my business, give me an exemption under section 4 and will you please pass an order in council for my store, which is at 555 Yonge St. in the city of Toronto"? I don't know.

I suppose the thing that bothers me most of all is what appears to be prejudice against minority groups. That is, we are saying, "Our day of pause, the Sunday—which has no religious connotation; it's secular only, mind you—must be observed by you no matter whether your religious convictions force you to pause on another day." There are persons, many of whom I represent and many of whom other members represent—Orthodox Jewish people, who are Sabbath observers; Seventh Day Adventists; Moslems; Seventh Day Baptists and others—who have a different kind of a pause day.

There are Seventh Day Baptists; I was surprised to find that out the other day.

Hon. Mr. Davis: I just learned something.

Mr. Singer: Why should that particular day of pause, the Sunday, be imposed upon those people?

I have one lady who lives in my riding who is a very religious and proper person. She takes her Jewish religion most seriously. She runs a shoe store. She doesn't wait until sundown on Friday. She closes it on Friday at noon and has been in the habit up till now of opening it again on Sunday. She says, "Economically, I will now be deprived of one of my most important days of business—Sunday— and I cannot continue in business with that kind of restriction." I single her out particularly because I know this lady and I know that she believes conscientiously in what she is doing and what she does in her business is dictated by her very serious religious convictions.

I say that the minister is unfairly picking on this person or this type of person when he says they must do it the government's way or not at all. When we discussed this in our caucus one of my colleagues suggested to me that it was really not a religious restriction, it was an economic restriction. I suggested to my colleague—he's not here at the moment but he'll know that I was talking about him—that it was really a distinction without a difference.

Hon. Mr. Davis: You had better identify which one you are talking about.

Mr. Singer: One in the Liberal Party.

Hon. Mr. Davis: You wouldn't want to—

Mr. Singer: He'll come back and he'll admit it. I'm not sure that he agrees with me but I suggest quite seriously that it was a distinction without a difference. If you pick on someone's economic right to carry on their business in a way that is going to prejudice them or hurt them, and say it's got nothing to do with religion, you are in fact making a distinction that is not a difference at all.

I have to agree with the stand the Globe and Mail took in the editorial this morning, which the minister referred to, that minorities are ignored. I suggest that in framing this law so strictly and not recognizing that there are certain minorities who, by reason of their conscientious religious beliefs, are unable to carry on as other people do—because you've chosen a day for them—you are picking on those people unfairly.

I will at the appropriate time be introducing an amendment that will say something like this—that section 2 should not apply to people who run retail business establishments which were closed on the preceding Saturday by reason of the religious convictions of their own.

I would hope that the government will accept that amendment beause I believe it should be there. I believe that the government does not want to pick unfairly or unreasonably on people, and they have a tough job in bringing this statute in in a manner where people are not going to be picked on.

I know my colleagues are going to have some other ideas, but I was most interested in what is going to be coming forward from the hon. member from Oshawa and his colleagues. Hopefully we are going to have a statute that we can have a little pride in, not one that is rotten with exceptions and inequitable to certain minorities. We don't want to prejudice any minority groups in this province or have an unreasonable penalty that can apply unfairly. Neither do we want a statute that turns policemen into, what?—building inspectors or employee counters or what have you.

Mr. Speaker, as I said at the beginning, my colleagues and I are going to support the bill in principle, but we are looking forward to going to committee—standing committee or outside committee—I think the House leader called it a select committee. Let us listen to the various people who have views on this. Hopefully we can emerge with a bill which in detail is much better than the one we have before us.

Mr. Ziemba: I too would support this bill to regulate holiday closings for retail businesses. I recognize its intent. I only regret, as my colleague from Oshawa (Mr. Breaugh) did, that it doesn't go further and impose reasonable limits on the hours that retail stores carry on business. We intend, however, to move an amendment to this bill when it comes to committee.

In this province we have seen the coming of what is referred to as the continental retail work week which makes no distinction between individual days of the week. We have come a long way in working conditions. Office and factory hours are becoming shorter and shorter. Retail hours, on the other hand, are becoming longer and longer. Holidays have become meaningless in the retail trade. They are simply "Big Sale Days."

We live in a consumer-oriented society. It is a fact that shopping is considered by some people to be a form of recreation and in the US, for instance, there are many stores open 24 hours a day, seven days a week—we're getting some here now—for a Los Angeles-type atmosphere of retail activity.

I realize that some customers may want to shop at odd hours, on Sundays and holidays and it is true if a store caters to their whims it may do a good business for a time. Competition has always been composed of price, advertising, quality of goods and service. Lately we've seen the introduction of a new competitive device—shopping hours.

The advantage however, is only temporary. Once all stores open at these odd hours, no advantage remains. They all do the same amount of business only it is spread over a longer period of time. The extended hours of selling simply decrease the efficiency of an operation and the extra costs are charged to the customer.

This was the case when trading stamps were introduced a few years ago. The first stores which offered them did a whale of a

business. The other merchants quickly joined in and the competitive advantage of the stamps disappeared. Only the added costs remain.

It is the same with extended hours of selling. When all the stores are open—and this is a coming trend—no advantage will remain. All the stores will simply do the same business over longer operating hours. The obvious result is less productivity per hour of opening, increased costs and reduced efficiency. The customer ends up paying more.

Legislating Sunday and holiday closings without legislating hours for the rest of the week, however, would be a mistake. The same stores which are opening on Sundays now would simply extend their weekdays and the same cycle would repeat itself. More overhead, more hardships for the retailers, more inflation.

It would be a bigger mistake to empower municipalities to regulate store hours and I say this knowing that my friends at the rear of the House, the third-party members, might take issue with my rejection of a home-rule concept. A patchwork type of regulation all over the province would be futile. Councils would compete with one another to attract retail developments by offering extended-hour operation. We would have, in bordering municipalities, one side of the street controlled by a bylaw and the other not.

The Conservative government in the past has always legislated in favour of the monopoly operations. The giants in retailing are getting bigger and bigger and small independents face ever-increasing problems just to survive. We saw the large food chains—the Loblaws, the Dominions—squeeze out the corner grocer in the 1950s, and the neighbourhood pharmacist faces the same fate today.

In 1962, we had 1,907 pharmacies and in 1974, last year, there were only 1,558 left. They are being replaced by the giant drug chains, like the Shoppers' Drug Mart people. The College of Pharmacy, which is supposed to be protecting these small independents, turns its back on them by permitting the chains to locate right next door in some cases to the small independent. As the competition is forced out of business, higher drug prices will follow as the food monopolies demonstrated so well when they got rid of their competition, the corner grocer.

The College of Pharmacy, without any apparent research or evidence—for instance evidence of abuse—persuaded the Ontario government to amend the Health Disciplines Act in July, 1975, to declare vitamins above a certain moderate dosage to be drugs. It further ruled that these vitamins above the minimal strength would require that a pharmacist be present for consultation, essentially giving the sale of the vitamins, which are considered a component of any nutritious food, to pharmacists. This legislation, once enforced, would drive 250 small neighbourhood health food stores out of business.

Who would benefit? Not the small pharmarcy—that's the first thought I had. I've since checked it out. I found that because of a shortage of necessary glass-enclosed space for display of this new vitamin stock, as well as the extra cash register that the new Act suggests, they're not really interested in the sale of the vitamins. They don't have the facilities or the means; they are busy with their other business.

On the other hand, Shoppers and the Top Drug Mart people do have the facilities and they are quite willing and able to take over the vitamin business. I have always been amazed at how the government could legislate in this way and at the same time pretend it is all for the free enterprisers and the small businessman.

I believe that section 3, subsection (c) of Bill 5 should apply to the large drug chains to limit their Sunday and holiday selling. In other words, the total floor area used for the serving of the public, or the selling or displaying of goods to the public in an establishment, is less than 2,400 sq ft. I don't believe that Shoppers Drug Mart operates stores of less than 4,000 sq ft in Metropolitan Toronto, and I'd like to see them closed at those times.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. Would this be a convenient place for the member to break his remarks? He may continue after the dinner hour.

The House recessed at 6 p.m.

CONTENTS

Thursday, November 6, 1975

Emergency mail service, statement by Mrs. Scrivener 293

MacGregor Point Provincial Park, statement by Mr. Bernier 293

Rent review, statement by Mr. Rhodes 294

Landlord and Tenant Act amendments, statement by Mr. McMurtry 295

Occupational and environmental health advisory council, statement by Mr. Miller 297

Ontario credit rating, statement by Mr. McKeough 298

Toronto teachers' negotiations, statement by Mr. Wells 299

Toronto teachers' negotiations, questions of Mr. Wells: Mr. Lewis, Mr. Nixon, Mr. Roy 299

Automobile insurance rates, questions of Mr. Handleman: Mr. Lewis, Mr. Singer, Mr. Moffatt, Mr. Sargent 301

Automobile insurance rates, question of Mr. McKeough: Mr. Lewis 302

Payments to doctors, question of Mr. Miller: Mr. Nixon 302

Payment for cattle purchases, questions of Mr. J. R. Smith: Mr. Nixon, Mr. Good, Mr. Gaunt, Mr. Worton 302

Mississauga inquiry, questions of Mr. McMurtry: Mr. Gregory, Mr. Singer 303

Telso strike, question of B. Stephenson: Mr. Mackenzie 304

Hydro explorations, question of Mr. Timbrell: Mr. Peterson 304

Housing action programme, question of Mr. Rhodes: Mr. Williams 304

Krauss-Maffei system, questions of Mr. Snow. Mr. Singer, Mr. Germa, Mr. Cassidy 305

Injured workmen's demonstration, question of Mr. MacBeth: Mr. di Santo 306

Liquor board appointments, question of Mr. Handleman: Mr. Conway 306

Violence in hockey, questions of Mr. McMurtry: Mr. Jones, Mr. Roy 307

Homes on Toronto Island, question of Mr. McMurtry: Mr. Cassidy 307

Payment for cattle purchases, question of Mr. W. Newman: Mr. Gaunt 308

Water pollution test results, question of Mr. Kerr: Mr. Angus 308

Expansion of GO-Urban, question of Mr. Snow: Mr. Reid 308

Resolution re Industry and Tourism 309

Residential Premises Rent Review Act, Mr. Rhodes, first reading 309

Judicature Amendment Act, Mr. McMurtry, second reading 309

Highway Traffic Amendment Act, Mr. Snow, second reading 311

Public Commercial Vehicles Amendment Act, Mr. Snow, second reading 317

Ontario Energy Board Amendment Act, Mr. Timbrell, second reading 322

Retail Business Holidays Act, Mr. MacBeth, on second reading 330

Recess 337

SPEAKERS IN THIS ISSUE

Angus, I. (Fort William NDP)
Bain, R. (Timiskaming NDP)
Bernier, Hon. L. Natural Resources (Kenora PC)
Breaugh, M. (Oshawa NDP)
Bullbrook, J. E. (Sarnia L)
Burr, F. A. (Windsor-Riverside NDP)
Bryden, M. (Beaches-Woodbine NDP)
Campbell, M. (St. George L)
Cassidy, M. (Ottawa Centre NDP)
Conway, S. (Renfrew North L)
Davis, Hon. W. G. Premier (Brampton PC)
Deans, I. (Wentworth NDP)
di Santo, O. (Downsview NDP)
Foulds, J. F. (Port Arthur NDP)
Gaunt, M. (Huron-Bruce L)
Germa, M. C. (Sudbury NDP)
Givens, P. G. (Armourdale L)
Good, E. R. (Waterloo North L)
Gregory, M. E. C. (Mississauga East PC)
Haggerty, R. (Erie L)
Handleman, Hon. S. B. Consumer and Commercial Relations (Carleton PC)
Jones, T. (Mississauga North PC)
Kerr, Hon. G. A. Environment (Burlington South PC)
Lawlor, P. D. (Lakeshore NDP)
Lewis, S. Leader of the Opposition (Scarborough West NDP)
MacBeth, Hon. J. P. Provincial Secretary for Justice and Solicitor General (Humber PC)
MacDonald, D. C. (York South NDP)
Mackenzie, R. (Hamilton East NDP)
Maeck, L. (Parry Sound PC)
Mancini, R. (Essex South L)
Martel, E. W. (Sudbury East NDP)
McKeough, Hon. W. D. Treasurer, Minister of Economics and Intergovernmental Affairs (Chatham-Kent PC)
McMurtry, Hon. R. Attorney General (Eglinton PC)
McNeil, R. K. (Elgin PC)
Miller, Hon. F. S. Health (Muskoka PC)
Miller, G. I. (Haldimand-Norfolk L)
Moffat, D. (Durham East NDP)
Morrow, D. H. (Ottawa West PC)
Newman, B. (Windsor-Walkerville L)
Newman, Hon. W. Agriculture and Food (Durham North PC)
Nixon, R. F. (Brant-Oxford-Norfolk L)
Peterson, D. (London Centre L)
Reid, T. P. (Rainy River L)
Renwick, J. A. (Riverdale NDP)
Rhodes, Hon. J. R. Housing (Sault Ste. Marie PC)
Roy, A. J. (Ottawa East L)
Ruston, R. F. (Essex North L)
Sargent, E. (Grey-Bruce L)
Scrivener, Hon. M. Government Services (St. David PC)
Singer, V. M. (Wilson Heights L)
Smith, Hon. J. R. Correctional Services (Hamilton Mountain PC)
Snow, Hon. J. W. Transportation and Communications (Oakville PC)
Stephenson, Hon. B. Labour (York Mills PC)

Stokes, J. E. (Lake Nipigon NDP)
Sweeney, J. (Kitchener-Wilmot L)
Timbrell, Hon. D. R. Energy (Don Mills PC)
Welch, Hon. R. Culture and Recreation (Brock PC)
Wells, Hon. T. L. Education (Scarborough North PC)
Wildman, B. (Algoma NDP)
Williams, J. (Oriole PC)
Worton, H. (Wellington South L)
Young, F. (Yorkview NDP)
Ziemba, E. (High Park-Swansea NDP)

No. 9



Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT — DAILY EDITION

First Session of the Thirtieth Legislature

Thursday, November 6, 1975

Evening Session

Speaker: Honourable Russell Daniel Rowe
Clerk: Roderick Lewis, QC

THE QUEEN'S PRINTER
PARLIAMENT BUILDINGS, TORONTO
1975

CONTENTS

A list of the speakers taking part in the debates in this issue of Hansard appears, in alphabetical order, at the back of this issue.

Daily contents of proceedings also appears at the back of this issue. Reference to a cumulative index of previous issues can be obtained by calling the Hansard Reporting Service indexing staff. (Phone 965-2159).

Hansard subscription price is $15.00 per session, from: Sessional Subscription Service, MGS, 9th Floor, Ferguson Block, Parliament Bldgs., Toronto, M7A 1N3. Phone 965-2238.

LEGISLATURE OF ONTARIO

The House resumed at 8 p.m.

RETAIL BUSINESS HOLIDAYS ACT
(concluded)

Mr. Speaker: Before we proceed with the debate, I would like to give the Solicitor General an opportunity to introduce some guests in the gallery.

Hon. Mr. MacBeth: Thanks, Mr. Speaker, I thought I needed a little moral support. I would ask you and the other members of the House to recognize some 18 young ladies from the 124th Girl Guide Company, under the leadership of Mrs. D. Saston, from Islington United Church, who are with us this evening in the west gallery.

Mr. Speaker: When we adjourned at 6, the hon. member for High Park-Swansea had the floor.

Mr. Ziemba: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The other example of legislation favouring the government's monopoly friends is section 6 of the Assessment Amendment Act, 1974, which amends section 17, subsection 3, of the Assessment Act so that it now reads as follows:

> The value of an assessment of an entire parcel of real property that is occupied by more than one person to be assessed under this Act shall be apportioned on the assessment roll among the occupants of the entire real property who are to be assessed, in that proportion that the fair market rent of the space occupied by each occupant bears to the fair market rent of the entire parcel of real property, so that the sum of the values apportioned to each occupant shall be equal to the value of the assessment of the entire parcel of real property.

This means, of course, that tenants paying high rent per square foot would pay more in both property and business taxes. The large tenants, the chains of course, would have their taxes reduced because being a drawing card or an anchor, as it is referred to in the retail trade, in an area, they would enjoy the minimum square foot rent. As a result, some small tenants are paying tax at 10 times the rate of the largest, compliments of the Conservative government of this province, the champions of free enterprise.

The provincial store hours law is supported by the Ontario Retail Gasoline and Automotive Service Association, the Federation of Independent Business, the Canadian Retail Hardware Association, the Retail Merchants Association of Ontario, the Ontario branch of the Canadian Association of Consumers and the Ontario Federation of Labour. If the business people and the consumers and labour are for controlled store hours, who is against? Who has persuaded the government to drag its feet for the past five long years and even now to present this halfway legislation? It has been suggested that Eaton's, Woolco and K-Mart are the reasons we do not have province-wide uniform store hours here in Ontario. If this is the case, surely the government should act to return reason to retail store hours?

The vast majority of retailers in Ontario would like to think that when they remain closed on Sundays or holidays or some other nights of the week, their competition won't put them out of business. Surely when we have enlightened labour legislation to prevent the exploitation of labour by employers over long hours, we can provide the same for retail workers? Surely there are reasonable limits which should be imposed that still offer shopping opportunities without condemning retailers and their employees to long hours of labour. Surely the time of wage control and efforts to keep prices down by compressing the hours of operation and striving for maximum efficiency is called for.

Surely this government can recognize the service that many small businesses provide in our communities. Surely these people who live and work in our communities, these people whose children go to our local schools, these people who feel the social obligation of dealing face to face with their neighbours and sharing their problems and concerns, deserve more than they've been getting from this government. I believe the interests of the small retailers and their employees, the consumers of this province, would be best

served by immediate legislation not only to regulate holiday closings but to regulate store hours on a province-wide basis.

Mr. Cunningham: Mr. Speaker, it is with interest that I note the great, and I am sure sincere, interest on the part of the gentleman to the right of me on behalf of small business people of Ontario. It seems to be a rather radical departure from their posture in the past. However, as a private-enterprise individual myself, I would say that I welcome their change of heart.

Mr. Young: Since when?

Mr. Ziemba. No one has represented them previously.

Mr. Warner: —dated 1967.

Mr. Cunningham: Initially, I would like to say that I agree with the decision by the law reform commissioners and those of my learned colleagues in their request for a uniform day of rest throughout the Province of Ontario, which I guess has been determined to be Sunday. But I would like to point out my objection on behalf of my constituents for section 3, subsection 2, part (d), where it refers to fresh fruit or vegetables for sale between April 1 and Oct. 31.

There are a number of reasons why I find it necessary to point out to the hon. minister that, first of all, in my particular riding, because of the hardship that farmers, especially, have faced in the light of regional government, they find it necessary to stay open with stands in front of their farms and appendages to their farms to promote the sale of fruit and vegetables, much of which they find they import.

I would say to you that this provides an interesting Sunday outing for so many of the people of Ontario who find it pleasurable to travel through my riding. Further to that, it also provides a great source of fresh fruit and vegetables for purchase on that day. Notwithstanding the fact that these people are, in fact, small businessmen, they cannot afford the elaborate refrigeration equipment that so many of the larger enterprises have. I would ask the hon. minister to reconsider this posture that he has taken and apply an exemption to these particular individuals so that they may sell the fresh fruit and vegetables that they import on a daily basis throughout the whole year. I think this would be fair to people who have, I think, demonstrated an interest in the tourism industry as well as on behalf of the citizens of their community.

I would say one thing further about the people to whom I think we are trying to direct this legislation, the employee who should be entitled to a day of rest on this particular occasion. So many of the people who work in this particular industry are in fact students; students who are trying to pay their own way; students who, in fact, would like to earn a little extra money and possibly not avail themselves of student loans and what not. They find themselves in the position where they can work in these stands.

I know there are many in my riding and in neighbouring ridings, and I think I speak quite objectively and in a non-partisan fashion on behalf of these people. I hope that the House, in its wisdom, would reconsider this particular posture as it applies to these small businessmen. Thank you very much.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Stormont.

Mr. Samis: Cornwall, Mr. Speaker, with redistribution.

Mr. Speaker: Cornwall, then.

Mr. Samis: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. First of all I want to extend my congratulations to the minister upon his appointment. I suppose it's a welcome change in his eyes from the hot-seat, or somewhat lukewarm seat, of the Minister of Labour. However, we congratulate him on the move anyway.

One of the key points of this whole thing is why do we have this bill before us now? It was very obvious it was needed many years ago, whether you talked with merchants or anyone else in the community. I think the need was there five years ago, and I think it's typical of the general Tory philosophy that you only move when the problem is so serious that you finally and absolutely have to do something. Then when you do handle the situation, do as little as possible. That's good classical Toryism and I think this bill is an excellent demonstration of that.

I wonder if it is a total coincidence that we get this bill only when the supermarkets themselves are complaining about the whole problem of Sunday store openings. I wonder if the supermarkets had taken a stand against this whether we would ever have seen the light of this bill. I notice that there was a lot of pressure put on the government before the election, yet they said wait until after the election and we will deal with it then. So, we do have a bill but it is emasculated and

it is a skeleton of what we really need in society.

I keep asking the question: Why did it take so long? This problem has been studied to death through a variety of reports through various ministers, as my colleague from Oshawa (Mr. Breaugh) and other speakers have mentioned. My essential reaction to the bill is that it is just a piecemeal solution to an overall problem. The problem isn't confined to Sunday; Sunday is the easiest one to solve; Sunday is the one that the government can move on most easily. But the whole question of store closing hours around the province, seven days a week—not just on Sunday—is something that we have to deal with.

This government wants it in and seems to be shoving the whole problem under the rug. They will do the Sunday thing and then they will hope that public concern, pressure and discussion regarding the question of uniform store closing hours will fall by the wayside—in view of the questions of inflation, possible teacher strikes and the housing issue.

I wonder why the Province of Ontario finds it so difficult to resolve this problem. Other jurisdictions have done so. I specifically refer to the Oct. 11 edition of the Montreal Star—an article entitled "Survey Backs Current Store Hours." I think I will quote from that and read it into the record, because I think some of the things in it are very important:

> Quebec consumers, merchants and store employees do not want store opening and closing hours changed, according to a province-wide survey. All three are opposed to store openings for business on Sundays, extending Thursday and Friday closing hours from 9 p.m. to 10 p.m., or providing telephone order service on a 24-hour basis. The poll was conducted by CO-GEM Inc., a Montreal-based firm, on behalf of the provincial department of industry and commerce. The poll takers interpreted replies as expressing satisfaction on the part of the three groups with the present law governing store hours. The sampling included interviews with 1,226 consumers including housewives, representatives of consumer groups and 517 merchants varying from small store owners to representatives of large chains.

Living as I do in a riding right alongside the border of the Province of Quebec, I wonder why Ontario can't resolve its problem. If the merchants, the consumers and the employees of Quebec expressed satisfaction with the way the problem was resolved there, then I again ask the question: Why has it taken Ontario so long to come to terms with this problem? Why can't we deal with it? Why are we continually shoving it under the rug?

Mr. Nixon: Your constituents go over and see them.

Mr. Samis: Oh no, they go east now; east not south.

Mr. Nixon: Over there probably.

Mr. Samis: That's just the visiting officials of the party. I didn't say which party.

I would also like to point out the damage the existing situation has caused. I think when people openly flout the law and the very few who are prosecuted are given such minuscule fines, it makes an absolute travesty and farce of the law and it breeds considerable disrespect for it. What we have had in Ontario is piecemeal Sunday shopping by the backdoor.

[8:15]

The previous Solicitor General has told the House that he had more than 1,200 requests to prosecute. If the average man gets caught stealing, cheating on his income tax, lighting a fire of some sort in his backyard, he is prosecuted immediately. But these big chains get away with violations, and sometimes it is amusing. These people, who are the financial interests behind the chains, frequently are the ones who associate with those who say what we need in our society is law and order. What is happening to the moral fibre of Ontario and of Canada? Yet they themselves sometimes are involved in flouting, violating and sometimes even making a mockery of our laws.

We paid a price for the government inaction. I think the public's estimation of the legal system has gone down considerably. The police have been put in a very difficult situation and are very sceptical as to what the Legislature really means about laws and how serious we are about implementing laws and enforcing them. Some small merchants who have chosen to observe the laws, who have chosen to abide by the legal system have suffered while some of their competitors, the law-breakers, have got away with extra profits and no particular shame, and in some cases, some sense of smugness or satisfaction that they have beaten the system and got the cash register to back it up.

So we paid a price for the present system of tolerance and the present system of closing the eye to the violators. As to the actual bill itself, I commend the minister for bringing in something to deal with the existing problem, even if it is piecemeal. Like

my colleague from Oshawa, my two concerns revolve around the question of penalties and municipal exemptions. I don't see why the hon. minister is afraid—and I assume it's not an oversight—to put in minimum fines or penalties for conviction?

Surely if we mean business on this, surely if this isn't going to be another travesty in the sense of the Lord's Day Act whereby the lettering is nice, the law is on the books, but it is not really going to be enforced, surely if we are serious we've got to have good, tough minimum fines. I would suggest that one consideration for the Solicitor General might be something along the lines of making a fine for the first conviction equivalent to half the gross take of that particular violator on that particular day of violation. Another possible consideration would be a minimum of $1,000 for the first violation.

Another consideration brought up by my colleague from Oshawa has been the whole question of enforcement. Let's give the police the power to enforce this law. If they are going to crack down in a variety of other areas, let's not let the big boys get free. Let's not encumber the police. If we are going to write a law, let's make sure that they have full jurisdiction to enforce it.

The question of municipal exemptions, I'm afraid, leaves us wide open to the possibility of abuse. I can realize the minister was sincere in the way he has proposed this. There is legitimate self-interest and concern about the tourism industry. Our concern is that we have a situation where two municipalities within close travelling distance would possibly be in competition for this same tourist dollar. If one had special attractions, the other might be very seriously tempted to designate itself as a tourist area and therefore allow all sorts of stores to open up to try and catch up with the competing municipality in terms of business and attracting customers.

I don't think we should allow municipalities to make these special exemptions. I think the example we have in the Province of Quebec, where it's centralized with exceptions written into the bill, is a far better system than allowing the municipalities to make special exemptions because frequently they are subject to heavy lobbying. I doubt that there is one municipality in Ontario that doesn't consider itself to be a tourist area, that doesn't consider the tourist industry to be important, and doesn't pride itself upon some sense that it has tourist attractions that can compete with any other municipality.

My own area, which is an industrial area, still considers itself a tourist area at the same time. I am sure every industrial community in Ontario feels that it, too, has its tourist attractions and therefore considers the tourist industry important.

I am glad to see that my colleague from Oshawa brought up the question of designating the first Monday in September as Labour Day. I am sure the Solicitor General, as a former Minister of Labour, wouldn't find it too painful to put right in the actual legislation that it is Labour Day.

Mr. Renwick: He would find it more painful than you think. It would be traumatic for him. He was the one who changed it from Labour Day to the first Monday in September.

Mr. Samis: I don't know. Maybe with the minority government that trauma will be somewhat less. In view of some of the flip-flop done in housing and rent control, I wouldn't think this one would be too difficult for the minister to accomplish.

I noticed in the Quebec legislation that they make Boxing Day and Jan. 2, half-day holidays, not full holidays.

Mr. Kerrio: Haven't you got any in BC that you can quote?

Mr. Samis: We are sticking close to home now. We don't want to wander too far.

An hon. member: You guys have trouble understanding.

Mr. Cunningham: They gave you Sundays.

Mr. Samis: I think there are two possible advantages for the consideration of the Solicitor General on that particular item. One is that it does give families who do have to go back to work in the stores some time at least the following day. If we make it a full shopping day then their holiday is limited to that one particular day. I noticed in the survey that I quoted from the Montreal Star, the respondents indicated they would like to see Dec. 26 and Jan. 2 added to the list of nine official holidays in the Province of Quebec. I would ask the Solicitor General that he consider that possibility for making Dec. 26 and Jan. 2 half days of operation for our stores.

Section 3. I commend the Solicitor General for taking the initiative to try to define what a small business is. That, I think, is important. To that extent, I think he's gone beyond the Quebec legislation and I con-

gratulate him on it. Twenty-four hundred feet might possible be generous, but at least he's drawing the line and I think we could live with that particular definition.

My colleague from Oshawa (Mr. Breaugh) has already spoken about the question of the three employees and the possible confusion that may arise from that. I would hope that the Solicitor General would possibly clear up our sense of confusion.

As to the general categories of merchandise in types of stores, I notice it is quite similar to the Quebec legislation. Nothing is radical or particularly different about that and I think it is fairly acceptable.

I would point out one concern. I think my colleague to the left has already mentioned this. It is a general question of outdoor stores, whether they be fruit or vegetable or antique or things of this sort. When they use special stands, when they have a store area behind, will they come under the full impact of the legislation? If the store calls itself a fruit and vegetable store but beyond the stand is a full time market operation, will they be completely under the jurisdiction of this legislation?

I appreciate the hon. minister's concern about applying the same space restrictions to these types of storage. I'd be interested to hear his views. Are the restrictions tight enough to prevent any abuses from any chain operation that would want to set up a chain of smaller operations with a possible front, whether it is a fruit and vegetable operation, antique store, or anything of this particular type?

One final consideration. I sometimes ask myself: Why are we dealing with this bill in the first place in terms of Sunday shopping? Nobody has proved that there is any need for stores to be open on Sunday. The loudest proponents of Sunday openings—and I've read their various submissions, their articles, their publications—have failed to demonstrate any need for Sunday openings on a mass basis. They fail to prove that there is any general desire for a Sunday opening. That will be the question that comes up: If there is no proven need, no proven desire, why do we have to confront this problem anyway? It would seem to me that plain old-fashioned greed must be the basic problem causing us to deal with this new legislation.

To some people, this bill may not be all that significant. But I think what we are dealing with is not just the bill on the store hours. We are dealing with a bill that says: "What type of society do we want? What type of lifestyle do we want in our leisure time?" I think that's the greater issue. I would suggest that if we move towards Sunday opening we are changing the type of society that we are living in. We're evolving into some version of a California-type society, where they pioneered the idea of night-time shopping, greater weekend shopping. And now you have the ultimate in materialism and crass commercialism: 24-hour shopping, parking lot to parking lot, wall to wall, 365 days a year. I think that kind of society and those kinds of values are repugnant to all classes of Ontario society—working men, businessmen, consumers and senior citizens. We don't want that kind of society.

It is not just a question of allowing store openings. There is a more fundamental question. Do we want to change our lifestyles? Do we want to modify our traditions of Sunday to that extent? Do we really want to commercialize this particular phase of our lifestyle? Or do we want to keep Sunday different from the other days? To me, if we did allow widespread opening of stores on Sunday, it would be tantamount to a surrender to the forces of materialism, commercialism and outright greed – and be virtually baptizing them the new Trinity of our age. I'm not arguing for preserving Sunday on the basis of religious or moral grounds per se. In fact in my view, Sunday is more secular and philosophical. I think it's in the best interests of our society that we preserve Sunday as a day of rest—different from the other days, freed from the pressures of commercialism, with many activities revolving around the family—

Mr. Cunningham: But they gave you Wednesday.

Mr. Samis: No, that's you—think of the people outside of this building.

The fact that we have many family activities which traditionally centre around the concept that everybody in the family is free on Sunday; the fact that virtually every major world religion has acknowledged the need for some form of a day of rest whether it's on theological grounds or other grounds; the fact that societies that pay no particular attention to religious values still acknowledge and cherish the ideas of—

Mr. Ruston: Are you free on Sunday?

Mr. Samis: – the importance of a day of rest, points to the idea that every society wants some sort of break from the usual routine. I'd point out that we must live in the most commercial, most exploitive, most ma-

terialistic society of any on the face of the human earth. We have more saturation advertising, more pressures towards commercialism, greed and materialism than most other societies in the world. When we turn on a television set, we can't watch a programme without being saturated with ads. We turn on the radio—except for that favourite institution of R. B. Bennett, the CBC—we're constantly bombarded with ads—

Mr. Ruston: On the socialistic TV and radio at public expense.

Mr. Samis: We read the newspapers, we can't escape—ads. We drive along our highways, whether it's in Ontario or any other province, we can't escape—ads. We take a subway train, we can't escape—ads. We sit on a bus, we can't escape—ads. We go to a hockey game, we can't escape—ads. Even if we go to a civic centre in a small community, we can't escape—ads. The time has come to say: Capitalism six days of the week we can take, but one day of rest we need.

Mr. Nixon: One day of socialism.

Mr. Bullbrook: Mr. Speaker would you permit an alleged point of order that might stretch your charity to let me advise you that a good friends of yours and mine, a former colleague of many of us, is sitting under your gallery—the mayor of Niagara Falls, George Bukator.

Hon. W. Newman: A very fine man. Fine man, especially after he gave up the Liberal Party.

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Speaker, my very brief comments on this bill.

On the side, I saw the Clerk of the House talking to George, no doubt getting some advice how to carry on this very difficult situation here. The new members may not know it, but Mr. Bukator was a thorn in the side of the government for many years as the Hydro critic. We're so pleased to have you here, George.

Mr. Speaker, the Solicitor General at long last is bringing this before the House—I'm glad to see the minister kicked upstairs—the bill is long overdue. I think your motivation is that it's politically expedient, or you wouldn't be bringing it in—the public wants it. The motivation might also be to help the small independent, fast becoming another endangered species. And if this is so, I suggest that we're not correcting it by allowing Becker's Milk and Mac's Milk to run high, wide and handsome because in effect they have a blank cheque in this legislation.

How to solve it, I don't know. But I would like to suggest that somewhere along the line we should do as the member for Cornwall (Mr. Samis) recommends, and as they do in Quebec, that the small entrepreneurs, the small independents should be allowed to sell beer in grocery stores if we want to help the small guy out.

[8:30]

Mr. Samis: Now you're talking.

Mr. Moffatt: Nothing has changed, has it, Mr. Bukator?

Mr. Sargent: I don't know how we are going to correct the fact that the large chains like Becker and Mac's, which are certainly not small operations; Silverwood's owns Mac's, I believe—

Mr. Nixon: Gordon Carton runs them.

Mr. Sargent: —being given a blank cheque in this legislation. How do we get around this? The convenience store business is a must in our society, but to let these guys have the whole ball game to themselves is not the answer, unless we can say to the small entrepreneur, the small independent, "We, the government of Ontario, will allow you to sell beer in grocery stores but not in the supermarkets."

Mr. Nixon: Sounds like a good idea.

Interjections.

Mr. Sargent: I don't know what other contribution I can make, other than to say that it worries me to see us passing legislation giving a blank cheque to a couple of big chains.

Mr. Deans: I don't have many remarks to make with regard to the bill, but I do want to say two or three things that have been on my mind. They haven't been on my mind for a long time, frankly. Some of them came to my attention as a result of the efforts of the member for Riverdale (Mr. Renwick).

I don't know what it is that motivates the government. I find it difficult to understand exactly why the government does the things that it does. I don't know whether they do it because they believe in free enterprise or whether they do it because they are now moving slowly towards regulating society. But whatever motivates them to bring in this kind of legislation, frankly I think it's worthwhile.

I have always believed that no matter what one did to the retail hours, there were only so many dollars available to be spent in any

given period of time and because the public, generally speaking, purchase only those things that they required and would purchase them when the stores were open, would continue to spend the same number of dollars. If you were open six days a week, they would spend X dollars in six days. If you opened seven days a week, they would spend the same number of dollars; they would simply spend them in seven days. If you were open from 9 to 6, five days a week, they would probably spend them in five days. Therefore, we are not serving anyone well by opening up the retailing outlets more than is necessary.

I have travelled, perhaps not extensively, but I have travelled through some parts of the world, and I've got to tell you that there is a certain civilized feeling about the way other jurisdictions deal with the opening and closing of retail outlets. It goes beyond that, there is a certain civilized feeling about the way they deal with the distribution of the wholesale product in the community. So I've got to say that when I look at this legislation, I think it makes a lot of good sense that we should try to recognize at the outset that by closing on Sundays and holidays we will not in any way detrimentally affect the amounts of dollars that will be spent in the marketplace to purchase those things we should normally purchase.

If we start from that premise then we can move on, because I think that is the general concern of a great number of people who might oppose this kind of legislation. I think they might oppose it because they feel that somehow or other they are not going to get their share of the consumer dollar. I want to set their mind at ease. I don't think that a year from now, when we look back, we'll find that there are any fewer consumer dollars being spent in the province. I think we will probably find that there are as many, maybe even more consumer dollars being spent, but certainly no fewer.

I also think it makes some sense to standardize the week. I realize that there are pressures to find ways to accommodate a number of groups, and I fully appreciate the difficulties that they might encounter. Nevertheless, it's not on the basis of who can purchase when, but rather that the business, the retailing of produce and products has to be conducted to satisfy consumer demand, and consumer demand will be satisfied if people are able to buy six out of seven days. There's something about having a day when nothing happens, or virtually nothing happens in retail trade.

My colleague, the member for Cornwall, was mentioning the general feeling of the California syndrome. In Hamilton we have two or three developments that don't please me. There's a couple of the large food outlets which are now open 24 hours a day, seven days a week. One of them, for the benefit of my hon. friend, who lives in Burlington but who represents Hamilton West, is at the corner of Upper Wellington St. and Mohawk Rd. It's open 24 hours a day. I know they don't have these things in Burlington, so I wanted to bring it to his attention in case he wants to shop in Hamilton.

Mr. Cunningham: That's another riding.

Mr. Deans: No, it is mine. The member would probably learn too if he found out where the boundaries were.

I want to tell you that I don't think it's necessary. In fact I don't even think it is desirable. And so what's being proposed at this point is generally acceptable to us—although we might want to amend it to bring it even more into conformity with what we think is desirable in terms of public acceptance over the long haul.

Let me tell you about one point; I want to dwell on it for a minute. The Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations (Mr. Handleman), in an interjection this afternoon, made the point that Labour Day wasn't a holiday. I want to share with you some of the background to it, because I think at the end of this you'll probably agree with me that it's a bit of a slur, a slight. It might even be considered an outright affront on the part of this government to put in under section 1(a), "the first Monday in September."

Hon. Mr. Handleman: I am on the member's side—just show me where it is.

Mr. Deans: I'm going to tell the minister in a minute.

Mr. Moffatt: Keep listening.

Mr. Deans: I find this government can't seem to draw itself out from the 1800s. Maybe it's something to do with the general approach of the government toward people who are in the labouring force. But they can find a way to set out that New Year's Day should be a holiday. They can find a way to set out that Good Friday should be a holiday—

Mr. Sargent: Are you for it or against it?

Mr. Deans: —that Dominion Day should be a holiday—

Mr. Moffatt: Take your pick.

Mr. Deans: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if you would tell that gentleman sitting in the gallery that he ought not to interject.

Interjections.

Mr. Deans: —that Christmas Day should be a holiday; that Victoria Day should be a holiday; that Thanksgiving Day should be a holiday; that Sunday should be a holiday. But somehow or other they can't bring themselves to say that Labour Day should be a holiday.

Interjections.

Mr. Deans: Why didn't the current Solicitor General, who previously pretended to represent Labour in some form or other; why is it that he couldn't bring himself to say that section 4 should say "Labour Day"?

Hon. Mr. MacBeth: We wanted it to be known as the Deans' amendment.

Mr. Deans: I want to help the minister—

Hon. Mr. Handleman: How about May Day?

Mr. Deans: I want to help the minister to justify the position that he inevitably must take. I don't want him to think that he's going to do it without good and solid justification. I want to read to you from a book that's in the library, for those members who know where the library is. It's not far from the washroom, I might tell the member for Hamilton West (Mr. S. Smith).

Mr. Shore: Why don't you take him out and show him?

Mr. Good: Right near the fire hydrant.

Mr. Deans: I say that because the member for Hamilton West in the paper indicated that he didn't find, and didn't know, where the washroom was and I didn't want him to feel that he couldn't find the library.

In a book called, "High Days and Holidays in Canada"—

Mr. Good: Right near the fire hydrant.

Mr. Deans: —it says in chapter 9—September—to be found on page 57 of the book: "In Canada and the United States Labour Day is celebrated on the first Monday in September."

Interjections.

Mr. Deans: It says:

> In Canada, the provinces of Ontario, Nova Scotia, New Brunswick, Manitoba, Alberta, Saskatchewan and the Yukon observe it by law [would you believe] while Quebec, Prince Edward Island and British Columbia observe it by proclamation.

Mr. Peterson: I am glad we got that straightened out.

Mr. Deans: Let me, for the benefit of the Liberal members who have difficulty identifying labour from anything else, point out to them that Labour Day has no connection, as some believe, with the older May Day. No connection. Just so you understand that, because I realize not many of you have any knowledge of these things.

Mr. Speaker: Will the member for Wentworth address his remarks to the Chair, please?

Mr. Deans: Mr. Speaker, you know me well enough to know that everything I say from this point on, whether or not I—

Mr. Ruston: He knows you too well, that is the trouble.

Mr. Deans: —specifically mention you, is addressed through the Chair.

Mr. Speaker: I appreciate that.

Mr. S. Smith: The member speaks through the Chair and through his hat.

Interjections.

Mr. Deans: It says, in fact:

> The first proposal of a Labour Day was made by Peter J. McQuire in 1882 when he was the president of the United Brotherhood of Carpenters and Joiners of America, one of the leaders of the Knights of Labour. In Canada, Labour Day was made a statutory holiday by Act of Parliament on July 23, 1894.

It has been around a while. It is not something new. I can appreciate the Solicitor General (Mr. MacBeth) with very little background in labour might have missed it and I can fully understand that the Liberals wouldn't have appreciated it, but I want to tell you that it is a fact. In Canada, Labour Day has been a statutory holiday since 1894 and it seems a shame that somehow or other this government has missed the point and missed understanding the important part that Labour Day has played in the social order of the country.

Hon. Mr. Kerr: He agrees to change it.

Mr. Lewis: Has he conceded? Is he prepared to stand up and repent?

Hon. Mr. MacBeth: Mr. Speaker, I repent.

Mr. Deans: I want to know before I go any further: Is the minister going to change the bill?

Hon. Mr. MacBeth: May I interject, Mr. Speaker? With the member's help we will change the bill.

Mr. Deans: I want the minister to realize before he changes it that the Liberals will likely oppose it.

Mr. Sargent: If the member will sit down now, he will fix it up.

Mr. Deans: But that is because they don't understand. But I will tell you what I will do. Rather than take the time of the House to explain all the background—which now the minister and I and a number of us on this side appreciate and understand—

Interjection.

Mr. Deans: —I am prepared to duplicate the information that I have and to make it available to the Liberal caucus so that they can fully understand the importance of Labour Day too.

Mr. Ruston: Did you ever have a Labour Day, Ian?

Mr. Speaker: It is my pleasure to be able to recognize the member for Armourdale.

Mr. Givens: I simply want to address myself to the one question, not of materialism or commercialism or greed, but the one question of minority religious rights. I am very surprised that this minister, the Solicitor General, knowing of his general fair mindedness, should take the attitude: "Go away, boy, you are bothering me; sorry, this bill is so neat and so tidy"; when it happens to be so shot through with exemptions present and exemptions which will be coming in the future. I am surprised that there is nothing he can do about it to accommodate the people of minority religious rights.

I make a plea for the people in my riding, particularly the Seventh Day Adventists, because they have a general hospital on the border of my riding, Branson Hospital; and for the people of the Jewish faith who genuinely and sincerely spend their Sabbath Day on Saturday in observation, contemplation and prayers. They feel that it is a very serious disability, and a very serious imposition on them, if they cannot keep their businesses open, particularly on Sunday.

[8:45]

I'm very surprised because the consideration for minorities' religious rights in this country have been generally observed with a great deal of sensitivity and understanding and compassion. I remember when, after the federal election, the Prime Minister of this country announced that the Parliament of Canada would open on a certain day and a certain date. He was informed that that day would be the Jewish Day of Atonement, after he made the announcement to the country. Because he thought it would embarrass the chief justice of this country, who was then standing in for the Governor General, and a handful of members of Parliament because of their faith, he changed that day.

Indeed, in the last provincial election it came to the attention of the Premier of this province (Mr. Davis) that one of the polling days of the advanced poll was going to fall on the Day of Atonement. The Premier went to the trouble of instructing the clerk of this House—or the chief electoral officer, I don't know who it was—to designate an additional day which would only affect a handful of people. He was understanding, sensitive and mindful of the fact that it would impinge on the minority religious rights of a certain number of people, so he changed that day.

Consequently, I find it incredible that the Solicitor General should take the position, having regard for the fact that this bill impinges on the rights of minority groups—a bill which is already shot through with exemptions and will continue to be shot through with exemptions by its very composition—that he cannot make allowances for these people; these observant people who are genuinely and sincerely affected by this bill. It will not change the pith and substance of this bill one iota to take their problems into consideration.

I say that it is a paradox that this statute—and you may stand on your head and wiggle your ears—is a secular statute and has nothing to do with a religious observance. The fact of the matter is that, originally, this statute, this observance of Sunday, was based on religious principles. Should this statute, which was originally founded on religious principles, cause a disability to the people who are minority religious believers?

It is also ironic to me that this statute should cause a disability to people who, 3,500 years ago, gave to the world the concept of the day of Sabbath rest. That they should be

the ones who are penalized by this kind of situation seems to me ironic.

The kind of bill which permits people to go to a burlesque show and watch Cupcakes Cassidy twirl her tassels cannot make an exemption for people of minority religious beliefs? They spend their Sabbath Day in contemplation and prayer so that they can keep their small businesses open on Sunday. It would be a terrible impingement on their economic ability to function as business people. I suggest, with great respect, that this is unfair. This is wrong. This is inequitable. So that the Solicitor General must see to it that this exemption is made I will either make an amendment at the proper time or I will support the amendment of my friend from Wilson Heights. I appeal to the Solicitor General to see to it that this amendment is embodied when this bill is passed.

Mr. Lewis: How can it be ultra vires?

Mr. Grossman: Mr. Speaker, may I first say that I think the Solicitor General made it fairly clear in his presentation that this bill does not carry with it those overtones which I hear creeping around this chamber, not one whit.

Mr. Lewis: Of course they do.

Mr. Grossman: They absolutely do not. Anyone who has read the report on Sunday observance legislation prepared for the Ontario Law Reform Commission, will see a long, well-reasoned explanation set out in chapter 16 thereto, which I may say I personally do not agree with, I don't buy. It has nothing to do with the riding I represent any more than your position would have to do with any other political overtones or connotations. I don't agree with chapter 16. I would hope that this committee, if it still goes to committee, succeeds in finding a way around this very difficult problem.

Mr. Lewis: It is not difficult. It is a question of minority rights.

Mr. Grossman: I would point out that 25 states in the United States have similar legislation and they have found exemptions. They have found a way around this problem. Indeed the Crathorne report presented in the United Kingdom, in 1964—which for those who will go to the library to pull it out is also known as the Report of the Departmental Committee on the Law on Sunday Observance—I suggest is quite appropriate for our present circumstances, reads at paragraph 199 as follows:

> Section 53 of the 1950 Act makes special provisions for shopkeepers who observe the Jewish Sabbath; e.g. persons of the Jewish religion or Seventh Day Adventists. After making a statutory declaration that he objects on religious grounds to trading on the Jewish Sabbath, the shopkeeper is entitled to have the shop registered by the local authority. He must then keep the shop and any other shop he occupies closed for all purposes connected with trade or business on Saturday.
>
> But he is free to keep the shop open on Sunday until 2 p.m. for any transactions; and, of course, to any hours for the transactions listed in schedule 5.

The details of schedule 5 really aren't relevant here.

> Similarly, section 62 allows a licensed kosher butcher to trade on Sunday provided that he does not trade on Saturday.

Paragraph 200 continues:

> The Board of Deputies of British Jews told us that as far as they had been able to ascertain these provisions worked satisfactorily. The British Union of Seventh Day Adventists thought that it was wrong to legislate on purely religious matters, but if legislation was considered necessary for the protection of the leisure and recreation of workers, provision should be made for all those whose religions demanded observance of a day other than Sunday.

The point I want to make, Mr. Speaker, is that other jurisdictions—indeed England—have found a way around this problem and also 25 states of the union. I would particularly commend to the minister those provisions in the state of Connecticut. These provisions find a way to solve this problem without defeating the purpose of the Act.

There are problems. It isn't quite as simple as that and it doesn't carry all the overtones —none of the overtones indeed—that my friends opposite would imply.

One of the ways to get around this, may I suggest, is to talk only about individuals. It would be difficult for me to imagine a religious exemption for corporations. One of the things the committee might deal with is granting such an exemption to individuals who can raise, on these grounds set out in any of the 25 states and the Crathorne report, those religious objections which would wreak a hardship; that is if the committee were unsuccessful in finding a way around this legislation.

I specifically want to draw the attention of the House to the fact that the very esteemed counsels who prepared the report on Sun-

day observance legislation for the Ontario Law Reform Commission dwelt at length on this problem.

Mr. Lewis: They were wrong.

Mr. Grossman: They were wrong, but I want to make clear to this House that it is equally wrong to leave any impression whatsoever that the bill as proposed by the minister has any overtones, any touches of irony to which the member for Armourdale (Mr. Givens) referred. In view of the history—

Mr. Renwick: It doesn't have any overtones; it just has clear exemptions.

Mr. Lewis: What does the member mean—by irony or overtones? What is he trying to say?

Mr. Grossman: Irony was the word used by the member for Armourdale. I want to dispel any suggestion for it.

Mr. Lewis: He said it was ironic that; he didn't say the bill contained irony.

Mr. Grossman: Those words irony and ironical set out in Hansard may leave some sort of impression at some later date to those who have not had the benefit of this discussion here this evening in person. That's all I wanted to clear up.

The fact is that the problems inherent in this type of legislation were quite clearly set out by a very esteemed group. It need not carry any overtones of irony, certainly not for a government—

Mr. Renwick: The ministry missed the point.

Mr. Grossman: —that has taken the care to see that for the last 20 years appropriate arrangements were made for non-persecution of those who found themselves in a religiously contradictory position in relation to the existing legislation. As one of those members on this side of the House who looks forward to the success of the committee in finding a way around this difficult problem, I do want to dispel any suggestion that there is any irony, anything untoward or any lack of respect or understanding for the basis religious problems here. There is only an appreciation of the difficulties which we can perhaps surmount in finding a way around this problem—

Mr. Lewis: Well then, why didn't the member surmount it before the bill came in? Why didn't he do it in his party's caucus?

Mr. Renwick: It's not that difficult.

Mr. Grossman: —without defeating the purpose of this Act. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Nixon: Mr. Speaker, in answer to the comments made by the hon. member who has just resumed his seat, there is a very clear amendment that can be brought forward for those people compelled by conscientious objection, religious or otherwise. They can be granted an exemption. I don't believe there is any problem at all in the membership of this House granting that by amendment to this bill.

I would trust that when the amendment is brought forward, perhaps even by the Solicitor General or by some other member of the House, it will gain support on all sides and solve the problem that has been put before us, on the debate on the bill.

There is an obvious solution, and as a matter of fact, we have used a similar solution under other circumstances. I think it had to do with the compulsory check-off of union dues. An amendment was brought forward to exempt individuals who can prove a conscientious objection under those circumstances. The amendment passed the Legislature without unanimous support, but it passed all the same. It will be interesting to see, when a similar amendment under these circumstances is brought before us, where the support does come from. I think most members of the House, responding to their own conscience, will be prepared to support an exemption.

It's true that it will be difficult to enforce in a fair and equitable way, just as the provisions of the bill as it is presently before us will be difficult to enforce. We have had laws prohibiting Sunday commerce for many years and it was in the very enforcement of those laws, which was a provincial responsibility and has always been, that we ran into the difficulty. It is surely going to be the initiative and the concentration of the Solicitor General that will make the law work or make it become just another superfluous piece of legislation. It will depend upon the attitude and the enforcement capabilities of the government in this regard.

There's no doubt in my mind that an objection raised on behalf of individuals—not corporations but individuals—can surely be accommodated by a bill that passes through this House.

I was interested in listening to the member for Wentworth (Mr. Deans). I'm always interested in his comments. I do not believe that the problems the government had in

bringing forward the legislation had to do with the possible reduction in gross sales. I think that most of us understand that many people in the province want to shop whenever they want, to get the family together and go out in the car to the local shopping plaza, whether it's late at night or Sunday or any other day. I think all of us are aware of this feeling. My own family considers it quite an outing indeed, particularly if I'm along, with my pocketbook.

Interjections.

Mr. Nixon: You begin by buying a pound of bridge mix and go up and down the aisles ruining your dietary consumption. In fact there isn't much purchasing done, but there's lots of comment and it's a family outing. Certainly in our community, and I'm sure in everyone else's, this has replaced many other activities and in the long run it probably is a little cheaper and is a family activity which is well respected.

[9:00]

We are prepared, and I think it has already been expressed by my colleagues, to support the principle of the bill. We believe, particularly in these times when we are concerned with the cost of living and inflation, that there would be ample justification to extend the provisions of this bill to the regulation and control of store hours through the week.

Obviously this would not be popular in all areas but the justification, as far as I am concerned, is that it should effectively reduce at least a part of the overhead that small businessmen and even big businessmen are having to pay to keep their stores open longer hours to meet what I consider to be the ridiculous competition which led A & P, I believe and perhaps one or two of the other food markets, to say they were going to stay open 24-hours-a-day, seven-days-a-week. They may think they are providing a service. I was interested to note one of the spokesmen for A & P, I think, said they didn't want to do it but they were forced to do it by competition.

Surely that is where the authority and the power of this Legislature can be brought into play. We can, by Act of this Legislature, control that sort of mindless competition which does nothing but add to the overhead which appears in the price tag the consumers pay. The one rational justification for controlling store hours during the week is to reduce this overhead based on mindless competition.

I wish personally that the government had moved much more dramatically to regulate store hours. I think it has already been put before you, Mr. Speaker, that some municipal jurisdictions have done this very effectively. Probably the city of Hamilton is the best example. It's been done in Quebec. The member for Cornwall, to whom I always listen with a great deal of interest as he pushes his main theme of beer in grocery stores—which I support as well—

Interjections.

Mr. Samis: We won him over. Congratulations.

Mr. Nixon: There are these alternatives available to us. I would say to the government, and I suppose to the Solicitor General who is the author of this piece of legislation, that if he were to move toward the regulation of store hours it would gain the support of members on all sides, as long as he could convince some of his colleagues to do that.

They've been fooling around with this for weeks, months, years, indicating to businessmen who want some sort of regulation that they are contemplating it. The former Solicitor General was going to be sent on an extensive tour around the province to listen to the objections of businessmen and consumers, and this he did at great length. He presented to us a green paper in which 47 alternatives were offered. The government, I suppose, because of a slip of the tongue of the former Sunday school teacher from Brampton—I am a former Sunday school teacher from Brant—

Hon. Mr. Davis. That's good news. It's nice to meet you.

Mr. Nixon: The Premier is going to join the debate. Isn't this great. We have that one thing in common.

Hon. Mr. Davis: There was a day when we had more.

Mr. Nixon: It really is ridiculous when we think of the time, the debate and the money spent by the Tories in trying to do the thing which they would find most popular and which would lose them the fewest votes. I suppose this is it.

By presenting this non-secular piece of legislation—I think that's the phrase the minister used on a number of occasions—they have probably touched a certain series of nerve endings which make this one of the least offensive pieces of legislation they could bring forward in this particular important

policy field. As for me and my colleagues, I would have preferred it if they had brought forward a fuller system of regulation of store hours. I have said the justification in this regard would be the reduction of overhead and doing something for the consumers along the lines of what is so popular in these days of inflation.

We intend to support the principle of the bill and, Mr. Speaker, you've already had notice that we intend to present an amendment which will give those people who object on conscientious grounds, particularly religious grounds, the alternative which we believe this bill must encompass. When the amendment is put forward we can count on the conscientious support of all thinking members.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: How about the employees of one of those conscientious objectors?

Mr. Nixon: Vote against the amendment.

Hon. Mr. McMurtry: Mr. Speaker, on a point of privilege: I regret I was able to hear only the last few minutes of the remarks by my friend, the hon. member for Armourdale, but it would appear it was suggested or I heard his suggestion or he attempted to attribute to the government of which I am proud to be a member, a deliberate intention to discriminate against minority groups.

Mr. Nixon: Nothing could be further from the truth.

Hon. Mr. McMurtry: I trust I misunderstood the purport of his remarks—

Mr. Givens: On a point of privilege, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: I am hearing one point of privilege. At least it was called a point of privilege at the beginning.

Mr. Nixon: He's making a speech.

Mr. Speaker: We will proceed, then I will hear you.

An hon. member: Don't give him the floor.

Interjections.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Hon. Mr. McMurtry: If my hon. friend from Armourdale will bear with me, the whole issue—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The hon. Attorney General—Order, please.

Interjections.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. May I determine if this is really a participation in the debate or is it a genuine point of privilege?

Hon. Mr. McMurtry: No—

Mr. Speaker: If you wsh to participate in the debate, that's one matter. It can't be called a point of privilege or order as the case may be.

Mr. Nixon: That's right. Let him get up and make a speech.

Hon. Mr. McMurtry: I am in your hands. It's a form of participation, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Good: It's actually only a point of view.

Hon. Mr. McMurtry: Yes and I think it's a point of view to which the member might listen.

Hon. Mr. Davis: As he should.

Mr. Good: Don't listen to the twisting done by the member for St. Andrew-St. Patrick.

Hon. Mr. McMurtry: It would appear from the concern expressed by my hon. friend from Armourdale that he did not wish to attribute any improper intent or intention to discriminate against a minority group. I think he would agree that if the public were to assume that's what he said, it would be accepted as a very irresponsible statement because it could only lead to the type of confrontation in the community that none of us in this House would desire.

At the same point I should like to say I share my hon. friend from Armourdale's concern with respect to certain minority groups. I think everything should be done to accommodate them, but at the same time I am sure he is aware of the very serious constitutional issues which can arise when the provincial government attempts to legislate with respect to religious holidays.

Notwithstanding that, I would like to say for the record that I share many of his concerns and as a member of the House I would like to do what I could to accommodate those concerns and find a way out.

Mr. Givens: On a point of personal privilege, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: On a point of privilege, the hon. member for Armourdale.

Mr. Givens: Mr. Speaker, I am glad the hon. Attorney General pointed out he heard the latter part of the remarks. I don't see how he could have construed the latter part of my remarks as indicating that I was saying the government has deliberately done this, as he said I had done. He might have construed some of the remarks of the hon. member for St. Andrew-St. Patrick who said I had said I was blaming the government for this.

As a matter of fact, to allay the fears of the hon. Attorney General, I praised the Premier for the fact that during the last election when he found out that one of the days of the advance poll had been on the Day of Atonement he went to the trouble of advising the chief electoral officer that this was so and they designated a special separate day on account of that. I said I couldn't understand why, since the Premier had done this—being as sensitive and Knowledgeable and concerned—

Interjections.

An hon. member: Don't overdo it.

Mr. Reid: I can see the ads in the next election.

Mr. Givens: Those are the words I used. Feeling the way he did, I said I couldn't understand why the Solicitor General, being as sensitive and considerate as he was, found he couldn't amend this Act—shot through with exemptions as it was—why he couldn't embody the changes necessary to comply with the appeal that I had made. So Mr. Attorney General, we are ad idem on this, and I don't see why you reached that misunderstanding. I would hate you to think that I had made this allegation, because I did not.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. There doesn't seem to have been a point of privilege. Though I believe there has been a good explanation given of the misunderstanding.

Any other members wish to comment on this? Does the hon. Leader of the Opposition wish to participate on second reading?

Mr. Lewis: Very briefly.

Mr. Reid: That's more than we usually get.

Mr. Nixon: And the fact is the Premier (Mr. Davis) needs two days for atonement.

Mr. Bullbrook: This whole debate is ironic.

Mr. Lewis: I am not really going to tell you anything, I just want to pay a brief homage to minority government. I am going to look around me in the chamber for a moment on this second reading and note the number of cabinet participants. Those of us who have been in this House for 12 years or more are quite taken by this extraordinary assemblage. It is also worth noting—

Mr. Nixon: It is positively crowded.

Mr. Lewis: —that there is very little seating room left over there.

Mr. Nixon: Nothing on at the Albany Club tonight.

Mr. Speaker: Now are we going to get to the principle of the bill?

Mr. Reid: Not more than usual.

Mr. Lewis: I am directly on the principle of the bill, Mr. Speaker. As I understand it the bill has to do with atonement and redemption, and I sense that that is what is involved over here.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Atonement no, redemption yes.

Mr. Lewis: Speaking to the principle of the bill and knowing that some of its frailties will be dealt with in committee—and hoping that the uniform store hour aspect of it can also be dealt with—I want to say that it is a significant and important debate, I think, in that both the Attorney General in a fairly majestic way and the member for St. Andrew-St. Patrick (Mr. Grossman) in a very modest way, have indicated that the government intends to shift ground, which is a useful thing to do. I would suspect that it wouldn't be terribly difficult to draft an amendment which can be argued constitutionally, and can accommodate the anxieties expressed on all sides of the House so that they are resolved. That's the advantage of the forum as it now exists. And I would think that if the wording of the member for Wilson Heights (Mr. Singer) isn't adequate—although I have seen it and—

Mr. Bullbrook: Perish the thought.

Mr. Lewis: Perish the thought. It strikes me that it is pretty germane—maybe the law officers of the Crown can alter it. But it is clear now that the Legislature would like to correct the anomaly which exists and which makes certain minority groups anxious, and that we should simply get about it. The government should indicate its intention, when it comes to the committee, of pre-

senting an amendment to the appropriate clause all of us can support.

This wouldn't have happened one year ago, and I simply wanted to acknowledge that, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Hall: Mr. Speaker, the leader of the Liberal Party has made it quite clear, but I also wish to stress that I support this bill subject to vast improvement. The major pressure for the bill is the fact that chain stores have started to open on Sundays, and this is my prime concern. Stopping this practice before it starts should be the principal issue, and should be acted upon without delay, and should not be lost sight of.

However, with reference to section 3(2)(d), I feel a modification should be made. Canadian fresh fruit and vegetables—I have no sympathy for the imported tender fruit—should be sold at any time of the year that this fresh produce is available. Things are tough enough for our fruit growers, as the hon. member for Brock (Mr. Welch) is very well aware, without the further restriction of an Oct. 31 deadline. The climate has been particularly warm this fall, as you all realize, and fresh fruit and vegetables are still available well into November. I don't think this point should be overlooked.

Mr. Speaker: Does the hon. Minister of the Environment wish to speak?

Mr. Bullbrook: You bet your life.

Hon. Mr. Kerr: Mr. Speaker, I would just like to add a few words to this debate because I've had some involvement in this subject the last few months.

Mr. Bullbrook: To the tune of what, $80,000?

[9:15]

Hon. Mr. Kerr: Without being repetitious I would just like to deal with some of the points that have been raised this evening. One has been that the bill should have included some reference and some provision for uniform hours during the full week. One of the things that we found in our public meetings that were held in various parts of the province was that this was a very controversial part of this whole subject.

Opinion was just about evenly divided as to whether or not stores should be open two nights a week or more, and as a result of these hearings we concluded that Ontario was not a province with uniform shopping habits. There were some parts of the province, for example, where stores would be open one night a week, they may be closed all day Monday, or closed on a Wednesday afternoon or two nights. In some areas, particularly in areas such as Thunder Bay, the stores were open five or six nights a week.

Bringing in legislation along the lines advocated by the PUSH groups would mean we would have to legislate in a way that would close a number of these stores and this could mean, of course, that a number of people would be put out of work, particularly part-time employees, married women and students, who did, in fact, take advantage of shopping hours in the evening and were employed during that period of the day.

As I say, while there is little controversy, little divergence of opinion as far as a pause day during the week is concerned, there was a substantial division of opinion as far as uniform store hours were concerned.

One of the hon. members mentioned Quebec—I believe it was the member for Cornwall (Mr. Samis)—and I just might mention that legislation was brought in in that province which could be considered uniform store hours legislation some six or seven years ago. At that time, in most parts of the province, stores were only open one or two nights a week. I would think the exception would be stores on the island of Montreal, but for the most part in the other parts of the province store hours were regulated at the municipal level, and as a result the maximum number of evening openings for the greatest part of that province was two nights a week. So there was really little difficulty in the provincial government bringing in legislation that restricted evening shopping hours.

As I say, the situation is different in Ontario. In Metropolitan Toronto, for example, where you have a number of shopping plazas surrounding this whole metropolitan area where stores are, in fact, open six evenings a week, if we brought in legislation it would, of course, substantially affect the operation of those stores.

If the hon. members will refer to the green paper, they will see that one of the options is that the municipalities themselves, reflecting the habits of their consumers and of the stores, could, in fact, regulate store hours during the week. This has been done in the Hamilton area and with some success, although there are some of the larger chains and supermarkets who are attempting to stay open more than two nights a week. But it has, for the most part, been successful, particularly in other areas such as Stoney Creek and Dundas and Burlington. That is one of the reasons why we have brought in this legisla-

tion as it is, and I am sure that at some other time you will have to deal with the question of uniform store hours.

The other point I would like to mention, which has also been touched on this evening, is that we have drafted this bill in a way that it doesn't have religious connotations.

Mr. Sargent: What took you so long?

Hon. Mr. Kerr: I won't be too long.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: Eddie, are you still in the House?

Mr. Sargent: I get paid for this.

Hon. Mr. Davis: When did you realize that?

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: He is being overpaid.

Hon. Mr. Kerr: We are talking about a pause day. We are talking about making it possible for families to be together, as employees who normally have been required to work on Sunday will have a holiday. That is the main purpose of this legislation. That has been the sort of the appeal that I have had in my mail during the last year or so. It is not necessarily for religious beliefs, but mainly so that they can have at least one day in the week that they can count on to be with their families. Although there has been discussion on that—the hon. member for Armourdale (Mr. Givens) has talked about this as well as the hon. member for St. Andrew-St. Patrick (Mr. Grossman)—if we expand the bill and amend the bill, as has been suggested, I think we must make sure that our legislation is intra vires the province. The Law Reform Commission dealt with this subject—

Mr. Bullbrook: Why must you be sure of that?

Hon. Mr. Kerr: Because the provincial government can't deal with legislation dealing with religion.

Mr. Bullbrook: Why must you make sure of it? That's what you have courts for.

Hon. Mr. Kerr: We want the bill to stand. We want the bill to be constitutional. We don't want the bill to be defeated if it's challenged in court.

Mr. Bullbrook: Are you convinced it is unconstitutional because that isn't what the Attorney General (Mr. McMurtry) said?

Hon. Mr. Kerr: The Attorney General expressed the same concern. I think that before this matter is discussed in committee, the law officers of the Crown must make sure that any amendments proposed along this line are in fact consitutional. I would welcome the change if it is constitutional.

Mr. Bullbrook: There is only one tribunal that can make sure of that.

Hon. Mr. Kerr: If you'll notice, the legislation, in the way it's drafted, avoids religious reference. It is a pause day; we are dealing with holidays. It is secular statute. It is not based on religious principles. If, as I say, it can be amended properly, then certainly I personally would favour such an amendment.

I haven't anything further to say. There have been some objections to this legislation, as reflected in the mail recently and in newspapers, particularly letters to the editor. But I think it's important, first of all, to note the rather generous exemptions that are available in the legislation and also to realize that one of the main reasons for bringing in this legislation is that we have a law at present that is archaic. It's not working; the fines aren't adequate. Efforts to ask the federal government to amend the legislation to increase fines have up to now failed. There is really no other alternative. If we're going to stop the elimination of at least one pause day in the province, it is important that the province itself bring in such legislation.

Mr. Bullbrook: I would like to address just a few comments. I hadn't intended to join in the debate because I had made my views known in the caucus. I recognize that my attitude and I think the attitude exemplified by the council of the city of Sarnia is coloured by its environment and mine. Because I'm so close to that great republic, the United States of America and their completely open Sunday, it doesn't take long for one to recognize the need for a day of pause.

Frankly, I compliment the Minister of the Environment (Mr. Kerr) on joining the debate. It's a happy circumstance we have here tonight, as others have mentioned, to have the Premier here and to have the Premier in the estimates committee this afternoon. This is a new exercise on our part and on his, and I compliment him for it. But to get to the point. One issue on which we're all of one mind is the question of the social need, as we see it, of structuring society for a day of pause. That's a simple one, and the only one the government comes to grips with.

I thought the question of uniform store hours might in your mind be out of order in connection with this debate. But that's a difficult one to come to. It's interesting to note that the Minister of the Environment who had been vested with the responsibility of

going throughout the province, listening to the people's response to these matters, publishing a green paper for our edification and understanding, says, in effect, that we can't govern in this respect.

He says it was easy for the Province of Quebec because basically there was uniformity there. I answer that in this respect—that's what government's all about. We don't rationalize our position by saying scattered throughout this metropolitan area are many shopping plazas which stay open six nights a week. If the government comes to a conclusion that it's in the best interests of the people who work in those stores, it's in the best interests in the long run of the proprietors of those stores, and it's in the best interests of society as a whole—as I think the minister did in his green paper; he did conclude there should be uniform store hours—then government has to do this—it has to govern.

It has to accept that responsibility and say, "We've come to this conclusion: On balance, the priority is this; these are the store hours." It makes that judgement. That's the first thing.

More important to me is this: I have grave reservations about the ability to draft an amendment which meets the objections of my colleagues from Wilson Heights (Mr. Singer) and Armourdale (Mr. Givens). I evince this to members. I have grave reservations about this, drafting an amendment which will not emasculate the intention of the statute. That's what concerns me, but I want to tell the minister this. I'm absolutely convinced after hearing the debate that the majority of the members in this House wish us to attempt so to do.

I'm absolutely convinced, I say to the Premier (Mr. Davis) and the Solicitor General (Mr. MacBeth), that the answer can't be the question of whether or not it's constitutional. It's not up to us, having regard to what we think the social impact is, to escape and abandon our responsibility by saying we believe it to be unconstitutional.

Let someone undertake, if they wish, the responsibility of having a court come to that conclusion because that is the tribunal which must make the ultimate conclusion. I invite the government to consider who would undertake to take to court the business person legitimately undertaking his or her religious responsibility on the Jewish Sabbath and opening on Sunday? I invite members to consider who is going to take that lady to court. Notwithstanding whether or not she is taken I say let us not make the judgement.

Let's sincerely attempt to draft an amendment with those people who have the sincere motivation, that integrity of purpose they feel for themselves, and understandably so. Let's take the chance that somebody might find it to be unconstitutional.

Mr. Renwick: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to make two or three observations on the bill. One comment relates to the matter which has preoccupied us for the last hour in the assembly, and there are two others. Let me make the two others first of all. It's very seldom that the member for Grey-Bruce (Mr. Sargent) and I talk about the same thing in the same language but I am equally concerned about the problem of Mac's Milk and Becker's.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: Do you use four-letter words?

Mr. Renwick: It's partly because of the default of the government that I am so concerned. What we're really talking about is store hours and we've said we are going to close the large stores and allow the small ones to keep open. I think that's what the bill is about. We have to be somewhat arbitrary in the criteria by which we decide what is large and what is small in relation to so-called convenience sales of foodstuffs and other ancillary items of merchandise. We automatically run into problems every time we are arbitrary.

What the government has done in being arbitrary with respect to Becker's and Mac's Milk is, of course, allow a large organization —a large corporate institution—under the guise of franchise arrangements to make a profit at the expense of the other large operations. It's just that simple. Of course, the default is that the government would not and has not and apparently will not bring in to the Legislature an adequate franchise bill which will make certain that the operators of the Mac's Milk stores and the Becker's stores and similar franchise stores will have a fair shake; and which will not necessarily allow those small operators, all of whom we now agree must remain open, to be used by a large corporate organization to make a substantial profit when what you're talking about is to protect the small businessman and the small person.

[9:30]

You know as well as I do that if you're going to allow the traditional so-called corner store, variety store or food store to remain open in the sense that it's a family store, then to the extent that the Mac's and Becker's

stores are, in a large sense, family stores operated long hours, usually by a family unit, you're allowing Mac's Milk, Silverwood's and the owners of those big chains to have, if one could use a capitalist phrase, an unfair competitive advantage.

I don't think the government can deal in isolation at any time on a bill such as this. The former Solicitor General, the present Minister of the Environment (Mr. Kerr), tried desperately to indicate that yes, you can. You can isolate it away from all of the other statutes. You can't do that and I would want a commitment from the government, presumably through the minister who is responsible for this bill, that a franchise bill will be introduced that will be fair to the franchiser and fair to the franchisee.

Hon. Mr. Kerr: The local entrepreneur?

Mr. Renwick: Don't be the spoiler. Don't let the Minister of the Environment be the spoiler by dropping across the floor specious solutions to real problems. This is a real problem.

Hon. Mr. Kerr: That's the trouble with this bill.

Mr. Renwick: You know as well as I do that Silverwood's, which owns Mac's Milk, is going to reap substantial profits because Mac's Milk stores, under this dispensation, are going to be allowed to remain open. You've got to deal with that in accordance with the recommendations of the franchising committee, the minister's committee, his predecessor's committee, which sat many years ago, the Grange committee. That has to be done because, otherwise, you're not going to get equity in this situation.

The second matter to which I want to refer is a little-known bill in the Legislature. I don't pretend that I know the ramifications between this bill, the employment standards bill and other bills. But there is on the statutes of the Province of Ontario a one-day's-rest-in-seven bill. That says: "Persons who are in the hotel and restaurant business as employees must, by law, be given one day out of seven as a rest day." It doesn't select a day but it imposes that obligation.

I would suggest to the Solicitor General and I would suggest to the Minister of Labour (B. Stephenson) that they should look at that bill to determine whether or not the ambit of that bill should be extended to cover those employees who are going to be engaged in these exempted institutions which might very well be operating with a limited number of employees seven days a week around the clock. I think that is essential and I think it's important. Otherwise I don't think the one-day's-rest-in-seven bill has any real relevance to the way in which the government has decided to deal with this question.

When you come to the question of whether this is a secular bill or not a secular bill, you're talking in language which is almost dead in Ontario. If you're talking about a secular bill because you've found the lowest common denominator on which you think the largest number of people could agree, that's all right. But that means there are always going to be people who are going to be hurt. This is a government which has talked for a long time about a multicultural society. The facts of the matter are, regardless of what the government says, that it is a multicultural society. That's the kind of society which we have built. As soon as you use the word "culture" you bring into play religious observance; the whole of the cultural tradition which is involved in it.

My colleague, the member for Wentworth (Mr. Deans), spoke today about Labour Day. It's not the first Monday in September. It is part of the cultural mosaic of this province that there is something called Labour Day which recognizes the historical fight by the working people in the province to establish the proposition that to organize as a trade union was not a criminal conspiracy. That's where the origin of the matter is. So you're talking about a multicultural society with many strands in it.

It's not the intention, as I understand it, either by the government speakers or by the members of the Liberal Party or by the members of this party to talk about trying to discriminate. They have been led by the red herring of this term "secular" to present a problem as though it were an insurmountable problem. No one is saying that they are going to allow a large organization, because it is owned by persons who have a particular cultural tradition, to remain open. What you are talking about is a small area between the permitted exceptions, under the bill, of the three employees and the 2,400 sq ft, and a somewhat larger expansion of those limitations to bring into account in particular and special circumstances, cultural or religious or whatever observances which are part of the cultural—I hate to use the term, it is such a degraded and debased term from what it was originally meant to mean—the cultural mosaic of the province.

I think it is quite clear that nobody has any political hate by fighting the issue. The fact of the matter is that it is within the wit and the capacity of the advisers to the minister, the advisers of the Attorney General (Mr. McMurtry) and the members of this assembly to produce the kind of legislation which will, in fact, admit what must be a recognized and necessary further extension of the exemption.

How it can be done, there are probably any number of ways, no one of which will be perfect. But this is certainly not a situation where even the Treasurer (Mr. McKeough) could call it a constitutional quibble. If there has ever been an area of legislation under the constitution where the federal government is quite happy to give way to the provincial jurisdiction it is under the Lord's Day or religious observance provisions of the constitution. That is why we have the Lord's Day (Canada) Act and we have the Lord's Day (Ontario) Act—which is a godsend for lawyers because no two lawyers could possibly make the provisions of either one of them jibe in any constitutional issue.

As my friend, the member for Sarnia (Mr. Bullbrook) says, we are not the ones who have to decide the constitutional question. Let's do it to the best of our ability and let the courts resolve the problem, should anybody be foolhardy enough to think that they are going to get a very welcome reception in the courts if they raise that kind of issue as a constitutional problem.

In summary, I say to the government, as has been pointed out, that you can't isolate this matter into something called a day of pause or a day of rest. Our society is much too complicated. You have selected the simplistic issue. There are many other aspects that you have got to deal with. I happen to have added my comments to the one which has preoccupied the assembly but I would draw again to the attention of the appropriate ministers, the requirement to look at the one-day's-rest-in-seven Act with respect to the exempted businesses, and for the Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations (Mr. Handleman) to look at the question of an adequate franchising law which will protect the operators of what we are recognizing in this bill—something called small family retail businesses, shaped and disguished as franchisees of large retail organizations.

Mr. Reed: Colleagues of mine in the front bench have expressed far more eloquently than I will ever be capable of the position that we are taking on this matter. I would like to add my support for the necessity of this bill to go to standing committee and add my support in principle.

As a fledgling member, I wonder if you would permit me to make this one observation. Legislation of this kind was promised a year ago. Only now is it coming on the table, which only establishes what a good kick in the seat of the pants will do.

I have also, in a little bit of research on this subject, found a private member's bill that we presented in 1973 and another private member's bill for 1974—both of which supported the spirit of this legislation.

We are very glad that it is now being presented and that we will be able to discuss it, change it and improve it before it is made final.

Mr. McEwen: Mr. Speaker, I too would like to speak in support of the principle of this bill. I have received many letters from the constituents of Frontenac-Addington placing in the letters requests that I support such a bill. As in the past, I have always been favourable at looking at the requests of the silent majority. However, I do believe that the government has shown neglect in not providing for uniform store hours across the province.

I don't think it is possible to place this responsibility on any municipality, for the reason that it may be that one municipality will present proper legislation while their neighbourhood may be in opposition.

I think it is very wrong for the Solicitor General (Mr. MacBeth) to speak out and say that Ontario is not a province ready for uniform store hours at this time. The situation is not different in Ontario, it is not different in Toronto, it is just that they have it. The Solicitor General should not suggest that this legislation should be forthcoming some other time. I believe is a neglect of duty for him to make a comment such as that at this time when we are discussing such an important issue.

If we go back a number of years ago, business was operated with uniform store hours satisfactory to all. It operated on a six-day week. Closing was approximately 6 p.m. every night, with a half-day closing at mid-week. But the large shopping centres and supermarkets came into being and they asked the municipalities to set aside the bylaws restricting the hours of operation for business. Now, once again these large corporations have come in and brought into being the operation of business seven days, seven nights. Again, this is interfering.

I'm speaking mainly on behalf of the small businessman, the small store operation. Squeezing out the small operator eliminates competition for the large corporations. Two previous speakers tonight spoke about Becker's and Mac's Milk, and I question the principle of the bill in allowing independent or corner store businesses of less than 2,400 sq ft to remain open on Sunday.

It is a know fact that Becker's and Mac's are really large corporations. They are not independent small corner store operations. The rents that are being paid by these people for the small locations range anywhere from $10,000 to $15,000 to $20,000. This only creates a higher cost of the goods supplied to the general public.

I believe that the government should have looked at supporting these small businessmen on the basis of a one-business, one-person operation—and not corporations such as Becker's and Mac's. They will have a store on one corner, and a short distance away they will have another store in direct competition. This just squeezes out the independent operator.

We have seen this happen in this sort of operation. We have also seen it happen in the supply of merchandise in the wholesale operation of these small stores. They are monopolizing the business and are taking away the small store operation and controlling the complete operation, particularly in the food business.

[9:45]

I believe that if we carry on into other ranges of businesses we will find that the same thing is happening. That is, a number of large corporations have been taking over the business from time to time, and eliminating the opposition. This creates the increase in the cost of goods to the consumer, to the extent that the inflation that we experience today is something that even this government here and the opposition members are going to find almost impossible to deal with.

I speak in support of this present bill to eliminate Sunday opening. I ask that those responsible in the preparation of further legislation take a look at those who are monopolizing the business world and business in the Province of Ontario, to allow the small corner business or the small businessman to get back into business and to operate as he has in the past.

Hon. Mr. MacBeth: Mr. Speaker, I have found the debate that we have just listened to most helpful and most productive. As I said when I spoke to it on second reading this afternoon, it is difficult legislation. The debate that has been conducted points up some of the difficulties that the government has had to deal with in the preparation of this legislation.

As I said, most of us agree with it in principle. I am pleased that the bill in general has the support of the entire House, but then when we get to specific clauses in that bill, each of us has our own ideas as to how they should be dealt with. This is where I think the committee work will be most helpful in completing a good bill for the Province of Ontario.

Let me deal briefly with some of the points that were mentioned. People questioned the $10,000 fine without some gradation. This was one of the problems in the Lord's Day Act, as you know. It set different grades of fines depending on whether you were a corporation, whether you were an individual, whether you were an employee—that type of thing.

In drafting this we thought we could have the confidence of the courts—those people who administered the law—to look at the offence involved, to look at the ability to pay and various other factors that judges do look at, and probably come up with a better answer than this House could do in saying that there should be a particular minimum. I will welcome any further discussion of that in committee.

Store hours, I believe, are a separate issue. I am not sure how the member for Frontenac-Addington (Mr. McEwen) got the thought that I had spoken in any way against store hours. I don't believe that I have made any pronouncement or comment on it. With the possibility of being corrected, what I am trying to emphasize is that the matter of store hours is a separate issue. Some municipalities deal with them very successfully; but I realize that there are others where there are problems. The government will continue to examine the matter of store hours, but it has not been looked at as a part of this bill, which looks at a one-day-in-seven pause day.

Labour Day: I have already bowed to the arguments from the member for Riverdale (Mr. Renwick) and the member for Wentworth (Mr. Deans). I am a little bit embarrassed by the fact that the bill appeared in that way. I knew better when I was Minister of Labour. It appeared in the Employment Standards Act as Labour Day. Evidently this is the wording that we used in this bill, and I take responsibility for it. It came from the federal Interpretation Act, and sometimes

when we look to Ottawa for guidance we get into trouble.

Mr. Renwick: If you had looked in the Ontario Interpretation Act you wouldn't have been in trouble.

Hon. Mr. MacBeth: We will bear that in mind. We wouldn't have been in trouble. Now, I have noted the suggestion about extending it for fruit and vegetables. This is a type of problem that we dealt with. I would agree that for a farmer dealing with produce from his own farm, we shouldn't have any dates at all. But we also agreed that if we tried to stop roadside stands from selling imported fruit, we would also have a problem. If we allow fruit stands of any size to operate throughout the entire year, we may be doing the farming community, those genuine farmers who are selling their own produce, a disservice rather than a service. That is the type of problem we are into. We can examine that further in committee.

Minority groups have been the main issue that we've dealt with this evening. I think it's worthwhile to take a minute to refer to the report on Sunday observance legislation of the Ontario Law Reform Commission. As we know, on it there were people like H. Allan Leal, Hon. James C. McRuer, Hon. Richard A. Bell, W. Gibson Gray and William R. Poole, who are pretty learned people. This is what they have to say on page 351 in part:

> The Sunday legislation which we consider appropriate for Ontario should be secular in both purpose and effect, and religious considerations should not influence or determine specific provisions of the scope of the legislation in any way whatsoever.
>
> [I'm not reading continuously here, I'm skipping.] We would hardly be consistent with this approach by proposing a sabbatarian exemption, allowing exemptions from the framework for those who would prefer for religious reasons to close their businesses on another day. To do so would be to clothe the legislation with the very religious character which we have deliberately sought to avoid. [And one further quotation]:
>
> The legislation must [and I underline "must"—it is in italics here] be secular as a constitutional matter. The adoption of certain religious provisions, such as a sabbatarian exemption, would be to put the constitutional validity of such a scheme in jeopardy.

I've listened very carefully to the representations that were made. I noted that the member for Wilson Heights (Mr. Singer) talked about the employer being of a certain religious faith so that he could close. But I think this bill is aimed not only at the employer, but at the employees. In drafting any possible amendment to this, it is not just the faith of the employer that we have to look at but the faith of the employee as well. I think that can possibly be done. We might run the risk of jeopardizing the bill, but maybe that is a risk that should be taken. Again, that is a matter that we can discuss when we get into committee.

On tourist areas, we were relying on local autonomy. There are possible further answers to that as well. You'll note how we separate regional governments from local municipalities in that bill. If the municipality is a part of a regional government, the decision would have to be taken by the larger or the regional area to declare a tourist area. That presents certain problems for the north. We were content to rely on the wisdom of the municipality as such itself on the basis of local autonomy. That too can be considered.

I note what was said about Mac's and Becker's. We admit that they are chains and large chains. We think, however, that the very nature of their operation—that they cannot carry on with more than three employees at a time, that the area of their store is limited and that what they can sell there is limited on a Sunday—will keep them relatively small. Because they have to operate in that way, their prices would be higher. You can say that it's not fair to the public to have higher prices. At the same time, I don't think that the majority of people will be entranced in any way to do their general shopping at stores where admittedly the prices have to be somewhat higher because of the smallness of their operation.

As I say, I haven't covered all of the points that were raised in the good debate here this afternoon and this evening, but I look forward to further constructive help when this bill moves on to committee. I had hoped originally that the bill might go to committee of the whole House on the basis that it has had a great deal of public participation up to this point, that there has been a great deal of input and that we now think one of the main objects of this Legislature should be to get the bill into legislation. But on the basis that further public input may be helpful, I'm quite happy that this should go to a special committee, as the House leader will

be speaking about shortly, for that type of consideration, still asking the opposition to move the bill forward as quickly as possible.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

Mr. Speaker: I understand this bill is to be referred to the appropriate committee.

Agreed.

Hon. Mr. Welch: Mr. Speaker, if the House would concur perhaps we could now deal with the committee to consider Bills 4 and 5. May I have permission to proceed?

Mr. Speaker: Hon. Mr. Welch moves that a select committee be established to consider Bills 4 and 5, such committee to have authority to sit concurrently with the House and to be composed of the following members: Campbell, Chairman; Bain, Bryden, Evans, Johnston (St. Catharines), Jones, Lane, Peterson, Philip, Reed, Yakabuski and Ziemba.

Mr. Good: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, before the motion carries. Could you clarify? As the two bills are completely different, will substitutions be allowed so that we can change personnel on the second bill to those persons who are more interested in that than in the energy portion? We thought this would be available, but now that it's a select committee, I don't know how that can be done.

Hon. Mr. Welch: I have no objection to that, except that the idea of having the same committee deal with both bills would, in fact, influence the various caucuses on making, their appointments.

You'll have to keep in mind, Mr. Speaker —and I want to accommodate the legitimate concern just expressed—that with the number of committees we now have, it's going to be increasingly difficult to keep track of all this movement of members on committees. But I have no objection to substitution here if it is really important.

Clerk of the House: Maybe we could bring that in later.

Hon. Mr. Welch: How would it be if we left it in the form it is now, just leave the motion the way it is now and I'll undertake to review that matter?

Mr. Speaker: In the meantime, shall this motion carry?

Motion agreed to.

ASSESSMENT AMENDMENT ACT

Hon. Mr. Meen moved second reading of Bill 8, An Act to amend the Assessment Act.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Yorkview.

Mr. Young: Mr. Speaker, we have seen today the results of the election when a minority government during an election campaign made certain promises and then, seeing how certain groups of people voted, reacted afterward. There is no question that people in apartment buildings voted strongly against the government because they wanted rent control; and now today we get the rent control.

Over the last couple of years, there has been a very great deal of dissatisfaction expressed in the condominiums of this province, particularly in Metropolitan Toronto, because of the assessment situation. As assessment bills same in a feeling grew up among condominium owners that they were being very seriously discriminated against. In my own area, a group of condominium owners undertook a survey of what was happening. They picked out single family homes in the area around them and they found that the assessment in the single family homes ran 10, 15, 20, and in some cases as far as they could determine, 25 per cent lower than they were assessed in the condominiums. In the last campaign this kind of dissatisfaction and discontent surfaced. In every meeting which I attended—and certainly this is the experience of others where condominium owners were effected—we had a barrage of questions about this matter. We had an expression of opinion that they were being badly done by by a government which did not consider them when it came to assessment.

Of course, I must say those of us in the opposition didn't discourage them in that attitude. I suppose we wouldn't have been politicians if we had. But we could see, as we have seen before, the justice of their claims and we could see how they could feel the way they did. They had bought a single family unit, just as the neighbours had bought a single family unit, except they had bought it in a complex instead of on a lot 50ft by 100ft, or whatever the size might be. As they looked about and compared taxation they realized that this was happening to them. The pressure mounted and the pressure of votes, of course, is the telling pressure in a democracy of this kind.

In this group we are delighted to see this kind of justice being done. We welcome this legislation at this time and we certainly will support it on second reading. We give the

government our congratulations on its action although we do that with reservations because we are not sure it would have come if a majority government had been elected instead of a minority.

Hon. Mr. Handleman: Yes it would.

Mr. Young: The minister says it likely would have. Perhaps it would, I don't know. When we see the miracles which have happened in this House since we began last week, we commence to get a bit disillusioned over the performance of this government over the past decade and more. For year after year it refused to bring in reforms which we nattered at its members about and urged upon them. Now, all of a sudden—

Hon. Mr. Handleman: Condominiums themselves are a form of reform.

Hon. Mr. Kerr: You sound like a Tennessee senator.

Interjections.

Mr. Young: —we find that this is a reform government with a vision of a future and very concerned about the welfare of the voters in Ontario.

Hon. Mr. Kerr: Let's go for five or six years.

Mr. Young: Marvellous! We are glad to see it and as I say we welcome and we will support on second reading the legislation before us tonight.

Hon. Mr. Meen: Good for you.

Mrs. Campbell: Mr. Speaker, as far as we are concerned in this party we do welcome the legislation. We are prepared to support it, but one of the things which has bothered me about the introduction of this legislation has been the statements which have appeared in the press. They indicate that this move will lower the taxes for the people in condominiums, who are being moved into single family residential definition by this statute.

I'm concerned about this for many reasons. I would like very much, for example, to ask the minister if he can advise us how we approach the mix-use kind of condominium situation?

I'm thinking of Harbour Square in my riding where we have condominium owners and tenants. How do we approach that kind of assessment mix? I think this is an important thing for us to know.

The minister is quite aware of my concern about the nature of the market value assessment which flows from this particular transfer in this bill. It may interest the minister to note that the latest information I can get —and the minister has talked about this matter of the factor which is to be employed somehow, sometime, somewhere in this situation. He has referred to the brief which the city prepared and presented to the committee on taxation on many occasions.

At the time the city presented its brief, we were advised that the shift would be in the neighbourhood of $20 million without some form of factoring. The latest information from Treasury is that that shift will be five times that $20 million at this point. I think it is wrong that we should be misleading these people by making any statements as to the resulting taxation effect of this transfer into the single-family residential situation.

I hope the minister at this point will give us that factor, because at the moment I feel we're continuing to buy pigs in pokes in dealing with this situation.

It's true that the condominium owners have been asking for the legislation and it's true that they believe that this, in fact, will assist their tax position. I hope the minister then, since he's doing this to meet their requirements, will make it abundantly clear just what form of factoring he's going to bring into effect in order to ensure that all these statements in the press are accurate and that in fact they will not lose by reason of this.

Hon. Mr. Handleman: That would be quite an achievement, making sure all the statements in the press are accurate. That's quite an achievement.

Hon. Mr. Meen: The member is asking the impossible.

Mr. Good: The government is getting the credit for it.

Mrs. Campbell: That's the point.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Mrs. Campbell: The government is getting credit for this as something which will assist the condominium owners.

Hon. Mr. Handleman. Oh well it's about time we took the credit.

Mrs. Campbell: I think it's time the minister gave us the factors. In the alternative the Treasurer (Mr. McKeough) should give us the taxation factor we have at this point so that we all know where we stand.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Ottawa West.

Mr. Morrow: Mr. Speaker, since I represent many condominium owners of Ottawa West I would like to add my particular words of congratulations to the minister and to the government for bringing in this piece of legislation.

I might say that I'm really speaking here because of the comment of my very good friend from Yorkview (Mr. Young) that we're only doing this at the 11th hour. For his information, and for the information of the House, I would say that this has been a matter of great concern, not only to me but to the government since sometime last April or May when it was discussed several times in our caucus.

I was one who led the discussion on many occasions in caucus on this subject matter and we were continually being encouraged by the minister and the government that perhaps there was an unfair assessment taking place here. As the thing built up over the election and we got talking to more and more of these condominium owners at their condominiums, and seeing their assessments and their taxes, we became convinced that there was an unfair assessment. With that information, we were able to convince the minister and the government that something must be done.

They are now giving the answer to our urgings on this particular matter. So I don't want him to think that we have not been concerned about this matter for some time. This is the result of our concern and I'm very pleased to see it brought in at this time, because it's going to make many condominium owners happy, not only in my riding but in many urban ridings throughout this province.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Algoma.

Mr. Wildman: I have some reservations about this bill because it leaves out one very important area that I had hoped would be included. My riding has one of the highest concentrations of mobile home parks in the province. I was gratified this afternoon to hear that the Minister of Housing and the Attorney General were going to make provision for protection of mobile home park owners and their tenants in regard to rents of lots and so on; but the area of assessment, which is a problem, has not been addressed in this bill.

Mobile homes were described by the former Minister of Housing in July as "factory-built, single-family dwellings designed to be transported on wheels and placed on a permanent foundation and connected to services." I think that is a quote. He described them this way, and yet their education taxes are not based on assessment as are other single-family dwellings.

The reason I am discussing this is that I had hoped an amendment to the Assessment Act would include not only condominiums but also mobile homes. The mobile home situation has been discussed by the other ministers, but just has not been discussed here.

Taxes for mobile homes were paid by licence fees until 1974, when they were placed under the provisions of the Assessment Act. But this was challenged in the courts. There was a ruling, I believe by Judge Vannini, that trailers were not permanent homes, and this meant that they would continue to be licensed as vehicles. This licence fee is not set by the Assessment Act, of course, but by the Ministry of Education under the Education Act. Before 1974, mobile home owners paid $3 per month, I believe, as a licence fee for a primary school tax, and $2 a month for a secondary school tax. It is one of the few times when primary schools have been given a fair share of the taxation money paid.

Then, as of Jan. 1, 1975, the Act was amended raising the licence fee to $5 each for primary and secondary school taxes.

Mr. Speaker: I would draw to the hon. member's attention that the principle of the bill does not refer to the mobile home parks, and I think—

Mr. Wildman: That is my criticism.

Mr. Speaker: —his remarks are out of order on second reading.

Mr. Wildman: You may rule me out of order, but my criticism of the whole amendment is the fact that it is not wide enough; that it only deals with condominiums and does not deal with mobile homes.

Mr. Speaker: The ministry or a private member would have to bring in their own bill to deal with mobile homes. As a result, on the principle of this bill, you are out of order.

Mr. Wildman: Thank you, Mr. Speaker; I do intend to bring in a private member's bill.

Mr. Good: The other matter in this bill that has not been touched is simply a matter of the return of the assessment rolls

and the changes necessary here to facilitate the return of the rolls at the proper time. Since market value assessment is put off until 1976 for taxation in 1977, I gather this is the need for the changes mentioned under one of the latter sections of the bill.

I would like to say a little regarding the change in the method of assessment of condominiums. Prior to the takeover by the province of the assessment function, each municipality carried on its own method of assessing the various classes of real property. This varied from one municipality to another. It was a degree of equity and taxation at rates which the municipalities felt pertained to their particular case. In other words, in my own area it was pretty well evident that residential property was taxed at between 15 and 20 per cent, highrise property at about 35 or 40 per cent and industrial property somewhat between 50 and 60 per cent. The variable was in the assessment. This was then transferred to the municipal treasurer who applied the mill rate for the various degrees of assessment.

I really think there was a great deal of equity in that type of variation from one municipality to the other. Justice did prevail if the assessment was done properly, as it was in most of the larger municipalities, because there was equity within classes and then the decision to vary the assessment on various types of property was one which was more or less a political decision.

At that time the city of Toronto and most of Metropolitan Toronto was assessing highrise apartments at about 42 per cent of market value, as I remember, and residential property at a considerably lower figure, somewhere between 17 and 29 per cent.

Then along came the condominium; it was new and people didn't know how to deal with it. Not only were those condominiums being built, but highrise apartments that were assessed were changed over to condominiums. Even the apartment owners found the level of taxation, at 42 per cent of supposed market value, was, in fact, a very great hardship on the tenants, who in the final result had to pay this high level of taxation.

I think it was some two or three years ago, after the ministry had taken over the assessment function, that in Hamilton and Ottawa and Toronto, where most of the problems were brought to light by various appeals of the assessment, there was a general reduction to 25 per cent of market value of high rises. This was put through, even though the statutes had declared that assessment would be frozen until the 1976 year for taxation in 1977.

The 25 per cent assessment then applied to highrise apartment buildings and the courts, at least at the lower level, I understand had ruled that condominiums woud be considered as highrise. This, of course, then went to the higher courts and was returned to the OMB for a final decision, because people in condominiums, owning their own property, were being treated in the same manner as highrises which were built as an investment and on which a profit was expected.

We now have various forms of discrimination against people who live in highrise apartments. For instance, the electrical rates charged by Ontario Hydro through the municipalities are commercial rates charged to people living in highrises. They are the only people living in residences who have to pay commercial rates. I spoke on this matter in the House before. It's not right, but Hydro gets away with it. The only explanation they give is to say the landlord is running it as a business so they charge him commercial rates. But don't forget, that rate is passed along to the tenants living in the highrise. It's reflected in their rent and they are paying more for their electricity than are people living in single family homes.

We had the same situation here—people living in condominiums who, in fact, did own their own unit were paying more in taxation. I think the minister must give some explanation of where this newspaper report came from, which said that this was going to be a saving of $200 to the average condominium owner. If the minister isn't going to take responsibility for that statement, let him at least tell us how the press picked it up and from whence it came; because with this change in the Assessment Act, the assessment on condominiums from now until 1976 should be reduced from about 25 per cent of market value to about 17 or 20 per cent.

Then comes the crunch, in 1976 for taxation in 1977, everything will be assessed at market value, and this is still the big problem and the big doubt in the minds of those of us here in the opposition. Since 1969, when the province took over the assessment function and agreed on market value assessment, we have all had very serious reservations about what is going to happen, particularly with the shift of taxation from industrial and commercial to residential assessment.

It has always been that the person living in a single family house or the person owning his own house must be given the utmost consideration. In no way should the burden of taxation bear heavily on him or her because they just can't afford to lose their house. We can put the burden of taxation more on commercial and industrial because they have someone to pass it along to—to us, the consumers. It is a very serious business when we start to depend on single family residences or condominiums as a major source of revenue. It just shouldn't be, because a person's house should be something which should not be jeopardized by excessive taxation.

When the 1976 assessment does come along for 1977, we are going to find that all classes of residential property—single family, row housing, condominiums, town housing, highrise—will automatically revert to 100 per cent of market value. In other words, if single-family houses are now assessed at 20 per cent, they will be multiplied by five. If a highrise is now 50 per cent, it will be multiplied by two.

As I understand it, with the amendments we put in the Municipal Act last year, the differential mill rate—which now is a 15 per cent spread for municipal taxation and only a 10 per cent spread for education tax—will be applied to those market value assessments. Unless this government comes up with something more dramatic than it has talked about up to now, there is going to be very great inequity when that taxation comes through.

It just isn't going to work with a 15 per cent differential mill rate, because we are going to have too big a shift from industrial to residential; I have great reservations about that. I think the time is getting so close to hand—a year from now—that the minister has to come up with something more definite, something so that people may allay their fears.

I have heard talk around that there may be a difference in the differential from one municipality to another. If a 15 per cent differential works in Kitchener, it may not work in Belleville or may not work in Toronto. That still is going to throw all classes of residential property into the one bundle, the one ball of wax as the member for Grey-Bruce (Mr. Sargent) would say.

Whether or not that is going to work, I think the minister has certainly had sufficient time to complete the studies which were started—it must be two or three years ago in the Mississauga area—to try to figure out what these shifts would eventually amount to.

I think this bill may be the last vehicle we will have to debate the implications of market value assessment on taxation and the shift in property tax. I would invite a very thorough response from the minister as to what effect this will have in the light of the announced market value assessment for 1976 or 1977 taxation.

Hon. Mr. Handleman: Mr. Speaker, first, as the minister responsible for the Condominium Act, I have a special interest in this amendment. Also, as the representative of an area where there is a wide variety of condominium development, I have a special interest in it. As the hon. member for Ottawa West (Mr. Morrow) said, there was a great deal of discussion about condominium assessment on a variety of buildings and the inequities are as varied as the different kinds of condominium units. Certainly, there have been inequities.

I think most members of this House recognize that condominium development is a relatively new concept and we are not going to achieve the kind of instant reform and instant perfection that the member for Yorkview (Mr. Young) would have us achieve. There are many problems still remaining to be settled in the whole concept of condominium ownership.

With regard to the comments of the member for Waterloo North (Mr. Good), I think it is wise to deal with the immediate problems and deal with them as they arise.

Mrs. Campbell: Like knowing where you are going.

Hon. Mr. Handleman: There is a great deal of speculation as to what effect this will have on the total market value reassessment of all properties in the province. I am sure the minister will be able to respond to that at least in some hypothetical way. At the present time we are dealing with a measure which will have great benefits to condominium owners across the province. It will bring them into the same kind of ownership that was visualized when the first condominium Act is brought in.

Mr. Cassidy: Is it?

Hon. Mr. Handleman: I think it should be recognized that this province and this government is farther advanced in the development of the condominium ownership concept than any other jurisdiction in Canada, and probably in North America with the possible exception of Florida.

Mrs. Campbell: What about the universe?

Hon. Mr. Handleman: We are saying that this is a measure to bring more equity into —condominium ownership, one which is highly—

Mr. Cassidy: The ancient Romans had condominiums; the minister can't claim that for this government.

Hon. Mr. Handleman: We are talking about giving equity to condominium ownership in the area of assessment. This bill will do it.

Mr. Cassidy: Who is the minister against Julius Caesar?

Hon. Mr. Handleman: Where was the member? There are, as I have said, a number of different kinds of condominiums and I must say that in my own constituency—

Mr. Good: Just a shot in the dark.

Hon. Mr. Handleman: —there was not that great problem in the disparity of condominium assessment—between privately-owned homes and condominiums—simply because there had been an appeal to the courts on highrise assessment which resulted in a reduction of highrise assessment. That brought the condominium down. This will bring them even further down.

[10:30]

I don't know what statements the hon. members are referring to in the press, but we have done some calculations in the Ottawa area. I am sure the member for Ottawa Centre, when he speaks on the bill, as I know he is going to, will accept the fact that this amendment will result, on the average in the Ottawa area in tax reductions of between $150 to $200 per year. I am sure every member in the House will welcome that kind of further measure of equity in the concept of condominium ownership.

Interjection.

Hon. Mr. Handleman: I have brought to the attention of some of the other ministers some of the other problems which still remain to be ironed out to provide equity in condominium ownership. This amendment at least removes the discrimination which did exist in the case of highrise condominium assessment. To what extent it should be welcomed by all members of the House.

Mr. Speaker: Perhaps in view of the hour we might adjourn the debate.

Mr. Cassidy: Can I say a couple of words before we adjourn the meeting?

Mr. Speaker: If you wish to keep an eye on the clock.

Mr. Cassidy: With a view to further debate, I would like to resume on the next day.

Mr. Speaker: Of course, if you would adjourn the debate it will be your turn.

Mr. Cassidy: I want to mark this occasion, since 2½ years ago I introduced a bill for rent control and security of tenure in this Legislature, which measures have now been adopted by the government. The details may be lacking but the principle has certainly been accepted. During the course of this election campaign I put forward a programme on condominium assessment and I feel rather happy to see that adopted by the government.

I have a few other bills that I have been putting forward. I thought they were in vain in the past. If the government would wish to adopt them some time before the end of the week, it would make me very happy.

Mr. Speaker: Now, will you adjourn the debate?

Hon. Mr. Handleman: Having said that, will the member adjourn the debate?

Mr. Cassidy: Having said that, yes, just in a friendly kind of way. I do have some comments on the bill itself and on the amazing coincidence that a government could overlook this rather scandalous situation for many years until the exigencies of a minority suddenly gave them the degree of responsiveness and sensitivity that one hasn't seen for rather a number of decades.

Mr. Cassidy moves the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to.

Hon. Mr. Welch: Mr. Speaker, before moving the adjournment of the House I would just like to remind members of the Legislature that tomorrow we will have Throne debate during the course of the morning.

Hon. Mr. Welch moves the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to.

The House adjourned at 10:35 p.m.

CONTENTS

Thursday, November 6, 1975

Retail Business Holidays Act, Mr. MacBeth, second reading 343

Assessment Amendment Act, Mr. Meen, on second reading 364

Motion to adjourn, Mr. Welch, agreed to 369

SPEAKERS IN THIS ISSUE

Bullbrook, J. E. (Sarnia L)
Campbell, M. (St. George L)
Cassidy, M. (Ottawa Centre NDP)
Cunningham, E. (Wentworth North L)
Davis, Hon. W. G., Premier (Brampton PC)
Deans, I. (Wentworth NDP)
Givens, P. G. (Armourdale L)
Good, E. R. (Waterloo North L)
Grossman, L. (St. Andrew-St. Patrick PC)
Hall, R. (Lincoln L)
Handleman, Hon. S. B., Consumer and Commercial Relations (Carleton PC)
Kerr, Hon. G. A., Environment (Burlington South PC)
Kerrio, V. (Niagara Falls L)
Lewis, S., Leader of the Opposition (Scarborough West NDP)
MacBeth, Hon. J. P., Provincial Secretary for Justice and Solicitor General (Humber PC)
McEwen, J. E. (Frontenac-Addington L)
McMurtry, Hon. R., Attorney General (Eglinton PC)
Meen, Hon. A. K., Revenue (York East PC)
Moffatt, D. (Durham East NDP)
Morrow, D. H. (Ottawa West PC)
Newman, Hon. W., Agriculture and Food (Durham North PC)
Nixon, R. F. (Brant-Oxford-Norfolk L)
Peterson, D. (London Centre L)
Reed, J. (Halton-Burlington L)
Reid, T. P. (Rainy River L)
Renwick, J. A. (Riverdale NDP)
Rhodes, Hon. J. R., Housing (Sault Ste. Marie PC)
Ruston, R. F. (Essex North L)
Samis, G. (Cornwall NDP)
Sargent, E. (Grey-Bruce L)
Shore, M. (London North L)
Smith, S. (Hamilton West L)
Timbrell, Hon. D. R., Energy (Don Mills PC)
Warner, D. (Scarborough-Ellesmere NDP)
Welch, Hon. R., Culture and Recreation (Brock PC)
Wildman, B. (Algoma NDP)
Young, F. (Yorkview NDP)
Ziemba, E. (High Park-Swansea NDP)

No. 10



Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT — DAILY EDITION

First Session of the Thirtieth Legislature

Friday, November 7, 1975

Speaker: Honourable Russell Daniel Rowe
Clerk: Roderick Lewis, QC

THE QUEEN'S PRINTER
PARLIAMENT BUILDINGS, TORONTO
1975



CONTENTS

A list of the speakers taking part in the debates in this issue of Hansard appears, in alphabetical order, at the back of this issue.

Daily contents of proceedings also appears at the back of this issue. Reference to a cumulative index of previous issues can be obtained by calling the Hansard Reporting Service indexing staff. (Phone 965-2159).

Hansard subscription price is $15.00 per session, from: Sessional Subscription Service, MGS, 9th Floor, Ferguson Block, Parliament Bldgs., Toronto, M7A 1N3. Phone 965-2238.

LEGISLATURE OF ONTARIO

FRIDAY, NOVEMBER 7, 1975

The House met at 10 a.m.

Prayers.

Mr. Williams: Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the House today to acknowledge and welcome to the Legislature, students from Woodbine Junior High School in the fair riding of Oriole, along with their teacher, Mr. Halket.

Mr. Gregory: Mr. Speaker, I would ask the House to join with me in welcoming a group of 40 students from Glenforest Secondary School with their teacher, Mr. McDevitt, in the west gallery.

Mr. Speaker: Statements by the ministry.

Mr. Martel: What happened to the cabinet this morning? Did they sleep in?

Mr. Speaker: Oral questions.

FOOD PRICE INCREASES

Mr. Lewis: I have a question for the Minister of Agriculture and Food. Is the minister prepared to have the Ontario Food Council conduct an investigation into the clear evidence of price increases, not to say price gouging, now documented at the Loblaws store, once called Pickering Farms and now called Ziggys, on Yonge St. in downtown Toronto?

Hon. W. Newman: I didn't see the article in the paper; I haven't had a chance. I was out at the Food Terminal this morning, talking to all the producers out there. I'll take that question as notice and I'll get an answer for the Leader of the Opposition.

Mr. Lewis: By way of supplementary, is the minister willing or ready as a matter of course, where evidence of price increases that seem undue are brought to his attention to launch an investigation through the Ontario Food Council and either exercise an initiative on the part of this government or, alternatively, take the material he finds to the Anti-Inflation Board?

Hon. W. Newman: If there is any case of price gouging, I would certainly like to look into it very carefully. The member is documenting a case this morning which I haven't had a chance to look into, but I will.

Mr. Lewis: The minister will look into it and will report?

Hon. W. Newman: Yes, I certainly will.

Mr. MacDonald: In the whole operation of the Food Council with reference to the food basket, does the minister mean to say they have never come across increases which they deem to be worthy of further investigation, instead of retaining them as a secret so that nobody knows anything about it?

Hon. W. Newman: I don't think it is a secret. It's not a secret what the food basket costs. They do it on a regular basis and the actual—

Mr. MacDonald: There is nothing on the components; where do they get the information?

Hon. W. Newman: The general cost of the basket for a week is released as public information.

Mr. MacDonald: My supplementary, Mr. Speaker, was: Has the Food Council never come across excessive price increases in the components, which are retained secret both as to the nature of the component and the store where they get the information? Have they never come across any information that they deem to be worthy of investigation for gauging?

Hon. W. Newman: Not since I have been in the ministry has it been brought to my attention in any specific case. If the member has any specific cases, I would be glad to look into them.

Mr. MacDonald: They want us to do their job.

Mr. Lewis: A question of the Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations: When there is a clear case of large price increases—in this instance, having looked at it mathematically, 30 per cent to 90 per cent on a number of items in a matter of one month to six weeks—is he ready within his ministry to intervene, to demand an explanation from

Loblaws, to join with the Ontario Food Council, to do something about the price increases so that the guidelines which he supports are not entirely destroyed for wage earners whose incomes are being controlled?

Hon. Mr. Handleman: Mr. Speaker, first of all I have something in common with my colleague, the Minister of Agriculture and Food, in that I have not had a chance to read the article on which the question is based.

Mr. Lewis: There was a time when the minister read the Globe and Mail each morning. It caused him such trauma in the last election.

Hon. Mr. Handleman: These days, I am sometimes busy. I don't know whether the hon. Leader of the Opposition was in the House last night; we were asked by the member for St. George (Mrs. Campbell) to guarantee the accuracy of press reports which sometimes is a little bit difficult.

I certainly will look at it. As the hon. Leader of the Opposition knows, there is a cabinet committee to deal with the anti-inflation programme, chaired by the Treasurer (Mr. McKeough), and any evidence of that kind certainly, I think, should be referred to that committee. There is a co-ordinator whose position has been announced and I think that is where these things should be dealt with. If that comes to my ministry, that's the route I would go.

Mr. Lewis: May I ask the Chairman of Management Board as a member, I think, of that cabinet committee dealing with inflation, will he bring the instance set out in the press this morning, of an apparent illegitimate increase in prices at one of the major Loblaws stores downtown, to the attention of the anti-inflation group in cabinet, and have it investigated and report back to the House?

Hon. Mr. Auld: Mr. Speaker, I would be glad to. I haven't read it myself either.

Mr. Lewis: I am sure he hasn't.

Hon. Mr. Auld: I was reading the Sun.

Mr. MacDonald: Have you all cancelled your subscriptions to the Globe?

Mr. Lewis: You all read Clare Hoy. You should try the Globe occasionally as an antidote.

MONEY FOR MENTAL RETARDATION BRANCH

Mr. Lewis: May I ask the Minister of Community and Social Services a question? He will recall, I presume, that in the middle of 1974 when the mental retardation branch was transferred from the Ministry of Health to the Ministry of Community and Social Services, there was the promise of an additional large amount of money—in the millions—which would come through the Canada Assistance Plan and which the member for Cochrane North (Mr. Brunelle) then said would go in total to mental retardation? What has happened to that very large additional sum of money and why is it not reflected in additional mental retardation programmes?

Hon. Mr. Taylor: First of all, I would like to determine what additional large sum of money is involved because I am personally not aware of the amount of funding the member speaks of. Secondly, until I know what moneys are involved, I can't say whether those moneys have been received or where they have gone. However, I would be happy to check into that.

Mr. Lewis: By way of supplementary, I would be pleased to hear. The minister may recall that at the time the amount speculated about was $25 million to $35 million in additional money. I'm given to understand that the ministry has received $41.8 million in additional money. Could the minister give us the amount and could he say what that additional money will be used for in the service of mental retardation, since the associations in Ontario have felt only a neglible increase, despite the clear and explicit undertakings made at the time? Could he find that out for us?

Hon. Mr. Taylor: As I have mentioned, I will be happy to look into that and get back to the Leader of the Opposition.

MINISTER'S VIEW OF PC PARTY

Mr. Lewis: I wanted to ask the Minister of Labour, if I could, has her faintly derogatory view of the Conservative Party in Ontario altered since she has run and become a cabinet minister?

Hon. B. Stephenson: Mr. Speaker, may I say to the hon. Leader of the Opposition that he has misinterpreted my remarks, obviously. They have never even been faintly

derogatory of the Progressive Conservative Party in this province.

Mr. Speaker: Perhaps the hon. member has urgent questions now?

Mr. Lewis: Perhaps the minister could put a different construction for me on her article in the Ontario Medical Review of September 1975—fairly recently—in which she says to her medical colleagues: 'The Ontario Medical Association, like our provincial government, I have to tell you, does have a reputation across Canada for being pretty conservative, if not stuffy."

The minister wouldn't regard that as faintly derogatory? Perhaps charitable was what she really meant.

Interjections.

Hon. B. Stephenson: Mr. Speaker, I don't think that that's at all derogatory. I think perhaps it's a plus characteristic in many circumstances.

Mr. Lewis: Now that stuffiness has been elevated to a principle, Mr. Speaker, I have no further questions.

Hon. Mr. Handleman: Sanctimony always pays.

Mr. MacDonald: Macaulay said the same thing 12 years ago.

HIGHWAY SPEED LIMITS FOR GOVERNMENT VEHICLES

Mr. Breithaupt: Perhaps some of the stuffiness has been knocked out—or the stuffing anyway.

I have a question of the Chairman of Management Board, in the absence of the Minister of Transportation and Communications (Mr. Snow). Can the minister advise me if there are any plans now to have provincial government vehicles follow a 55-miles per hour speed limit, as has been announced by various federal authorities, including the Ministry of National Defence?

Hon. Mr. Auld: Mr. Speaker, the short answer would be no, because I'm not aware of any plans at the moment, although I believe there have been some discussions.

Mr. Breithaupt: On the presumption that there would be some value in fuel saving and also increased safety, would the minister at least discuss this matter with his colleague to see if there is the possibility of considering such a programme?

Hon. Mr. Auld: I would be delighted to pass the question along to the Minister of Transportation and Communications.

SPACE FOR GOVERNMENT OFFICES

Mr. Breithaupt: A question of the Minister of Government Services: With respect to advertising for leasing by tender of some 17,000 to 18,000 sq ft of office space in the Metropolitan Toronto area, apparently for the sales tax department of the Ministry of Revenue, have there been any discussions with Ontario Hydro with respect to the possibility of using or considering space in the buildings occupied formerly by Ontario Hydro or in the New Ontario Hydro headquarters that might accommodate this requirement in order that we are not tendering for certain space, when there may be suitable space for which we directly or indirectly as taxpayers are already covering ourselves?

Hon. Mrs. Scrivener: Mr. Speaker, I would inform the member that we have actually very little space available at the present time. I'm not aware of the discussions that he's inquiring about, but I will make further inquiries and report to him.

Mr. Sargent: Get a microphone.

Mr. Deans: On a point of privilege, if I may, the member for Grey-Bruce makes a good point. I wonder if the gentleman operating the sound system, the console at the corner—

Mr. Sargent: We can't hear the minister.

Mr. Deans: —could perhaps experiment a little more with it and raise the volume in order that we might hear. It's becoming a bit difficult.

Mr. Speaker: I think it was pointed out earlier before the session started that we were going to have some difficulties for a while with the sound system.

Mr. Deans: We understand.

Mr. Speaker: If all those who are rising to address the assembly would make a special effort to speak toward the mike I think it would be helpful for one thing and we will get the volume as loud as we can.

[10:15]

MINISTER'S DUTIES

Mr. Breithaupt: I have one brief question of the Minister without Portfolio, the mem-

ber for Lambton (Mr. Henderson). In order that the House might have the benefit, perhaps the member might advise us just what duties he now has as he shares the burdens of government with his colleagues.

Hon. Mr. Handleman: Take it as notice.

Mr. Bullbrook: Tell us that that is confidential information.

Mr. Lewis: Just tell him you cannot violate cabinet secrecy.

Hon. Mr. Henderson: I would like to thank the House leader of the third party for this question.

Mr. Bullbrook: There's a new twist, the third party.

Hon. Mr. Henderson: It does give me an opportunity to respond. I know the hon. member for Sarnia (Mr. Bullbrook) suggested a couple of days ago he had a question for me. Over the past few days I have been meeting with delegations, groups of people from opposition members' ridings.

Hon. Mr. Bernier: There are 74 of them.

Mr. S. Smith: That's a lot.

Hon. Mr. Henderson: These are people who are concerned that they are not going to have representation in the House. Just to confirm it, I haven't met with any this morning, but yesterday I met with a delegation from the Sarnia riding, a delegation from North Bay and a delegation from London North.

Mr. S. Smith: Would the minister agree to meet people from my riding as well?

Hon. Mr. Henderson: I am sorry, to the hon. member for Hamilton West, I met with his group last week.

Mr. Singer: As a result of all those meetings, you are wasting away. Anybody can see that.

Hon. Mr. Henderson: I will be up in Bruce area next Saturday.

Interjection.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Hon. Mr. Henderson: In addition to this, the Premier (Mr. Davis) has special responsibilities but I will leave it in his hands as to when he wishes to announce them. I say thank you to the hon. member.

Mr. Speaker: I am not sure about the urgent public importance of this particular discussion.

Mr. Bullbrook: It is important to all the people of Lambton county.

Mr. Speaker: That is a big share of the public.

Mr. Bullbrook: By way of supplementary, does not the minister consider that that example of forthrightness and directness is not in keeping with the normal attitudes of the Conservative government of this province?

Hon. Mr. Henderson: Mr. Speaker, I am very happy that that is the attitude taken by the member for Sarnia. I am cowed at that attitude.

Mr. Speaker: Is this a supplementary?

Mr. Peterson: No, it is a new question.

Mr. Speaker: It is not the hon. member's turn yet. The member for Kitchener?

Mr. Breithaupt: No, that's all.

Mr. Speaker: All right, the member for Renfrew South?

EGANVILLE CREAMERY

Mr. Yakabuski: Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the Minister of Agriculture and Food. Would the minister employ the resources of his ministry to ensure that the cream producers of Renfrew county and the periphery are ensured of a market for their products after Nov. 30, when the new owners of the Eganville creamery plan on closing down that butter-making operation?

Hon. W. Newman: Mr. Speaker, one company, Ault, I believe it is, will be taking it until the end of November. As a matter of fact, we are negotiating this morning with another company to make sure that the producers are taken care of. I can assure the member as of now that the producers in his area will be taken care of.

Mr. Conway: Supplementary, Mr. Speaker: With respect to the Minister of Agriculture and Food, seeing that the purchaser of the Eganville creamery, Ault, I believe, received substantial assistance over the past year from the Eastern Ontario Development Corp., will the minister see to it that that particular beneficiary of the Ontario government's assistance will do its best to ensure the economic

viability of that creamery in the Eganville area?

Hon. W. Newman: I didn't say the creamery itself would be kept open as a creamery at Eganville, but the producers will be protected to make sure that they have a market for their cream.

Mr. Conway: But surely, considering the—

Mr. Speaker: Question? This is not a debating period.

Mr. MacDonald: Supplementary: In looking after the producer, if they are now going to have to ship their milk elsewhere will Ault have to pick up any increased transportation charges or is the producer going to have that as a further deduction from his gross income?

Hon. W. Newman: At this point in time the Ontario Milk Marketing Board has set a distance limitation on the transportation costs. I assume that Ault will have to pick up the cost of any additional transportation—

Mr. Deans: You assume or you know?

Hon. W. Newman: —keeping in mind that the cream from the Eganville plant will probably be going to the Pembroke creamery.

EDUCATIONAL TELEVISION IN NORTHERN ONTARIO

Mr. Martel: A question of the minister of Wintario. At a Tory clambake held in Kirkland Lake in November, 1974, the cabinet promised $9.5 million in capital for transmitters and equipment to bring educational television to northern Ontario and to parts of eastern Ontario. Why has the government now seen fit to cut back the approximately $1.2 million needed for the next five years to provide ETV for northern Ontario and parts of eastern Ontario?

Hon. Mr. Welch: The explanation is a very straightforward one. The government, in reviewing its spending programme, had indicated to the Ontario Educational Communications Authority that funds would not be available for the present to underwrite that particular expansion. OECA then appeared before the CRTC last Tuesday to indicate the fact that this programme had been postponed, expressing the hope that the channels involved would be reserved for educational television some time in the future when we could afford it.

Mr. Martel: A supplementary: Why then, in view of the fact that the government has cut back there, it is including $7,588,000 in the Ministry of Education estimates for films and so on for ETV when a good portion of this province is being denied that service, which it was promised long ago?

Hon. Mr. Welch: I think this perhaps would have been an appropriate question at the time the Minister of Education's estimates were before the House—

Mr. Martel: We didn't know the cutback was coming.

Mr. Speaker: Order.

Hon. Mr. Welch: —but, as the hon. member knows, the Ministry of Education is one of the customers of OECA, and of course there is a broadcasting obligation with respect to about 75 per cent of the population which is presently being served. Secondly, we are talking about an extension of services, but that doesn't preclude the fact that there are other ways in order to accommodate the needs in the northwest through the availability of tapes which are sent and so on.

I would think that the hon. member would appreciate that I've used the word "postponed," that we are in a period of capital constraint, and that we felt some obligation and some responsibility to indicate that at the time of the appearance before the CRTC, rather than waiting for the overall constraint package of the government to become known.

Mr. Speaker: One final supplementary.

Mr. Martel: Why did the government wait until Nov. 3 to advise the people responsible, who were to appear on Nov. 4, that it was cutting back the money?

Hon. Mr. Welch: Because Nov. 3 was when the cabinet took its decision.

SALES TAX REBATE ON AUTOMOBILES

Mr. Shore: I almost forgot my question, Mr. Speaker, but I think it's coming back. Could I address my question to the Minister of Industry and Tourism; and if he isn't the right minister, perhaps he would redirect it.

It is true, as I've heard, that the sales tax that has been taken off automobiles and is due to come back on Dec. 31, I've heard substantial complaints, including some from Sarnia and the Lambton area—I appreciate the member for Lambton taking care of some of my constituents; I'll take care of

some of his—that in the area of sales tax people have been going to car dealers since Oct. and trying to be assured that their cars will be delivered by Dec. 31, which is 10 weeks, and they're finding from the car dealerships that there's no—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I think the question has been asked.

Mr. Shore: Has it?

Mr. Speaker: Yes. I think you've asked a question.

Mr. Shore: The question is, it appears that many people have no assurance that they're going to get car deliveries—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. That's not a question; the first part of it was a question. Is there an answer?

Mr. Sargent: It's a damned good question.

Hon. Mr. Bennett: Mr. Speaker, I suggest that that question be directed to the Minister of Revenue (Mr. Meen) or the Treasurer (Mr. McKeough).

Mr. Speaker: The member for Ottawa West.

Mr. Shore: Excuse me, Mr. Speaker. I asked the Minister of Industry and Tourism, if he couldn't answer my question, if he would redirect it. Could I have that answer?

Mr. Speaker: I don't see the Treasurer here.

Mr. MacDonald: The Minister of Revenue is there.

Mr. Shore: I think it is a rather important question, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: It is an important question. The member for Revenue.

Mr. Singer: The member for Revenue—that's a good riding.

Hon. Mr. Meen: I've been waiting for somebody to ask me a question since this House opened, and I get it in a backhanded fashion.

The programme is scheduled to terminate on Dec. 31, and this car rebate programme has been immensely successful. We have made it abundantly clear throughout the entire programme that it terminates on Dec. 31. It's also very well known that—

Mr. Sargent: The used car dealers liked it too.

Hon. Mr. Meen: —delivery time for new cars is a period of roughly six weeks. This is par for the course. So, any time from now on I think a purchaser would have to be very careful to have assurance from the dealer that he was going to have delivery or at least registration available in his name by the end of December in order to be able to avail himself of the programme.

Interjections.

Mr. Shore: In view of the minister recognizing the difficulty in delivery, and in view of the fact that people don't necessarily plan buying cars many months ahead—I have heard this since October—is there any chance of anyone who makes a guarantee or places an order before Dec. 31, or Nov. 1, being assured that they'll be eligible? Some of these car dealers are at least being honest in saying that there's no chance, but some of them are saying that there is going to be a chance—and I don't think it's fair.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Mr. Shore: Would the minister answer that?

Hon. Mr. Meen: Mr. Speaker, I thought I had answered it. They must assure themselves, or get a guarantee from the dealer, that delivery of the vehicle can be made by Dec. 31, or at least can be registered in the name of the purchaser by Dec. 31.

That may require some co-operation of an unusual nature from some of the car manufacturers in providing serial numbers to their dealers, so that registration by Dec. 31 can be accomplished. But that would fall within the four corners of the regulation as it presently stands. I do not contemplate any significant alterations of that programme, but if that were to be done, obviously it is a fiscal matter and a responsibility of the Treasury.

OVERCROWDING IN OTTAWA HOSPITALS

Mr. Morrow: I have a question for the Minister of Health. The minister will recall that during his recent visit to the city of Ottawa, he mentioned that he was going to get in touch with his counterpart, the Minister of Health in the Province of Quebec, to discuss the overcrowding of hospital facilities in Ottawa created by patients from that part of western Quebec adjacent to the city of Ottawa. Would he be in a position to inform the House if he has met with the Minister of Health in Quebec and, if so, what steps or measures his counterpart in Quebec is contemplating or taking to alleviate this situation?

Hon. F. S. Miller: I haven't met with the Minister of Health in Quebec yet; I will on Monday. The situation from our point of view is not one of dollars and cents, but of bed availability. I think we allow about 200 beds in the Ottawa area, on the average, for use for people from the other province because of their highly specialized services. And our guesstimate is that somewhere around 350 beds are in use at the present time.

With the bed situation in Ottawa being fairly aggravated, I feel it's a responsibility of the Quebec government to make sure their own beds are available for their own people, in so far as possible. I have been a bit concerned because I have been told that up to 200 empty beds are sitting on the other side of the border.

Mr. Morrow: As I understand the minister, he is going to visit Ottawa for a couple of days next week and will be meeting with various hospital groups, as well as other health delivery groups in the city. Would the minister then undertake to bring back to the House a progress report as to what recommendation those groups are making to him to alleviate the chronic care hospital bed situation there that we all agree exists?

Hon. F. S. Miller: I certainly will, Mr. Speaker. I expect that when I visit Ottawa on Monday, that the Ottawa-Carleton Health Council will have some specific recommendations. When I was there in, I think it was September, I asked them to prepare some. It's my understanding they'll have some for me Monday. I don't know what they are, but until I see them I can't make any comment on them. I certainly will be able to tell the members whether I see them as acceptable or not.

[10:30]

COMMUNITY HOME PROGRAMME

Mr. McClellan: I have a question of the Minister of Community and Social Services respecting the fate of the community care proposals which, as the House may know, were designed to provide project funds for the care of paraplegics and other severely disabled people in group home settings. Since the care package proposals were approved by the advisory council to the social development minister, by the social development minister and by the previous Minister of Community and Social Services, would the minister advise the House why he found it necessary to snatch the proposal away from cabinet and subject it to further study? Would he advise this House whether he intends to recommend that excellent and urgently needed programme to cabinet for approval and, if so, when?

Hon. Mr. Taylor: I suppose the member is talking about the care package? If so, the matter will be coming before the policy field within about a week's time.

Mr. McClellan: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker: It has alread been through the mill in terms of the social development policy.

Mr. Speaker: Did the member have a supplementary question?

Mr. Deans: He's asking it.

Mr. McClellan: Yes.

Mr. Speaker: The member doesn't need to reply; we need a question.

Mr. McClellan: Is it not true that the care package proposal has already been through that route and approved? Why is the minister doing it again?

Hon. Mr. Taylor: There is no repetition; it has not been approved as far as I'm aware. I've discussed it at the staff level and there is a report going to the policy field for consideration and determination.

METRO CENTRE

Mr. Givens: I have a question of the Minister of Housing. Would the minister tell me what ministerial initiatives he is using to revive or resurrect the developmental land-use aspects of the railway proposition around the Union Station which would enable us to construct 10,000 units of residential rental accommodation in that proposition which was then called the Metro Centre? What is he doing? Is he doing anything about that on the 170 acres of land or is he simply going to let the matter drift away to see whether somebody else is going to do something about it?

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: No, Mr. Speaker, I have not been involved in that. I did have some involvement when the Metro Centre project was being considered. As the member well knows, the various levels of government, federal, provincial, metro, municipal—anyone handy, I guess—were invited to the meeting. At that time the programme appeared to be moving along but it ran into some very stiff opposition from the city of Toronto. Quite frankly, I have not been involved in any further discussions concerning it. I will be pleased to find out just where things stand and if there is some way we can get the

whole project moving. Up to now I have not been involved.

Mr. Givens: A supplementary: Doesn't the minister feel that it is important for him, having regard for the fact that if the project goes one way he can have 170 acres on which to build residential accommodation and if the project goes another way he won't be able to build? Doesn't he think it's important for him to initiate that sort of initiative?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. This seems to be a debating question but it should be for further information.

Mr. Givens: Answer it.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: Mr. Speaker, I don't disagree with the hon. member at all but I think that the hon. member well knows that until such time as we can get the co-operation and, more importantly, the agreement of the city of Toronto on what's going to happen to that land it's very difficult for any provincial agency simply to go in and impose its will or its desires. If we can reopen discussions that, hopefully, will be to that end certainly I'd be happy to try it.

Mrs. Campbell: Is it not a fact, that the government took the position that it would move ahead in that area to build a bridge; to enlarge the station to do all those things which would, if continued, completely erase the possibility of the use of the land for housing, or a substantial portion of it? Is that decision open to change?

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: Mr. Speaker, I'm sure the hon. member knows that this whole project involving the Metro Centre or that whole area around the Union Station has been kicked around since 1967.

Mrs. Campbell: It wasn't kicked around in 1967.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: The whole project has been in and out of committees; in and out of planning meetings; planning committees; planning boards. So many people have looked at it that it's probably the most studied piece of property in Canada today. It's correct that we attempted to go ahead, when I was with the Ministry of Transportation and Communications, to improve the station facilities there. Our information was that they were not capable of handling the volumes that were expected to be coming into the station.

We wanted to be improving Union Station to handle the commuter traffic as well as the regular trains. We wanted to be able to make sure that that facility was there as a transportation centre. We had relative agreement on that between all levels of government and the railroads that were involved. However, the thing bogged down again.

The member is correct, there was a move being made to improve the transportation facilities there. As I responded to the hon. member for Armourdale, that has gone down the drain obviously, and if we can reopen discussions to go ahead and develop that for a better use—and I would have to agree, housing is probably a better use—then I'll be happy to open up that discussion.

ETOBICOKE VALLEY LANDS

Mr. Philip: A question of the Minister of Housing please: Several days ago I sent to him, to the Premier and to five of his colleagues, a brief on behalf of the Thistletown regional residents association and 1,488 residents. The brief concerned the destruction of the valley lands in northern Ontario—sorry, Etobicoke.

Interjection.

Mr. Philip: In my riding that's northern Ontario.

Mr. Stokes: You sound like a Tory.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: We agree that's your attitude, my friend.

Mr. Philip: Has the minister or any of his colleagues made arrangements to meet with representatives of this group, and has he communicated with the Etobicoke council, as requested in the brief?

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: No, Mr. Speaker, I have not communicated with the Etobicoke council. That particular material that was sent to us is in the ministry being looked at by staff at the present time. I do know it has gone, as the member has suggested, to our other cabinet colleagues, who will be discussing it. But I haven't contacted the Etobicoke council, and I do want to thank the member for his public confession that he isn't really sure where northern Ontario is. Thank you.

Mr. Lewis: In this caucus he will learn soon enough.

PAYMENTS TO ROBERT MACAULAY

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Speaker, a question to the Minister of Energy regarding his inability

last night to reveal anything much about his department.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: Tell 'em, Eddie.

Mr. Sargent: I asked him two questions last night: 1, about the amount of moneys being paid to Mr. Macaulay, the counsel for the Energy Board; and, 2, the names of the five firms in the consortium. This morning—

Mr. Speaker: Your question.

Mr. Sargent: In view of the fact that this morning I phoned Mr. Dillon, the deputy minister of the department, and he advised me that the minister has paid Mr. Macaulay $149,000—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. We must get to the question.

Mr. Sargent: Is it true the minister has paid him $149,000 in the current fiscal year—that's 1974-1975 and it's not even over yet—or he has funnelled through to him $149,000—

Mr. Yakabuski: That was just a retainer.

Mr. Sargent: —at the rate of $75 an hour?

Mr. Bullbrook: That's about the size of it.

Mr. Sargent: I say what the hell kind of a—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. Is there an answer to the question?

Mr. Sargent: The second question is, what are the names of the five firms in the consortium with Hydro?

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: Mr. Speaker, let's have the record clear; the member did not raise—and I think if you'll check Hansard you'll find this to be true—the question of payments to lawyers, in the debate last night on the natural gas allocation bill.

Mr. Sargent: You weren't even listening last night.

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: Oh, you raised it later? All right.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: In the lounge?

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: Yes, like after adjournment. The deputy minister did give the members the figures this morning for amounts that were paid in the—

Mr. Sargent: Why didn't you know?

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: I knew; you just didn't ask me.

Mr. Sargent: One hundred and forty-nine thousand dollars.

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: —in the 1974-1975 fiscal year, and they relate to three specific firms—Thomson, Rogers; Reid, Perry; and Macaulay, Perry—which involved the work of not only Mr. Macaulay with such things as the Ontario Energy Board review in 1974 of the Hydro rates submission, but also a variety of other interventions and legal work in general carried out on behalf of the government. The total paid to the three firms is roughly $139,000 in 1974-1975.

Mr. Sargent: The second question was on the consortium; who are they?

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: The consortium? I haven't had a chance this morning to look up the names. I indicated in the debate yesterday that I would look that up—

Mr. Sargent: Ask the member for Frontenac-Addington (Mr. McEwen). He should know.

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: —and we can discuss it during the estimates of the Ministry of Energy, which I understand will be considered by the estimates committee sometime next week.

USE OF HAZARDOUS CHEMICALS

Hon. F. S. Miller: Mr. Speaker, on Oct. 30 the hon. member for Hamilton East (Mr. Mackenzie) asked if I was aware that the chemical Kepone was being used in the FMC Corp. plant in Burlington and if I would check to see if adequate safeguards exist for the workers.

The FMC Corp. plant at Burlington, formerly Niagara Brand Chemicals, handles agricultural chemicals. Kepone, a chlorinated hydrocarbon, is an insecticide imported from Lethelin Products Co. Inc. in New York in a gel form of one-eighth of one per cent concentration. It is used in the manufacture of ant traps.

Mr. MacDonald: You were momentarily caught there.

Mr. Breithaupt: Aren't you glad you were asked that question?

Hon. F. S. Miller: I was thinking of the little crawling—no, I musn't let my mind go.

Mr. Moffatt: What colour is it?

Hon. F. S. Miller: I was thinking that if I could build a better ant trap, maybe we could win next time.

Mr. Breithaupt: Only if you catch more ants.

Mr. Martel: And if you get a new leader.

Hon. F. S. Miller: The handling procedure at the plant is satisfactory and should not be a hazard to the health of employees.

The occupational health protection branch of my ministry is aware of the incidents arising in the United States as the result of the manufacture of Kepone. It is our understanding that improved control conditions have been directed in the manufacturer's plant following violations of the US Occupational Safety and Health Act. In addition, restrictions have been imposed in the shipment of Kepone from this plant by the US Environmental Protection Agency.

Mr. Moffatt: A supplementary: I didn't get from the minister's answer whether his ministry has investigated conditions in the particular plant in Hamilton in the past four months to find out if those conditions are being met in that particular plant.

Hon. F. S. Miller: I can't give the hon. member the date that we made our inspection. I would assume that perhaps it at least occurred after the question was asked and that the handling procedures are correct, but I would be glad to verify that.

Mr. Swart: Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the Minister of Transportation and Communications.

Mr. Bullbrook: Mr. Speaker, two in a row?

Mr. Swart: Before I place that question, I would like to take the opportunity to introduce to the Legislature approximately 100 students from grade 10 at Eastdale Secondary School in the city of Welland, who are here with three of their teachers, Mr. Grant, Mr. Hueglin and Mr. Wraight. Would the House please welcome them?

Mr. Singer: Is that part of the question period?

Mr. Shore: Could we get an answer to that?

COMPULSORY USE OF SEATBELTS

Mr. Swart: My question to the Minister of Transportation and Communications is this: In view of the figures contained in the tabled report on motor vehicle collision facts, which show conclusively the advantages of buckling up seatbelts, and in view of the Canadian Press story, which I believe was carried last Saturday, about a report of the director of transport in Australia which showed that fatalities and injuries there were 26 per cent less than they would have been if they had not had the compulsory seatbelt law, is his government now prepared to reconsider the previous decision against compulsory use of seatbelts?

Hon. Mr. Snow: Since taking over the responsibility for the Ministry of Transportation and Communications, I have been looking very seriously at many reports and information relating to the possible compulsory use of seatbelts. As of yet I have not made any recommendation to my colleagues in cabinet, but the matter is under consideration.

Mr. Young: A supplementary to the minister: I just want to ask him if he talks to his neighbour on his left, since the Minister of Health is so anxious that seatbelt legislation be passed in order to drop the cost in the hospitals and to the medical plan in Ontario?

Mr. Lewis: I think the new Minister of Labour (B. Stephenson) is anxious as well. [10:45]

Hon. Mr. Snow: I have had some very serious discussions with my colleague to my left.

Interjection.

Hon. Mr. Snow: To my left physically, here.

Hon. F. S. Miller: I have sure got the wrong seat in this House.

Mr. Martel: He has gone all the way to the right.

Hon. Mr. Snow: The matter certainly is not dead. It is under consideration and I have discussed it with some of my colleagues independently, but I have not brought in a recommendation.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The time is just about up. We have many more questions, and we are getting repetitive. The member for Sarnia.

ANTI-INFLATION PROGRAMME

Mr. Bullbrook: A question to the Treasurer in his capacity as the committee chairman

directing Ontario's commitment to the anti-inflation programme.

Relative to the famous comments of his colleague, the Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations (Mr. Handleman) about pigs at the trough—rhetoric more suited to the politics of Mississippi than Ontario—could the Treasurer advise what he is doing in connection with the two matters that concern him: one, what is his committee doing which the federal government wouldn't do with respect to interest rates in financial institutions coming directly under Ontario's constitutional responsibility; and secondly, what liaison has he had with his colleague, the Minister of Labour, to direct the conciliation and mediation services in their function of responsibility to take into consideration those guidelines and press forward for some less piggery at the trough?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Perhaps answering the first question—I have not seen the comments of my colleague, the Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations.

Mr. Lewis: It is just as well. He should get a new speech writer.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: I will be glad to have a look at them.

With respect to the second part of the question, I think the answer has to be with the conciliation officers. The mediators or the arbitrators, who from time to time may be appointed or used by the Minister of Labour, are there to bring two parties together. They are not there to impose the will of this government or the government of Canada under any programme.

Mr. Bullbrook: Why should they be called pigs at the trough when this government can do nothing about it?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: That's really not relevant to the point.

Mr. Bullbrook: Certainly it is.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: No, the point that the member is trying to make is that our mediators or arbitrators in some way should try to dictate settlements, and we reject that philosophy. That is not the philosophy of our labour relations Acts, and the member well knows it.

Mr. Bullbrook: Let's get to the interest rates.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: What they are trying to do is to bring two sides together.

With respect to interest rates, I think the member is well enough versed in the fact that interest rates, in effect, are set by the Bank of Canada and not by any emanation of the Province of Ontario.

Mr. Bullbrook: Is the Treasurer saying to me that the Province of Ontario has no jurisdiction with respect to the control of interest rates, for example, by loan and trust corporations—for example, by finance corporations? Is that what he is trying to tell me?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: I suppose probably we do, but I can't think of anthing—

Mr. Bullbrook: You bet your life you do!

Hon. Mr. McKeough: I can't think of anything more ridiculous than our suggesting to the loan and trust companies, or legislating that they are going to do something with their interest rates, when the chartered banks who are directly looked after by the Bank of Canada, are going off in another direction.

Mr. Bullbrook: Why does the Treasurer characterize people that way?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Interest rates in this country are the responsibility of the Bank of Canada, and the member well knows it.

Mr. Bullbrook: He is full of rhetoric.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: The member well knows it! Go and take a little course in economics.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The member for Nickel Belt.

Mr. Bullbrook: I don't need a course in economics. The Treasurer could bring down the interest rates overnight if he wanted to. Instead, he sends out speeches with remarks like that.

GOGAMA WATER SUPPLY

Mr. Laughren: I have a question for the Minister of the Environment.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: Stand up, Floyd.

An hon. member: That's a good line; where did you think that one up?

Mr. Speaker: Time is just about up; will the member continue with his question?

Mr. Laughren: Since the member for St. Andrew-St. Patrick (Mr. Grossman) laughed, I don't mind him directing his comments toward me.

In view of the fact that the Minister of the Environment's predecessor, who sits on his immediate right, so miserably failed to solve the drinking water problem in the town of Gogama, would the minister review the case with the view to replacing the community tap—which his predecessor installed—with a communal water supply? Further, would he agree that there is no place in Ontario in 1975 for a community tap in a town of 600 people?

Hon. Mr. Kerr: I understand that is in an unorganized territory, and I will speak to officials in my ministry in an attempt to solve the problem.

Mr. Speaker: The oral question period has expired.

Mr. Lewis: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order if I may. As a firm believer in political dynasties, I thought it should be pointed out that the father of the member for St. Andrew-St. Patrick is in the Speaker's gallery.

Mr. Speaker: I have to get used to seeing that gentleman up there.

Petitions.

Presenting reports.

Mr. Morrow from the select committee on reports 4 and 5 of the Ontario Commission on the Legislature presented a report which was read as follows:

Your committee recommends that it have authority to sit during the interval between sessions; that it be allowed to employ such personnel as may be deemed advisable for the purpose of preparing its report; and that the committee have authority to sit concurrently with the House if it deems necessary.

Hon. Mr. Welch: Mr. Speaker, just before this motion is put, I do want to make some reference to the third aspect of that report. I will be bringing a motion in shortly to give the select committee on Ontario Hydro's rates the opportunity to sit concurrently with the House. This does create some problems in the organization of committee time. Although I am sure we would want to deal with the matter today, I have asked my colleagues, the other two House leaders, the chairmen of all the committees which have been established and the whips to meet briefly on Wednesday morning at 9 o'clock so that we could ensure a satisfactory timetabling of all of these committees so they wouldn't interfere unduly with the business here in the House as well.

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Speaker, to the minister in the same vein, may I ask him, in view of the fact he has a new ball game over there, and his policy is to get his members into the question period and many of the new members can't get a shot at a question at all—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Mr. Sargent: —why doesn't he enlarge the question period to an hour?

Mr. Speaker: That is out of order.

Mr. Sargent: Come on now—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The hon. member is not discussing the matter before us. That's a different matter completely.

Mr. Sargent: He should enlarge the question period to an hour instead of 45 minutes.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Interjection.

Mr. Sargent: Why not?

Mr. Speaker: As I understand it that order is for the—

Mr. Sargent: What kind of a forum is this?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. Would the hon. member take his seat?

Interjections.

Mr. Lewis: You are going to have to do something about your authority as Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member was out of order completely. He has taken his seat now.

Report agreed to.

Hon. Mr. Bennett presented the annual report of the Ontario Development Corp., the Northern Ontario Development Corp. and the Eastern Ontario Development Corp. of all the loans made and of all the guarantees given for the payment of the loans, setting out the amounts and the terms of the loans, the guarantees and the individuals receiving them, by address, for the year 1974-1975.

Mr. Martel: You judge that is helpful now?

Mr. Laughren: Right after your estimates.

Hon. Mr. Parrott presented the financial reports of the University of Toronto, the University of Western Ontario for the year ending April 30, 1975, and of Ryerson Polytechnical Institute for the year ending March 31, 1975.

Mr. Speaker: Motions.

Hon. Mr. Welch moved that the select committee on Ontario Hydro's proposed rate increase be authorized to sit concurrently with the House for the conduct of its business.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. Speaker: Introduction of bills.

MEDICAL DATA BANK ACT

Mr. B. Newman moved first reading of bill intituled, An Act to establish a Medical Data Bank.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Mr. B. Newman: Mr. Speaker, the purpose of the bill is to establish, just as it says, a medical data bank in which in computerized form would be stored the medical histories of persons in Ontario who wish to participate in such a data bank. The social insurance numbers would be the numbers that would be used.

Mr. Speaker: Just before the orders of the day, in response to a question from the hon. member for Wentworth (Mr. Deans) yesterday when I was not in the chair and for the information of all members, I am advised by the Ministry of Government Services that the Bell Telephone Co. will have completed all installations in members' offices by Wednesday, Nov. 12. You will appreciate that a very large number of changes had been required in the telephone system, involving rather complicated technical changes.

Mr. Lewis: Don't give us Bell Canada's excuse.

Mr. Speaker: However, I am assured that the representatives are working this weekend.

Interjections.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. There have been a large number of changes necessary and they've been working overtime, and I understand they're working overtime this weekend. We should all be in business by Wednesday.

Orders of the day.

Clerk of the House: The second order, resuming the adjourned debate on the amendment to the motion for an address in reply to the speech of the Honourable the Lieutenant Governor at the opening of the session.

THRONE SPEECH DEBATE

(continued)

Mr. Grossman: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It is indeed an honour to rise to participate in this debate.

I too would like to congratulate you on the office you hold and wish you well in the very difficult task that lies before you. As one who has sat both where my predecessor now sits in the gallery and where he used to sit in the House, although quite a bit to the right of where he used to sit—at least in terms of seats in the House—let me say that I've watched you from both locations. Your sense of fairness and your good humour have served you well before and I trust will stand you in good stead in this session.

The same would, of course, apply to the Deputy Speaker. His reputation precedes him, his performance in your chair, sir, has been exemplary so far, and it just shows that there is indeed one good thing about minority government.

I'd like also to congratulate the member for Kingston and the Islands (Mr. Norton), who moved the address to Her Honour the Lieutenant Governor, and the member for Mississauga North (Mr. Jones), my seatmate, who seconded the motion. Both of these gentlemen, like myself, are new members to this Legislature, and much to the chagrin of some opposite I think it indicates that we back here intend to make a significant and ongoing contribution to the debates in this House and to do so on well-based grounds, and on the basis of a lot of preparation.

Mr. Lewis: It's a pleasure that you are doing it.

Mr. Grossman: It won't be a great change, only that some of our ablest members did not make it back here. But I'm happy to say some of our ablest members did make it back here.

May I also say that I appreciate the introduction that the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Lewis) made of my predecessor, my father, who's here this morning. And, indeed, it is one of the great pleasures that I've experienced in the first few weeks and months around here to walk through the halls of this Legislature and be stopped quite often by those who are reminding me of the contribution my father did indeed make to these chambers over the 20 years he sat here, the good humour with which he conducted himself and the good grace and good sense he showed while he was here.

Although I will say it's a little hard on me to hear I have large shoes to fill, I do appreciate the indulgence of the House in allowing me for just that short moment to wax on about my predecessor.

[11:00]

Indeed, I have three other predecessors in a manner of speaking, two of whom are in this Legislature as a result of redistribution. One of my predecessors is the hon. member for Armourdale (Mr. Givens) and the other is the hon. member for St. George (Mrs. Campbell) who represented portions of my riding prior to redistribution. They also leave shoes to be filled. The only reason they're not as large as those that I got from my father is that they represented only a small portion of what is now my riding.

Leonard Reilly, the overworked and underpaid chairman of the Science Centre, is another one of my predecessors.

Mr. Lewis: A pause, a tear for Leonard.

Mr. Grossman: There's no question I have also large shoes to fill in that sense, as he represented the Oriole Park area of my riding very well for so many years. Also, in a certain sense, another one of my predecessors is the member for Eglinton (Mr. McMurtry). As a constituent of mine, his personal popularity in Oriole Park obliged me to spend the first two weeks of my campaign convincing his neighbours that I wasn't running against him.

Mr. Breithaupt: And did you?

Mr. Grossman: I trust members will forgive me, I will not go on long about it but I know they will be interested to hear about my riding because they are sitting in it right now.

Far removed from the furore experienced here we have some quieter areas, I assure members—that Oriole Park area I referred to before; and the Forest Hill area. The west annex area is a quiet portion of my riding, as well, I'm happy to say—largely, indeed solely, as a result of the brave decision to kill the intra-city expressway that this government made in 1971. I'll have more to say about that shortly.

My riding also includes the very precious Kensington area which, I'm happy to say, is just embarking upon a massive neighbourhood improvement programme which will have the effect of shifting the importance of that area and the core of that area away from the market to the very fine residential neighbourhood that abuts it. I also have in my riding the University of Toronto—I'll have more to say about it and its august publication, The Varsity, in a few minutes.

One of the very fine aspects of my riding is the excellent Alexandra Park development where the residents are so well-treated and so happy that this government has had its members reap the rewards in terms of votes in that area, in terms of open doors, and in terms of warm greetings for very many years. The needs of the people in Alexandra Park are not entirely met. There's the Scadding Court project which will complete their needs in terms of vast recreational facilities. The aldermen for the area are working with me, the federal government and one or two ministers of this government, on this project on a day-to-day basis to see if we can't complete this very excellent project.

One other part of my riding which members may be familiar with and may have heard of before is the Toronto Islands. There is some anticipation, quite correct, that I will be presenting a bill which will have the effect of transferring ownership of those islands from the municipality of Metropolitan Toronto—which wants to spend $5 million to pull down those homes and build some more parkland there—to the city of Toronto which is currently in the midst of attempting to have those lands rezoned residentially. This matter has been referred to Mayor Crombie and the executive of the city of Toronto and they have indicated some interest in attempting to work out ways in which this can be accomplished.

To use the words of the Toronto Sun, the issue of retaining homes on the Toronto Islands is "an issue close to the urban activist hearts of the NDP Metro members." That's all right. Nonetheless, I might add, it is close to my heart, for which I do not apologize. I've long felt that it's foolhardy, indeed almost disgraceful, for the Metro Toronto parks department to be seeking to expand the island park facilities which really are not in need of expansion, at the expense of a higher priority, which has been talked about in this House for months and years, which is housing. Some time later, perhaps this matter can be reassessed.

For example, I anticipate that as being at the same time at which the yacht club leases, which are on those same islands, expire. Then we can reassess the whole situation, see if there is a housing shortage at that time, and see if the new plans brought forward by the city of Toronto planning department have created such housing in downtown Toronto that the need then shifts to parkland. But

right now, it is inconceivable to me that there are still those, sitting in Metro council particularly, who are on a crusade to throw people out of their homes while we up here are doing what we can to retain housing, to find more housing, to find more money, more dollars and more locations, particularly for those who cannot find suitable affordable accommodation.

I'm obliged to say that typical of the attitude of those who would crusade to force these people out of their homes is that typified by my friend, and indeed he is my friend, the non-elected chairman of Metropolitan Toronto. Chairman Godfrey has been quoted as saying that my actions were "a political move to solidify his (that is my) position with the voters of the island."

Perhaps if Mr. Godfrey will read the results of the election of Sept. 18, and I suppose he's not really used to reading election results, he will discover that I got all of 51 of the 320 votes cast on the island. He probably won't read them. It is easy for Mr. Godfrey to describe the actions of any elected officials as "a political move." I suppose his moves, almost by definition, are never political. Since he is insulated from the voters, then that very insulation may explain his never-ending battle to build expressways and to destroy the island homes.

I didn't hear the Metro chairman describing the actions of the member for Armourdale (Mr. Givens) and the member for Wilson Heights (Mr. Singer) as political, when they wanted, and still do in looking after their people, to continue the fight to build the Spadina Expressway. Chairman Godfrey, being one of those who believe in that, does not feel that those moves are politically based —moves meant to solidify anyone's position. I do not suggest that as the motive behind the two members I have referred to. Equally it is inapplicable to ascribe those same political motives to me, simply because I'm looking after a portion of my constituents.

I do say to the Metro chairman that if I'm wrong on the issue then the voters on the island and in other places of this riding can reject me. That's fine. I will answer to them. I will at all times do what I think is right and what I believe in. I've long believed in retention of those homes, and I'll answer for it, right or wrong, but I do not think that my non-elected friend should ascribe political motives only to those that he doesn't agree with. In any event, he can continue to look after his constituents, being the members of Metro council, while I look after mine, being the citizens of my riding, my city and my province.

It was a shock for me on the first day to come in here and look across the floor, not because I haven't been at least behind here before, but to see the NDP having shifted over and in such great numbers. Like very many people over here, I was looking forward to the remarks of the new Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Lewis) and the remarks of the leader of the Liberal Party (Mr. Nixon) as well.

However, I was indeed distressed to hear both parties bleat about this government's attempt to abide by and to live with the anti-inflation guidelines set out by the federal government. It's easy for us to accept this, because it is just a watered-down version of what our federal leader was pleading for a year and a half ago.

But, I was indeed distressed that both parties opposite, rather than support the guidelines, saw fit explicitly or more often by implication to support or give solace to those who wanted to undermine those very guidelines by seeking their own peculiar particular exemptions thereto. It is not a new experience for me to hear the Liberal Party play to one pressure group or another in the hopes that by courting enough of them, sooner or later they will get over here and form a government of special-interest groups. They tried it in 1971 on the separate school issue, right through to September, 1975, when their pitch was to the civil servants.

I was particularly distressed to hear the amendment proposed by the leader of the Liberal Party in light of the quite clear need for national unity at this particular time of national crisis. It's a clever ploy to suggest that an Ontario mechanism be set up to deal with exemptions in those wage and price guidelines. It's clever because it carried with it the implication that those who would apply to that board would be more successful than if they were obliged to apply to he federal board. If that is the case, all the more reason that we ought not to have sectional provincial interests dealing with these applications.

The implication that the Liberal Party leaves is that by applying here in Ontario the applicants will be more successful and, therefore, somehow their party is more concerned about these groups than is this government. That is, of course, entirely not the case. It is precisely because the government of Ontario is concerned about both the short- and long-run welfare of all citizens' groups and all citizens throughout this prov-

ince and country, that it feels it is important that all persons—not just all Ontarians—be judged equally by the same body and with the same concern factors and on the same standards as all others.

So there may be political gain to be made by the implication inherent in the proposal for the provincial board. However, I am proud to be standing on the side of the House that treats the tender state of the economy as too fragile and important to be used for political point scoring, even in the minority situation.

The official opposition has, of course, played the same game by attempting, for example, to appear to support the position of one of the parties—I needn't say which—to the labour negotiations involving Metro secondary school teachers. Of course, that sort of posture is not new to the party since it supported, in essence, price but not wage controls in the federal election of 1974. In that interesting federal election—I remember it well—the leader of my party, of course, was supporting complete and full wage and price controls and met his fate as a result. The result of that, of course, is that we find ourselves struggling with an even more serious problem today.

I can't resist adding that the NDP in that same election met a heck of a lot worse fate, because it committed the most grievous sin by supporting the one but not the other; that is, price but not wage controls. My own opinion is that Mr. Trudeau supported the other, not the one. But it is interesting to quote the Leader of the Opposition when he said in the Throne debate—I can't quite quote as mellifluously; I'll attempt it though:

> I think we have understood what perhaps the Conservatives in Ontario have not understood, and that is that the power of the state is so awesome that you don't intervene lightly.

He went on to talk about intervening only with fairness and feeling. I take him back a year and a half: Did he really suggest that price controls, but not wage controls, are not the precise type of halfway, light interfering in the economy that he so objects to today? If his party really understands that, then what were they doing a year ago when they offered, on a national basis, to intervene on only one side of the economy? I quote the hon. Leader of the Opposition: "The power of the state is so awesome that you don't intervene lightly."

I was also interested to hear his complaint —and again I quote; as uncomfortable as he felt quoting John Munro, I equally feel uncomfortable:

> Either you set up a provincial review board in Ontario which scrupulously and relentlessly monitors every single price increase and rolls it backward as illegitimate, or you do what they had the courage to do in the Province of [guess where?]British Columbia; that is, to institute a price freeze, and you do it today for a minimum period of two months until things sort themselves out.

Hon. Mr. Handleman: Until you have an election.

Mr. Grossman: That was indeed a couple of days before the election; yes, that's true.

The other day, before they called the election, I heard the British Columbia Attorney General on CBC radio—and I mention that to give it some authenticity—and he said that his province had not set up a system to monitor prices since he believed that the threat of adverse publicity would do the job. Does that ring a bell? Further, he said that he has faith in the businessmen of the province to toe the line. There you have it. There it is.

The Leader of the Opposition suggested the other day that we should do what they did in British Columbia and monitor the prices. But they didn't. Why didn't they? Because in British Columbia apparently the NDP government can trust its businessmen but, according to the Leader of the Opposition, a similar type of businessmen in Ontario can't be trusted. I reject that. He challenges the government to have the courage to do what they did in British Columbia, but in fact the BC government didn't do it.

I cannot fail to refer as well to the latest position of that party regarding rent controls. Does that have a familiar ring? The Leader of the Opposition dealt at some length in his speech with the question of where or if the government ever checks facts and figures. He asked in his speech if the government ever checked the increase in profits of some of the big companies.

I wonder if the NDP, during the election, ever bothered to check the actual figures on rent increases in Metro Toronto in the past year? The recent CMHC figures show that the actual increase was 13 per cent. I don't purport to stand here and suggest that 13 per cent was a fair or equitable increase, but it sure as heck is a lot less than 93 per cent paid by a widow in Scarborough or by a Mr. A or a Mr. B in Sudbury. It was good politics not to check the figures, or at least not to use them.

Mr. Renwick: Are you questioning the validity of the individual case figures that were used?

Mr. Grossman: Not a bit; I'm not questioning their validity.

Mr. Moffatt: He didn't go quite that far.

Mr. Grossman: However, the member's leader suggested that we go out and check the profits of big companies. All I say is that it isn't that difficult for the members. They just have to call up CMHC, check the figures for actual rent increases and give us those figures.

Mr. Renwick: Are you disputing the individual cases that were brought to the attention of the electorate during the election?

Interjections.

Mr. Speaker: Order.

Mr. Renwick: We got them from the people who paid the rent, not from CMHC.

Mr. Grossman: The CMHC figures, for the benefit of the member for Riverdale, were not the figures as they related to CMHC-supported or financed units. They were the CMHC figures, as a result of their survey—well respected, I might add—of all rental units in Metropolitan Toronto.

Mr. Renwick: We weren't talking about that—

Mr. Grossman: Of course, the 93 per cent—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. Will you allow the member for St. Andrew-St. Patrick to continue?

Mr. Renwick: I want him to continue, but it is now 11:20 and we will have to wait until 1 o'clock before he will finish.

Mr. Grossman: I hope so.

Mr. Ruston: You can always go home, Jim.

Mr. Sargent: There is a 20-minute time limit here.

Mr. Grossman: The 93 per cent was calculated in the CMHC figure, which leads me to wonder how many people experienced a heck of a lot less that 13 per cent in order to average out that 93 per cent down to 13.

Mr. Swart: Forget about the 93 per cent.

Mr. Grossman: Mr. Lewis, in his speech, talked about how easy it was—

Mr. Speaker: I must remind the member for St. Andrew-St. Patrick that when you refer to a member of this House you refer to him by his riding name, not his surname.

Mr. Grossman: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Sargent: And don't be provocative either.

Mr. Grossman: I have watched the member for Grey-Bruce a few too many days in here.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: Not too many.

Mr. Grossman: Not too many. In any event, the hon. Leader of the Opposition, in his speech, talked about how easy it was for the cabinet to posture themselves in more extreme positions than that of the federal cabinet ministers. At the same time, I can't help but notice his own posture, whereby his party just recently arrived at a six per cent figure for rent increases, only after serious speculation began that our government would propose eight or 10 per cent increases. It was easy to go lower. We understand. Of course, the further proposal that we roll back rents to 1974 stands on equal footing with their price-but-not-wage control, proposed a year ago by their party.

Finally, the hon. Leader of the Opposition says, "You people over there, you are so easy with your inequities." He then went on to state that an NDP government would strike out inequities. First, the government of Ontario can proudly stand on its record, not promises, for stamping out inequities. The government is not easy with inequities, and has moved far and long with programmes ranging right across the board, from free drugs plans, to guaranteed annual incomes, to the Human Rights Commission and so on.

The NDP understands and knows that what the government is saying is that in this emergency, if we attempt to alleviate wage inequities, that attempt will be costly, perhaps disastrous, in terms of granting large or excessive increases to establish parity. A system has been set up to resolve this problem, and those that we can afford and that fit into the guidelines, and that can present a reasonable case, will go to Ottawa.

There's one other alternative for wiping out the inequities. The alternative, of course, is for the NDP to suggest that some of the inequities created by some excessive wage settlements in the past few years be eliminated by rolling back those wage increases. We heard the Leader of the Opposition—

Mr. Germa: How about legal fees?

Mr. Grossman: —use John Munro's quotation, that "some settlements, admittedly, have been excessive by any standards." I did not hear the Leader of the Opposition suggest that this inequity be wiped out by rollbacks. Presumably then, he would wipe out these inequities by raising everyone else to those admittedly high standards, further feeding inflation, without any reference whatever to the federal board.

I'd like to refer specifically to another major concern in my riding, and that is a concern about the ultimate resolution of the traffic problems in the northwest quadrant of Metropolitan Toronto. My constituents were the direct beneficiaries of the permanent—I underline permanent—stoppage of the inner-city Spadina expressway. That decision has encouraged and caused literally dozens of young married people to buy homes in the central portion of my riding, determined to raise their families in what will now be a quiet, happy, valued inner-city atmosphere and area.

These people, who have had their homes and neighbourhoods saved and maintained by this government, are now being scared by the radical reactionaries into believing that the 1971 decision has been abandoned. These people have obviously neither read nor understood nor care to relate the Soberman report, which emphasized the seriousness of the traffic problem in the northwest quadrant and, as well, they have failed to understand the wide range of solutions which would, in Mr. Soberman's opinion, not destroy those parts of the city of Toronto which were saved by the 1971 decision.

The Soberman report itself is based on the presumption that the Spadina Expressway shall not be completed. Those people who raised the scare that Spadina shall continue should refer to the Premier's statement of Aug. 8, 1975, wherein he stated:

> First, I want to emphasize again that the heart of our urban policy is, simply put, that the government of Ontario will do all it can in practical terms to encourage the development of mass transit facilities in and between urban centres; and as well, that the government will do whatever it can to prevent decision on transportation policy which will have the effect of dumping passenger automobiles upon the downtown streets of our cities.
>
> This has been settled policy since the so-called Spadina decision of 1971. [That policy remains in place today.]
>
> I say that as assurance for those who support the Spadina decision and I say that for the information of those who still oppose it. Since the Spadina decision in 1971 some municipalities have seen fit to eliminate expressway programmes from their transportation plans. [That is a matter of record.]
>
> The people in the Spadina corridor have preserved their neighbourhoods and they will continue to so do. So will the people in Toronto's east metro where the Scarborough Expressway has also been stopped.

I'm proud that this government assumed leadership in North America and killed intra-city expressways in one fell swoop. However, the Premier, unlike those people in parties who continue to serve special interest groups, has a responsibility to all the people of this province and all the people of Metropolitan Toronto.

To quote the Premier directly out of that same statement,

> Notwithstanding that benchmark in Ontario transportation policy, we still have to move people from where they live to where they work. We still have to provide facilities that will allow people access to and egress from the city to encourage commerce, trade, recreation and enterprise. But we will not do this at the expense of the city itself, at cost to its environment and to its life at the core.

The Premier's Aug. 8 statement goes on to set up a vast array of rapid transit facilities, including an extension of GO Transit to Oakville, Burlington, Hamilton, Markham, Uxbridge, Claremont and Stouffville. However, specifically on the transit situation in Metro, the Premier went on to say,

> Personally, I do not mind at all if the unfinished portion of the Spadina Expressway, as it now stands, remains as a symbol of our determination to save our cities for people rather than sell out to the automobile. But while I do not mind the fact that the present half-finished portion of the expressway from Lawrence to Eglinton becomes a symbol of that, it need not, on the other hand, become an artifact.
>
> We could use that portion of the expressway, as the Soberman report suggested and Metro council has requested, for an arterial road running between Lawrence and Eglinton. Such a facility would accommodate, as the Soberman report found, much of the local traffic which exists in the area. Further, the corridor could be used for park-and-ride facilities both at Lawrence and Eglinton for com-

muter transportation to downtown Toronto by subway.

Notwithstanding the cries of those who refused to recognize responsibilities and needs of persons other than themselves, the Premier went on to clearly set out certain conditions which he felt, while solving some transit problems at the same time, would not create others.

[11:30]

Firstly, he provided that the arterial road be extended between Lawrence and Eglinton, and that it be ended with single lane ramps only. Secondly, the Premier undertook to "assist in the design and construction when necessary to park-and-ride facilities at Lawrence and Eglinton."

Let those who say there will be no park-and-ride facilities know that this member and this government will not retreat from that commitment to work with Metro and the city of Toronto to meet the need for park-and-ride facilities at Lawrence and Eglinton.

Without taking the time of the House, may I say that the Premier's statement went on to provide certain legal guarantees that there will be no further construction, arterial or otherwise, south of Eglinton. To those people who will always operate by way of scare tactics and cannot believe that the Premier is as up to date as their own sandal-footed spokesmen, let me say that because of their success in scaring people, I believe that some people still remain concerned about the possibility of future paving. Therefore, I would urge the Premier to see to it that the park-and-ride facilities are constructed in such a way that they would operate as a permanent road block at Eglinton to any further and future roadway extension south of Eglinton.

I would further urge the Premier to encourage the early start of the east-west transit corridor study referred to in his statement. In the event that study were to include, as I expect it will, a recommendation that the facility should be constructed along Eglinton, then I for one would strongly recommend that the facility also be constructed so as to operate across the right of way and therefore as a further road block.

Finally on this subject, may I remind both the House and my constituents that Metro has still not satisfied a proviso which reads as follows in the Premier's statement:

> As a further proviso, should our arterial roads be placed in the Spadina corridor between Lawrence and Eglinton, we would require that Metro council develop a plan to ensure that any excess traffic generated by the new roadways will remain on other Metro arterial roads.

I want to assure my constituents and this House that the plan must be brought forward by Metro Toronto first. When it is brought forward, it will be carefully scrutinized to see that it is not just tokenism but that it is a real and workable plan. The fact that the Premier has referred to that plan as a proviso would require that Metro apply their minds to the traffic plan, not just to letting contracts for paving. Indeed, they must apply themselves to the traffic plan before applying themselves to paving contracts.

There are a couple of other matters which have long been of concern to me and I would like to take this opportunity to refer to them. As a lawyer, like most recent graduates at the time I spent my early days of practice in the criminal courts. I have returned from time to time to have a look at the improvements or changes, and I want to comment upon the judicial procedures and what is, in fact, slow justice in our courts.

It is not unusual for accused persons to await trial for 12 or 13 months, especially when there is a preliminary hearing involved. It is not unusual for the accused to be remanded on three of four occasions. It is not unusual for the accused and his lawyer, on each of these occasions, to wait in court one or two hours until in 30 seconds he is remanded for another week or month. It is not unusual for trials to commence at 11:30 or 12 o'clock, only after 40 or 50 routine remands and adjournments have been dealt with.

Now, obviously, there are some simple partial solutions that money can buy, and I hope we have it. First, we need more Crown attorneys and we need more courtrooms and more facilities.

I have always felt that it is in the provincial judges' courts where the majesty and importance of the courts and our procedures must and can be brought home to those who have been charged with violations of the law. To have these people dragged up from the cellar of the old city hall in Toronto and in some cases to be kept in a cage—nothing more—in the middle of the courtroom is no way to impress importance, majesty and fair treatment.

When the court house on University Ave. was constructed I felt then, as I do now, that a facility of that calibre should first have been constructed for the lower provincial courts rather than as a high court building for the convenience of the lawyers and judges

to practice and sit in. Not only do we need these more and better courtrooms, but enough Crown attorneys to lighten the caseload of each one, in order that each of them can understand and have a real grasp of each case he must deal with, in order that he may make a sensible well-conceived, well-thought-out recommendation with regard to bail.

The recommendation of the Crown attorney is a very key consideration to the granting of bail. Too often these matters come before the courts and the Crowns doing the best they can—and they are very excellent Crowns—can only look over their docketed docket matters and make a quick assessment of the situation and make the best recommendation they can simply without enough opportunity to delve into each case individually.

This whole matter of bail could be substantially improved if we simply had more and better study by lightening the caseloads of these bail applications. An increase in numbers of Crown attorneys would also allow for speedier and better trials.

To solve some of these problems, I would like to see an extension of the system now being tried in some courts, to have a singular court set aside for remands and adjournments, such courts to begin sitting perhaps at 9 or 9:30 in the morning and such courts to be concerned solely with routine remands and setting dates for trial.

In this way trials need not begin at 12 but could begin in the existing courts at 10 a.m. and our excellent judges would be able to spend their entire days dealing with trials—not clerical remands. Other and different bail courts dealing solely with the question of bail on remands ought to be established so that those courts as well are not dealing with routine remands, remands with bail questions involved, and trials all on the same docket on the same day.

I had intended to make extensive remarks on the matter of gun control. Suffice it to say, that I would only urge upon the Attorney General one thing at this time. In view of the anticipated federal legislation, I would hope that he would give some consideration to requiring in the meantime immediate registration of all sales of all firearms of any type and calibre whatsoever so as to avoid the possibility that there are those running out now and buying guns in anticipation of legislation which will restrict their right to so do. Let's register everyone that is running in and buying those guns now.

I might also add that all the legislation I have seen so far simply does not go far enough on this matter. All of the purported intentions, in my own opinion, don't go far enough. I can't conceive of any reason that guns need be hidden in basements and attics, and indeed in some cases not even hidden there. Throughout the length and width of this province let those who require rifles for hunting purposes acquire them, rent them or buy them, but be required to sign them out on a Friday to be returned on a Monday so that we know where each and every gun in this province is and so that only those guns that are being used for hunting are available; and we know where they all are and we know they are locked up when they are not being used for hunting.

I just can't conceive for a moment the need or any excuse under the guise of hunting or whatever to permit hundreds of thousands of guns to be lying around this province to make it easy for those who go off half-cocked for whatever reason and commit the horrible crimes we have seen in some of our high schools in this province.

I have one or two other matters. I want to express my complete support for the Attorney General's (Mr. McMurtry) steps on the matter of hockey violence. Anyone who can't tell the difference between the routine matters which arise during a hockey game and those extra amounts of untoward and uncalled-for violence is as blind as those hockey owners who apparently not only have little respect for their employees as people, they don't even respect them as valuable assets of their own. Apparently they feel they are human chattels to be put out into the bear pit to do whatever passes for entertainment in Philadelphia or New York, at whatever expense to life or limb.

I hear often that no one was ever hurt in a hockey fight but it just isn't so. Over the past 10 or 15 years, I guess, I have attended 70 per cent or 80 per cent of all the Toronto Maple Leaf games at Maple Leaf Gardens. I might add that was before I was elected. What is true about hockey fights is that where injuries did result from those battles, those injuries invariably resulted from those instances in which that extraordinary amount of legally questionable violence was involved. It's easy to identify. One only need to look at the pictures in the paper the morning after.

I'm tired of hearing the moguls of that sport say they can and do police themselves. My friends opposite quite properly do not like to hear groups of oil companies, apartment owners, developers or any other business group say: "Leave us alone; we will

police ourselves." We should equally object when the subject matter of intentionally inflicted bodily harm arises. We cannot simply abdicate our responsibility by taking Clarence Campbell's word for it that they'll police themselves.

To drive home the importance of getting this matter under control, let me show members or refer to any issue of Sports Illustrated, the most widely-read sports magazine in North America. I have before me the Aug. 20 edition; that's the last one that came in the mail. They have, as they always do, superstar posters for which one can write in and purchase by mail.

There are only seven hockey players you can get superstar posters for. Let me read them to you: Bobby Clarke, Phil Esposito, Tony Esposito, Bobby Orr, Bernie Parent, Brad Park and Dave Schultz. Those are the ones.

Those who don't know Dave Schultz by his fisticuffs, by his uncalled-for punching of Ace Bailey last year, may be interested to know that Mr. Schultz got nine goals last year. Nonetheless, he is one of the superstars of hockey offered for sale throughout North America. I presume this list is drawn up in accordance with the demand and the salability of these posters. That's shocking.

I sat at Maple Leaf Gardens when this same hockey player—using the term loosely—earlier this year in an exhibition game threw a clipboard at the hockey official, tackled the linesman and was thrown out of the game. He appeared the next day on the ice and nothing further has happened. I can't believe that even Harold Ballard and John F. Bassett can't identify that sort of behaviour and separate it from a hard, clean body check.

I feel obliged before I finish, sir, to refer to one issue. It is something I heard time and again during the election campaign in my riding with regard to this whole business of multiculturalism. Let me say that the Minister of Education (Mr. Wells), displaying some depth of understanding of the situation, dealt at great length with the problem presented by language differences, particularly in our elementary schools in Toronto.

[11:45]

Working to resolve this problem is not easy. The draft report on multiculturalism in Metropolitan Toronto is only a draft report, and I have it before me. It is a very substantial volume. A lot of hard work and good thought went into this, and it is only now out for some answers from the parents involved. This report goes to 223 pages. That's how complicated this issue is.

Mixed into all the discussions—and this is what disturbs me—has been the suggestion that there are those in this government and in the universities who are attempting to place quotas on the basis of racial background and that there are those in the communities of Toronto who are attempting to create a second-class citizen class in this city.

Some of the arguments being used to achieve this very great objective of bridging the language gap are invalid and in themselves encourage that type of racial problem to grow and arise where indeed it does not exist, at least in this member's opinion, in this city right now.

One of the things that is being used to feed this is the scare tactic that suggests the now very able Minister of Labour (B. Stephenson) of this province has long supported quotas for medical schools. I have pursued this matter with the minister, and let me assure this House that she at no time made any remarks supporting quotas in relationship to university admissions.

She was approached on an occasion by a reporter and she asked him three questions with regard to the University of Toronto faculty of medicine. She asked these questions in her then capacity in order to attempt to get from the public some feeling on the very difficult subject matter of entrance to the U of T medical schools. The questions are as follows:

1. Are university admission policies sufficiently closely related to the needs of the people the universities are functioning to serve?

2. Do federal government immigration policies impinge upon post-secondary educational opportunities for native-born or naturalized Canadian students?

3. Are Canadian citizens fully informed about the way in which their taxes are utilized for post-secondary education? If they are so informed, do they agree with the spending pattern now in practice?

People have taken those questions and said, "Hold on. Bette Stephenson—as she then was—is in favour of quotas for entrants to medical schools." This is a very real concern and I object to any suggestion that the new Minister of Labour supported quotas. Those were questions only.

This is not a matter new to the official opposition. The then member for High Park (Mr. Shulman), on March 21, 1975, referred to this matter in this Legislature. He referred to the fact that there used to be some quotas —and I quote Hansard for March 21, 1975:

The intriguing thing is what happened the first year the quota went out. The dean was happy. It turned out there was some 28 per cent of the class, or perhaps there was 30 per cent that year, who were landed immigrants, largely from Asia. They were brilliant, they did fantastically well on the exams—everything went well. This was three years ago. Everything went well until this year, when they started taking clinical classes. The professors discovered to their horror that a very significant proportion of these people, something like a third of them, could not communicate with the patients.

He went on and on in this vein. He concluded by saying—and I quote again:

We have to at least ensure that the students we are letting into medicine can communicate with the public and can understand their patients' problems.

I continue quoting the then member for High Park on March 21, 1975:

I want to talk about the unthinkable for a moment. I want to talk about the students who are coming from Hong Kong and Korea and Singapore and are getting in. There is a great deal of tragedy in their cases, and I have the greatest sympathy for what they have suffered in those other countries.

They come over here with their entire family's future depending on what they do. They do nothing but study and they get incredible marks. They get marks that our students can't consider—98, 99. One lad got 100 per cent.

The way they do that is that they don't socialize. They don't go out with girls. They don't play sports. They don't do anything but work.

Finishing the quote for the moment, I don't necessarily agree with that portion or any portion of his remarks, but certainly not that last one. I continue:

I can understand their motivation, because when they succeed in getting into medicine they get a lucrative position which represents everything. They will then be able to bring in their families from those other countries and support them.

He concludes with this paragraph:

I can sympathize, but their problems must come secondary to ours; and ours are to educate our own students first.

I don't stand here and say that the then member for High Park supported quotas on a racial basis or on any basis for medical schools. He addressed himself only to the problem. Likewise, I don't ever again want to hear anyone suggesting that the now Minister of Labour supported quotas, simply and only because she suggested that there were some concerns in this area and some questions which needed to be answered.

Finally, and I talked about the University of Toronto before, I simply cannot resist finishing my remarks today on this—and I'm sorry they have gone on so long, but there were a lot of matters on my mind and as I said before, we over here are kind of enjoying this opportunity to participate in the debate in this Legislature and we are not at all going to be shy about so doing. We have researchers on this side too and we indeed, all of us over here, are our own researchers as well.

I must refer to the publication called The Varsity, published by U of T. This year their budget, which sooner or later comes out of the public purse, is some $42,000. I'm not naïve enough really to always expect fairness—perhaps never to expect fairness, being a Tory—

Mr. Lewis: You'll soon be telling us about the faces in the crowd. It was a favourite phrase of your predecessor.

Mr. Grossman: —but I couldn't resist bringing the election issues of The Varsity here today. I didn't really mind the fact that an hour interview I had with the reporter from The Varsity resulted in an article perhaps half the size of that of my NDP opponent—

Mr. Lewis: Excellent judgement on the part of the interviewer.

An hon. member: There is real priority.

Mr. Grossman: Let me continue—

Mr. Reid: The member is sure making up for it today.

Mr. Grossman: We are allowed to speak from this side too; it is a new rule of minority government. The article also was only half the size, I say to the Leader of the Opposition, of the article on the Communist Party candidate.

Mr. Lewis: Entirely possible; the member probably had less to say.

Mr. Grossman: Is it the same good judgement? I just want to know if it is the same good judgement.

Mr. Lewis: No, but it probably means you had less to say.

Mr. Grossman: I see, not the same good judgement.

Mr. Moffatt: Anyone would say it was.

Mr. Grossman: I might say it's about the same shot that they gave my Liberal opponent, but—

An hon. member: Perhaps the member could read it.

Mr. Grossman: I could read it, and I'm sure members would find it enlightening, but perhaps embarrassing. In any event, the point I want to make is that very few notes were taken by the reporter and I find myself quoted almost entirely throughout, with gratuitous comments thrown in between. Let me only refer to the headings on the various articles.

"Beardsley"—that was my NDP opponent—"Veteran With A Taste For Victory."

Mr. Lewis: Well, she came close—pretty close.

Mr. Grossman: Close only counts in horseshoes and grenades.

Interjections.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please; the hon. member has the floor.

Mr. Grossman: Cunningham was the Communist Party candidate who got equal coverage in the Varsity: "Professor Battling Monopolies."

Mr. Peterson: Is the member suggesting we close down the universities?

Mr. Lewis: What is this Philistine speech the member is making about the student press? Don't be so paranoid.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Mr. Lewis: That's what universities are about. Let them have their fun.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for St. Andrew-St. Patrick has the floor.

Mr. Grossman: Kan, the Liberal opponent: "Cut Back Expensive Education Frills." Not bad, so far. Grossman: "Trying To Take Over From Dad."

An hon. member: No chance.

Mr. Grossman: Well, at least I did. I would have been annoyed, but I had indeed more sympathy for my fellow candidate in St. George riding. Without going through the articles, let me just read the four headings on the articles on St. George riding candidates. Robinson, NDP candidate: "ECO-100 Mostly Bunk." Hill, the Communist candidate: "Answer To NDP Band-Aid." Well, not a bad heading. Margaret Campbell: "Soup's On." She didn't do much better than I did.

Interjection.

Mr. Grossman: But I just have to read into the record the heading on the article for our candidate in St. George, Vasilkioti "Views From A Toilet." So taking all things into consideration, I really wasn't that insulted by the treatment I got.

Mr. Lewis: I should think not.

Mr. Grossman: But I trust that the reporters will be following the events of this House, this government, this Legislature—

Mr. McClellan: The member drove them out hours ago.

Mr. Grossman: —and will not let anything interfere with their, quote, "good judgement." So, Mr. Speaker, in concluding, may I say that I will be participating further in private members' hour and as the debates go on and the legislation—

Mr. Peterson: The member shouldn't feel he has to.

Mr. Grossman: I hope that a lot of people, a lot of members of this House will—

Mr. Lewis: I hope the member gets good coverage.

Mr. Grossman: —in view of the fiasco we experienced, as we always do with enumeration, be working with me and supporting my attempts to obtain for this province a system whereby the already existing Ministry of Revenue's assessment lists of eligible voters can be authorized for use by the enumerators when they go out and around this province. And that when they knock on a door and get no answer after two calls, be authorized to enter the person shown on the last revised assessment roll—which can never at any time be more than 11 months old—as the voter out of that household, subject to later revision.

It's not a perfect system, but it is a system which is a heck of a lot better and a heck of a lot fairer than the system that has historically been employed in this province from day one.

Mr. Breaugh: Mr. Speaker, I had some trepidation about making this speech in the House this morning, but I must confess over the last hour or so, the trepidation has entirely left my body and I feel quite at ease.

An. hon. member: Replaced by a feeling of calm.

Mr. Breaugh: Just familiarity.

I want to express perhaps some unusual thoughts from the penthouse section of the Legislature where we're relatively free from parliamentary intrigue and the assignments of the front benches; so we can kind of think about things and reflect a bit.

[12:00]

The very first thing I want to do is thank the government of the Province of Ontario for putting three New Democrats out of four ridings in the region of Durham right into this House and right on this side. Members might recall previously there were a lot of members from another political party representing this particular region. Due, I

think, in great part to the myopic perspective offered by the provincial government on regional government three of those guys are unemployed these days. Another one headed for the hills and ran in another riding and managed to survive by, I think, a little over 100 or so votes. Three of us managed to arrive here.

I think in large part, in some areas of that region, the whole issue of regional government was one that struck home to a great many people. In that regard, one of the things the three of us intend to do is what we think the members of the other side of the House should have done in the first instance. They should have taken some time to listen to the needs of those people.

In that regard, we intend to do just that—to have some public hearings, if you like, and to hear some representations from some groups in that area—I suspect not the least of which will be the municipal councils in that particular region. As someone who had to work under that legislation it's a most difficult proposition. It is one which really does not represent regionalism in much else other than name and bureaucracy. It really has very little substance.

In the spring session the three of us will present to this House a private member's bill which will reflect the needs of those people; one which will put before this House, at least in a formal way, what ought to be done in that particular region. Then I think we can no longer hear the excuse that the government doesn't really know what the people want; the government doesn't really know what it ought to do; and the government doesn't really know what the real problems are.

I suspect that the government actually does know. The reason I suspect that is every time we see the provincial Treasurer (Mr. McKeough) in the region of Durham he's on a white horse and carrying a million dollar grant in the back saddlebag to bail them out. He has done that every spring when they try to set a budget. Every spring when those people say there isn't a snowball's chance they can finance this operation, the Treasurer has managed to find some funds; a very necessary requirement.

We are most grateful for being bailed out and my only objection really is that had the government seriously considered the ramifications of that particular form of government in that area, it would have been quite prepared to do one of two things—either accept the financial obligation involved or abandon the concept; one of the two.

Let me move to something else which I find rather difficult. That is this area of municipal reform. I find it difficult because so much has been said on that particular topic and yet so little has been done. I strikes me, as someone who has spent considerable amounts of time and considerable effort working on a municipal council, that it's the largest system we have, especially in terms of representation. There are more municipal councillors in this province than any other form of representation either sitting in this House or in the federal House. In terms of being most direct to the people; physically closest to the people they represent; in terms of being more directly exposed to the problems of individuals, there's nothing we have which matches that municipal government system.

Yet it really is the tail end of the dog. It really is trying to do in a great many cases things it just cannot afford to do. It is trying to pick up the slack of a provincial government which wants to do portions of things but not all of them. It's attempting to provide a great many services, above and beyond what was once expected of a municipal council; a vast array of them.

It is an extremely difficult job and we are finding, I think, throughout the Province of Ontario mill rates escalating at unprecedented rates simply because people at one end are demanding service. They are talking to the people they can find, their municipal representatives; but the other side of that coin really is that the municipal government can't afford to do that kind of thing. They can't afford to carry out so many of those operations.

Let me move to an area which I think quite obviously is a blocking point for almost everything which has happened in the Province of Ontario and it has a lot of rather serious ramifications. That's the Planning Act. I say that it is a blockage point because it deals with people's houses. That is the mechanism by which, for the most part, people build houses. It also deals in large measure with the building of industrial plants and commercial enterprises, many of which are faced with the obstacle course that is provided by the Planning Act.

Though I have heard the Minister of Housing (Mr. Rhodes) on many occasions say that he is going to build more houses and that he is going to expedite that process, he is rather reluctant to say how. I've heard a great many arguments in press releases and statements by ministers that it is all the municipalities' fault. They don't want to take low-cost hous-

ing and they don't want to expedite that process. Could I remind the members of the House that the Planning Act is administered by this House and that the real powers in that Act are possessed by our own cabinet ministers of this House, not by municipalities.

In fact, all the municipalities get out of that deal is the wonderful opportunity to do all the work and to take all of the flack and not have the power of approval.

Let me suggest that if the government really wanted to build houses in the Province of Ontario one of the first items that it would do is review that Planning Act substantially. I attended a PMLC meeting recently where the Treasurer (Mr. McKeough) indicated that they were doing that. He said that they weren't going to review the mechanics of the Act but they were going to review the philosophy of the Act. That was rather an interesting announcement because those members of municipalities present at that meeting stated quite clearly that they had been under the illusion for the last year the minister was actually going to review the Act—not have a philosophy class but actually do something. That of course is the breaking point with this government. They are quite prepared to discuss philosophy and quite prepared to talk to almost anyone but they are never prepared to do anything, even when the problems are as obvious as those contained in that Planning Act.

Could I quote just one simple example? In my own riding, almost any plan of subdivision goes through a public hearing process, particularly if it is of any significance because it almost always involves a rezoning. At a public hearing session, on hearing the needs of the people in the adjacent area and hearing the case of the developer, the poor old municipal council has to make some kind of a decision. It is usually hung right up between the needs of people who have to have houses and the needs of people who don't want their own neighbourhood destroyed; very often that's the dilemma.

Fools that they are, they very often make that decision and take that flak. Then it goes up to the regional government level where it gets roughly the same process again, and that seems to be a long and cumbersome process. It sometimes takes four to six months and sometimes longer; that's about the average. That seems like a terribly difficult process but that is only the tip of the iceberg.

Once it leaves there it gets floated through 22 different ministries, in Kingston, Peterborough, Ottawa, Cornwall, Toronto, Richmond Hill, and in many cases they physically lose the plan of subdivision. Most developers that I know, who have a great tale of woe at any time but who in this particular instance have a point, have got to the point now where one of the things they do is they assign people to follow their plans of subdivision around the Province of Ontario on this merry little scheme to try to locate them in the offices of the Minister of Housing. By that, I mean physically locate it. On whose desk has it been lying for the last four weeks? Can we get him to pass it on to the next guy so that he can give his initials to that project. That whole process is not only cumbersome; it is ridiculous.

I support in a very real and meaningful way a one-time and a thorough review of all plans of subdivision and all industrial plans. Whatever you care to do, do it once, do it thoroughly, and do it locally where the people can have some say in its process. Put a check on it; that seems fair enough, but let's not do the thing three, four and five times. Surely we could get organized enough with all of our resources and all of our money to handle that simple process.

Let me move to an area of wage controls, which in effect is what we are talking about through all of the rhetoric that has come across the House. We are really talking about identifying those areas where there are increases, and that is very simply wages. I watched in my own riding Hon. Barney Danson present to some high school students —not very well, I might add, but he did present it to them—his version of the federal wage and price control scheme. In the course of 20 minutes he admitted that they could certainly control wages—no problem about that—but they didn't really know how they were going to control prices. He admitted that is a very difficult thing. Well, we were listening to people tell us how to control prices. Nonetheless they were going to do it.

In effect, he told those kids that their parents, and the kids themselves, ought to be quite prepared to suffer for the national good. It seems like quite a reasonable thing in some quarters, except that when he got into his limousine and went back to Ottawa in his private airplane, I didn't notice him suffering a lot. I didn't notice him following any of those kids home to see what kind of lunch they had or whether their father was still employed. I didn't notice any of that. The only thing I am saying about that is, admit it, it is wage control.

Tell me one other thing: Why is it always necessary that the poor guy at the bottom of the heap takes it in the neck? Why can't there be some measure of justice put out in that process? It is fine to say that they froze some senior civil servant's salary at $60,000 a year. I wish to heaven my salary could be frozen at $60,000 a year, and I could fill this chamber with people who would love to freeze their salaries at $50,000 or $60,000 because they haven't made that in the last 10 years. Some measure of justice, it seems to me, is necessary there.

What I have perceived coming across the floor of the House, though, is that the government has been very happy to grab that one; it is very happy to all of a sudden become a "me-too" minority. They have found themselves something that is rather worthwhile. A government that was facing substantial unrest in its own public service sector, in teachers, in almost anything one could name, all of a sudden has found a gimmick—a federal hammer, if you like—that they are going to use with great abandon.

This thing has only been announced about 10 days or so and they are already lining up at the door. There are negotiations in my own riding that were proceeding quite nicely before that announcement; now they are all backed up. Let me quote the one example that I think is most ridiculous. The Metro separate school teachers had an agreement signed, sealed and almost delivered, but at the last minute they grabbed it. What is going to happen to it? No one knows. The government again is prepared to listen, but is it prepared to act? Not yet.

Let me say a couple of words about housing programmes, because one of the things we have been faced with is a most extensive public relations programme on the Ontario Housing Action Programme, and we have had the pleasure of meeting with the Minister of Housing (Mr. Rhodes)—with several of them, in fact—in terms of what the Province of Ontario is prepared to do.

Let me propose some rather simple and basic suggestions for your consideration, Mr. Speaker. Would it not be possible for the government of Ontario, in terms of trying to induce housing, to say, "There are some things that we will do. We will provide some hard services, some sewer and water services; we will put them in the ground"? That is the nub of the argument that involves lot levies in municipalities and escalating mill rates; that is where all of that comes from.

The provision of those hard services involves a major expenditure of funds at the municipal level, and not particularly in terms of forgivable loans, although that certainly is a better deal than having to run out and pay the interest rates on those loans. The fact still remains that if you construct an $8 million plant, whether the loan is forgivable or not, you are still paying off the $8 million. That is a substantial amount of money for anybody to look at.

Let me cite, in the region of Durham, perhaps the biggest foofaraw that this government has entertained to date; that is, its own North Pickering project. Let me take a look at that one and say that in my own municipality, in my own riding and in my own region there has been a lot of discussion about that. We have met with those planners, we have seen the numbers that are coming in and, quite frankly, we don't see any way at all that that particular project, under the current rules of the game, can go anywhere but down the tube.

[12:15]

We don't see any way at all the government can ask the people of that region to fork over the $1 million worth of social services—social services alone—that that North Pickering project requires. Why should they? How can the government ask the people in that area to put up the kind of money for industrial development which is necessary—many of them have already done so—and ask them to compete against the little golden boy—the provincial, special status community—it is going to stick in the middle of that area.

That's going to cause some major problems and it's my sense that the government would be quite happy to dump that one as well. I don't see a lot of movement in that area except what has been normal for the last three or four years—endless meetings, endless studies and endless talk.

While we are on that particular area of how this government functions, could we at some point in time entertain some discussion not about how large the civil service has grown or whether we are actually financing it directly as the civil servants of the Province of Ontario or contracting it out but some discussion in this House about how effective that civil service might be? Could we at some point in time discuss whether they actually do all the things they are supposed to do and how well; could we make that process accountable to this House?

Let me move to something which is substantial in my own riding and that is the auto

industry. At one time this spring we met with the Premier (Mr. Davis) and several of his as istants; there were people there from municipalities throughout the province which have auto industries. We all learned some amazing things. Something like 70 per cent of industry in the Province of Ontario is in some way related to the auto industry. I thought that General Motors of Canada was a rather large bucket in my riding. It turns out, though, that the automotive industry as a whole is a rather substantial bucket in terms of the Province of Ontario.

We heard some discussion in the question period today that that great salvation of the auto industry—the tax rebate on new cars—is not going to go any further than was originally intended. I am of two minds on that particular subject. First of all, it really didn't do anything for anybody, except those fortunate people who intended to buy an automobile anyway. It gave them a break, just before an election, since we seem to be mentioning when the breaks always fall. That's when it happened.

It really didn't do very much for the automotive industry—

Hon. Mr. Meen: You should tell that to your friends down there on the production line in Oshawa.

Mr. Breaugh: —because in those very months the government was intending to stimulate the industry the sales dropped. The only time they picked up was when they traditionally pick up, in the new model year. That's what happened in that one.

Whatever happened that made the government of Ontario go to Germany to look for transit vehicles? It could have gone to Oshawa. It could have gone to Oakville. It could have gone to Windsor or a great many other places. When did it ever look at our own transit vehicle production sector, if you like, and ask them to design some things that the government of Ontario might use?

When did it ever—in terms of interfering with the economy which we now appear quite happy to do—discuss production? In my municipality we get the weirdest phenomena. That plant runs full tilt all day, every day, until it has built such a large backlog that it simply shuts down so the people who work there either work overtime or they don't work at all.

There are strange phenomena at work there. At one point in time, we find the entire plant shut down because there were too many vehicles built. The next day we will find it is working overtime and working on weekends. Perhaps it might be considered to be the responsibility of the Province of Ontario to put some stability into that industry.

In this session we are proposing to deal with something called an Industrial Development Act, which may be—at least on the surface it appears to be—a needed item in the Province of Ontario. Partially because of what I said earlier about asking the municipalities to do things they really cannot afford to do, let me state now some concerns I have about that, although they may be dealt with. Could I simply ask that those areas adjacent to Metro—and mine is one—that are now under totally unprecedented pressures for housing—the housing is moving in there at an unprecedented rate, and that of course is causing some serious problems in trying to keep some kind of an industrial sector going for jobs and for assessment purposes as well—could we see that those areas are not neglected by this?

I firmly hope that it means the end of a minister making the decision as to whether somebody pays three per cent transfer tax or 21 per cent transfer tax. That kind of a disincentive, if you like, seems rather unfair.

I want to say too that I am not particularly happy with the idea of subsidies—of subsidizing particular industries, in that sense. I would prefer to see them given assistance. I would prefer to see them assisted in the sense that the government of Ontario tries to locate them and helps those municipalities provide services to them—in other words, makes it a good place for an industry to go—rather than subsidizing their operations thereafter.

Let me attempt to outline too a couple of rather serious problems we have in my area; they're very specific ones as well. In the course of the election something that had been a matter of great discussion for some time in my riding—the construction of a new senior citizens apartment centre—was brought up.

In the spring of this year when there really wasn't an election on, the ministry staff went to the city of Oshawa and oddly enough didn't talk to the members of that council. They went and they talked to the media and they said there were great problems over the city's lot levies. As members of that council we never did get any correspondence from the ministry. We had to read it in the newspaper.

During the course of the election, however, all of a sudden those problems were clarified. And that senior citizens apartment was going to be built; no question about it. I am now told that it is going to tender, the purpose of which is not really to begin construction of it but really to make the case that they can't

afford to pay the city's levies. What I find so—forgive the word—awful about it all it is that project is an excellent example of a municipality that got fed up with the ministry horsing around with the needs of its people. It got fed up to the extent that it went out and actually purchased the property for that particular apartment building, handed it over, got them all happy, got all the little bureaucrats in the same room at the same time and sorted it all out. Then, of course, they all came back here and found out that it was costing money.

I find it odd that you would be asking the municipality to subsidize a provincial project. It strikes me it ought to be the other way around. It also strikes me as being most unfortunate that the people who really need some assistance in terms of housing are being used as the scapegoats in the middle of a provincial-municipal argument. In terms of cutbacks—and we are all interested in saving money—I really am at a loss to understand why every time this government wants to cut money it always cuts out a service to people.

In my riding we are very proud of the senior citizens' centre we have. It was built by the people in the community, with the assistance of the municipality, with their own money—with local tax money. They put it up. They expanded it, with some assistance from the province after great negotiation, and they run it. It works and it works extremely well, serving about 5,000 senior citizens in that area. Theirs is one of the projects hanging fire in terms of an operational grant for this year because we are thinking about cutting back government spending.

We are not slowing down the number of ads that are going in the newspapers about how great Ontario is. We are not ceasing to tell people in this particular part of the province what a great part of the province it is. We haven't cut that one out at all. We haven't ceased to announce constantly how great Wintario is and how we all win. But at the other end of the scale, the guy who isn't the subject of that kind of public relations programme is suffering. Could we not at some point in time adjust that priority? Could we not look after those things?

Let me move to something that is increasingly a problem in my riding and I suspect in a great many other ridings, and that is the trend in housing to selling condominium units. That whole Condominium Act, reviewed rather recently in fact, still has major areas of great concern to individuals. What is rather cruel about it all is that that tends to be in the open market one of the last remaining areas where our people can afford to buy any kind of housing. Then they get in and find that they really don't own that until it's registered. They begin to find that what they were promised in the first place does not happen. They begin to find that they are part of a condominium corporation responsible if the parking lot crumbles or the plumbing doesn't work or for the painting of units or how they are cleaned. They are into a whole mess.

We have some absolute classics of people who bought in all sincerity into units like that. The units are not working out very well. There are a multitude of problems to the extent of builders going bankrupt. Then what do they do? Having socked their money into that project initially, having spent the long wait and then finding out that the whole thing was for naught anyway, where do they go now?

I am suggesting that in that particular area of condominium conversions, even if they are new units, there are major problems. That's not to say that we ought to exclude those rather rascally fellows, who take old apartment buildings on the verge of cracking and crumbling at that point where they run into maintenance problems and at that point where they really don't have a first-class building any more because they spent no money to keep it up, and decide they ought to enrol the thing as a condominium. That is still happening and that also hurts in terms of rental accommodation, as members know.

Let me move to one other area in terms, if you like, of social reforms. I like to use those old terms. They are always good. When in this province are we ever going to get to the point where we look at people's needs as opposed to a little handout system? When are we going to stop saying to mothers on mothers' allowance, with maybe one or two kids in some kind of subsidized units, "I don't want you to go out and work and make a few extra bucks this week because, if you do that, I am going to cut off your mothers' allowance. If you do that, I am going to kick you out of this unit"?

When are we going to get to some point in time when that myriad of programmes operating between the federal government and the provincial government gets sorted out so that the kind of things that happened this September, where one family getting some federal assistance got $50 to equip their kids to go to school while some people in the next unit in similar sets of circumstances, not on the federal programme, but on a provincial programme, got nothing? When are we going to make that kind of decision?

When are we going to get to that particular point?

When are we going to give them the things they need as opposed to what is good showy material? When are we going to give those people, whether they might be men or women who are single-parent families, some provision of day care? That's the very physical problem that they have—what do you do with kids?

They say: "If I wanted to go to work, if I had the offer of a job, who will look after my children? Who will help me out in this situation? If I am lucky, I have a mother or a father or a friend in the area. If I am not, how do I fulfil my obligations to see that my children are looked after?" That's called day care. When are we going essentially to get away from giving them handouts?

I don't know of a social worker who doesn't really agree that the whole welfare system is nothing but a complicated scheme of handouts from all over the map so that in the end everybody can say: "Well, we have got 19,000 programmes, dispensing millions of dollars." That's what we are doing about people who are that kind of a problem. When are we going to turn social workers back into being social workers instead of being accountants? When are we going to offer those people the things they need—the counselling, the assistance?

Let me relate to you, Mr. Speaker, one simple problem of a guy that I know in my riding who has, as a lot of these people have, not just one problem but several of them. After a year and a half of arguing with Canada Manpower and the welfare department and the social services and a great many other agencies, he finally got a job. There was only one hitch. The job was not right in the city near where he lived. He had to get there. Would you believe after having spent all of that money counselling this poor guy, after having spent all of that money seeing that he doesn't starve to death and putting some kind of a roof over his head, the whole system was about to fall down because they couldn't figure out a way to get him from one place to another? The entire system was set to crumble. We discovered some emergency funds entailing probably about $10 a week that actually made the system work again; but it was a struggle, because he didn't fit any of the little boxes that they are given to fill out.

[12:30]

Perhaps 50 per cent of the problems that I now get as a member of this House, and before becoming a member of this House, are in terms of labour legislation. Let me say quite flatly that in my opinion the Workmen's Compensation Board does not work.

I don't have any other single area with so many related problems, and some of them of a very tragic nature, and which come in on such a regular basis. If there was a stoplight that only worked on every second occasion, I would be quite prepared to recognize that it wasn't working properly. At some point in time everything that you set up malfunctions, but the premise that I always go on is that as a rule it ought to do what it is supposed to do. It ought to provide that kind of service whether it's a tap, or a stop light or a Workmen's Compensation Board. It really shouldn't become another judicial system, flapping away with its own bureaucracy and its right of appeals —and quasi-lawyers at work. The thing ought to function. It ought to function as a Workmen's Compensation Board. I find it most unsettling that it does not.

Let me move to another area. There is a private members' bill in—one of the hon. members put one in—that deals with a very noble kind of an idea, and one that I think I really wasn't probably as aware of as I should have been until I got involved in politics. That is, things in terms of health and safety in plants. Some plant health and safety problems are not very dramatic. They are not exotic diseases requiring extensive medical help. Some are not really the kind of earth-shaking tragedy that I think has been carefully documented over the last year or two years. Some are very simple problems. The fact is that in that work place, very simple health or safety problems have a difficult time getting resolved. It seems to me that whether that problem is one of great significance or whether it is a very simple one, there ought to be an immediate and sensible mechanism to solve that problem. If you want to be specific about it, a health and safety committee that is composed of management and labour with the power to do something.

That doesn't seem to me to be a terribly complicated piece of legislation to draft, nor have any great, far-reaching ramifications except in those cases where it really ought to. If the argument really is about where they pile the lumber or what kind of boots they wear, surely, without a great lengthy grievance programme, that kind of thing could be solved.

I want to summarize what I have to say about my own personal views on what the

problems of the government really are. I really think it is a matter of priorities, and I guess that's a term I learned as a municipal politician. And I probably learned it as well from some provincial politician. It really is quite true that you only have certain amounts of money to spend and the trick is in deciding how to spend it. I really think that is where things are a little mixed up on the other side of the House.

I quite agree with the Attorney General (Mr. McMurtry) when he says that violence in hockey is an important thing. Just because you are in a hockey rink, you shouldn't have the right to club somebody over the head with a stick. I will not argue with that. But really, in terms of priorities in the midst of maybe a record murder rate this year in the city of Toronto, in terms of all the other things that are happening around us, I fail to see where that's the priority item; I really do.

Much has been said about Wintario funds and what a great non-tax-supported source of revenue they are. That's the nice way to say it. The unfortunate way to say it is that it is really the legalized numbers racket in the Province of Ontario. There were times in this province when if somebody else had suggested implementing that programme we would have heard all about the Mafia. The fact that the government of Ontario has displaced the Mafia is perhaps a happy by-product. Nonetheless, that is what has happened.

Mr. McClellan: The government says there is no Mafia.

Mr. Breaugh: They took it over, nationalized the Mafia.

In a nutshell, I think you have three problems that you really should address yourselves to. One is this matter of priorities. Is it more important to provide people with little grants for this, that and the other thing, which we're doing with great abandon? I don't know of a riding that doesn't have little cheques floating around from the government of Ontario. It might be Wintario, it might be International Women's Year, it might be this, that or the other thing. A lot of money is spent on that, and a great deal of money is spent on telling the people of Ontario at their own expense how lucky they are to live in the Province of Ontario.

Could we not channel some of those funds into the basic human needs that these people have? Can we not readjust our spending priorities to address ourselves to the needs of people? Can we not get this government to be responsible to them—not just to listen, because that's important but it's important to do a little more than listen to them—to respond to them, and to provide some leadership? In this House, with this kind of a make-up, there is that opportunity to do so—perhaps on an all-party basis; perhaps just on the basis that the government has now the obligation to put in front of us some legislation that actually works, some legislation that will be open to criticism and change.

The government has to do it now the hard way, and perhaps that's a great opportunity. I'm not really working for your side at all, but perhaps it's a great opportunity for the people of Ontario to have some good and some sensible legislation and to find a government that responds to their needs and actually does things as opposed to just talking about them.

Mr. Shore: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to comment first that I assume this House breaks right at 1 o'clock, does it?

Mr. Lewis: Yes, it does.

Mr. Shore: Could I just ask, if you're in the middle of it, you stop and start next time, is that right?

Mr. Speaker: Yes, that's the procedure.

Mr. Shore: I just wish to inform the Speaker that I have not prepared to talk for hours, but at the same time—

Mr. Moffatt: Why not?

Mr. Shore: I'm not prepared to. I'd just like to make some points.

Mr. Moffatt: You probably will anyway.

Mr. Shore: The point is I feel comfortable that the contents of my address or comments tie in together substantially and I would feel uncomfortable to knock them out in the middle of it, so I'm going to just preamble a little bit at this time and take the opportunity of continuing later. Thank you very much.

Mr. Lewis: If the member means he is going to kill time, it is a normal practice in this Legislature. Don't feel selfconscious about it.

Mr. Shore: As a matter of fact, I do feel selfconscious about it, and if it's any value to the House, I don't know the protocol, if it's the desire of the House to break and I could start next time, I'm prepared to do

that too. However, if the worthy Leader of the Opposition wants to consider it killing time, I will continue.

First, I am pleased to follow our leader in responding to the Throne Speech. If I could just comment for a moment on some pleasantries, the Premier of Ontario (Mr. Davis) was in London, Ont., the other evening, along with a former Premier, the Hon. Mr. Robarts, attending a dinner on behalf of the retired hon. member, John White, and many other worthy former members were there, including Mr. Winkler.

It was a lovely evening. I believe there were more Liberal people there, and others, than Conservatives. However, it was a worthwhile evening for me to have attended. It was interesting that during that evening our worthy mayor of the city of London, who has political leanings not of the nature of the Liberals or the Conservatives, and who apparently is a great lover of the retired member, the hon. John White—now I'm not so sure whether the hon. John White is quite as much in love with her—commented that she was sorry to see the hon. member retire, and also Hon. Mr. Stewart and other cabinet ministers, because she felt quite strongly that with cabinet ministers in government there were better chances of receiving favours for the city.

I would like to believe that she truly didn't mean that. I would like to believe that the government will grant the municipalities the needs in accordance with the true needs as opposed to whether or not there happens to be a cabinet minister there. For your information, Mr. Speaker, it is certainly the intention of the elected members of London to make sure that type of attitude is carried on.

I must say further on that very point, during our leader's speech in the Throne debate he identified many of the promises made by the government in the course of the recent election campaign. The Premier was quick to point out that the Liberal Party also made some promises, of course. We don't deny that fact, but surely the Legislature deserves something better from the Premier than a casual tossing of the ball back to this side of the House.

In my opinion the Premier and his colleagues now form the government of this province, albeit a minority one, and he has the privilege of being in a position to appoint members and other associates to key government positions. With this privilege, of course, he has the power inherent in forming the government. He also certainly has responsibilities, I submit. One of these responsibilities is really to answer the question—will he produce on his election promises; and perhaps more important, when and how? Particularly we in London would certainly like to know that answer.

As financial critic for our party, I accept this responsibility and challenge with deep appreciation and a determination to serve and a sincere desire to learn. I shall speak on the issues, policies and planning of all matters pertaining to the provincial Treasury and its related fiscal responsibilities. Subsequently, other members of our caucus committee will address themselves to issues pertaining to their areas of interest and responsibility.

In my view, in the years of public life which I have served locally I have taken some pride in concentrating upon and debating real issues of public concern rather than participating in confrontations on a personality basis. Some members will know, perhaps, or will learn, that I am quite capable of doing that also but I don't believe in that type of principle. This will, hopefully, be my approach in the House and with all due respect I assume the minister, his colleagues and the other opposition critics will approach our mutual responsibilities in a similar spirit. I would like to stress that point.

As I stand here now I am reminded of the election campaign when candidates went to all-candidate meetings and public meetings and found, in many instances, there were more press and media people there than public. However, at one of these meetings one of the few participants was a plant of the Conservatives; and I suspect that of course we probably had our own plants periodically. At any rate, he said: "Hey, Shore, are you on an ego trip?" And it was a hell of a good question—excuse me, it was a good question. Unfortunately he was smarter than I and he asked the question right at the time the time was up and I didn't reply to it. It was just as well because I really didn't have a massive reply.

I wish he were here now because if there is any way of getting humbled it is to come before this House and speak some time. One does really get humbled. If he were here now I could give him an answer probably; that humility comes forward at one point it time.

At this time, I wish to state publicly further, my appreciation of the offer—and I wish he were in the House today—made by the provincial Treasurer (Mr. McKeough) to meet with me and officials of his ministry in an endeavour to assist me in becoming better informed on matters pertaining to his minis-

try. I really would like to thank him for this gesture and I'm sure if he doesn't read Hansard the few members of his caucus and party will pass that on to him. I would certainly hope this offer would be of an ongoing nature because I am firmly convinced, as I'm sure he is, that an informed House will always serve the public better.

Our leader, in his opening remarks on Tuesday, stressed certain areas of great importance in the Throne Speech. On behalf of the Liberal Party the thrust I will be concentrating on is in the areas of inflation; the minister's statement of Oct. 30 to the Legislature on Ontario's anti-inflation programme; his recommended actions to control inflation; and the fiscal position of the Province of Ontario generally. I am particularly concerned with the ramifications of the Throne Speech and the anti-inflation programme that he has developed.

In the Speech from the Throne, the government delineates inflation as the foremost critical issue of the province and this country, and appeals to the people of Ontario to be resolute in their fight against this inflation. All parties surely would agree with this assessment.

[12:45]

In my remarks I will address the real question, which I submit is of equal importance, if not greater, and the answer to which we as a party and the people of Ontario want to really know and to be assured of: Will the government also be resolute in its fight against inflation? That's the real question. As I proceed, I shall make it plain that we expect the government to lead the province in this battle, We have every right to expect this, and we have every intention of assuring that we shall not be disappointed in our expectations. I'm certainly pleased that the Premier has been able to get back and perhaps will make some notes.

Hon, Mr. Davis: I will certainly listen. I hope you won't be offended if I sign a few letters at the same time.

Mr. Shore: Absolutely not. As a matter of fact, I just commented on your worthy trip to the city of London, Mr. Prime Minister—Mr. Premier, I guess; I'm sorry.

Hon. Mr. Davis: I am not offended by the other term.

Mr. Philip: Does that mean you are starting your leadership campaign?

Hon. Mr. Davis: No, only that I am not announcing.

Mr. Conway: You will make a lot of trips to London between now and the next election.

Mr. Shore: The government surely must govern, the government must lead, but the government also must listen. If the Premier and his colleagues do not have a true assessment of the real issues, if they do not have the practical and effective solutions, they should at least be prepared to listen to the members of this Legislature and take heed of what is said here.

I read with interest and a great deal of satisfaction the Treasurer's opening remarks, under the section entitled, "Basis of Reporting" in the "Financial Report of the Province for 1975" — which in my opinion is a massive and important document. To paraphrase: It is the constitutional principle underlying our system that the Legislature [and I stress, the Legislature] votes sums of money to certain ministries, provides for the money by authorizing the government to levy taxes and borrow, and the accounts of the government are therefore a record of stewardship and reflect accountability to this Legislature.

That, of course, is a tradition developed over 100 years or so, I understand, but I submit that it does not excuse the ministers from their obligation of listening and responding to the opinions and suggestions of the private members. With respect, I submit that this should be more than just a theory, as I feel has been the case in the recent past. It should be a responsibility, acted upon in the true spirit of the statement.

With respect to the province's anti-inflation programme, the Treasurer has reported to the Legislature on the gravity of the current economic situation. He stated that our consumers have been hard-hit with massive price increases in areas such as food, housing and fuel—and, I submit, shortages in many of those areas—and warned that our demands on the economy must be limited to its capacity for growth. It is easy to find flaws in the federal anti-inflation guidelines, he told us. All these statements are substantially true. One might even say that they are self-evident.

Our party does not dispute that the problems of inflation are of national importance. However, before the minister and the government decides to opt in to a federal plan, which I submit might be interpreted as copping out of its responsibilities for the province, the minister should have the strength and determination, the political clout, to satisfy himself that this government,

this House and the people of Ontario have certain assurances that this plan will work. We have the opportunity to lead in making it work, but we must have some assurance that the proposed measures will ultimately solve the problem, rather than merely alleviate the symptoms.

For example, within the federal guideline statement, it is acknowledged that there are four major areas of concern in attempting to curb inflation. I am not an economist but I have some grasp and understanding of the problem. These four that are discussed in brief in the anti-inflationary document—and, incidentally, agreed to by the Treasurer in principle or in concept — are: Fiscal and monetary policies must be kept in line with overall demand consistent with lower prices; government expenditure policies that limit provincial growth of the public purse must take place; structural policies—that is addressing ourselves to the solution of the massive increase in cost of energy, food and housing and their shortages; and wage and price controls.

Our party would agree that action must be taken in all four of these areas in order to solve the problem. However, I submit there has been no meaningful direction given by the federal government, and more particularly by the provincial government, other than verbalization to this House as to how we are going to deal with the first three of these items.

It's true we have an all-party committee set up to study energy prices, but I would submit that this route is largely a device to avoid making a tough political decision—a decision which this government could make today; a decision which it refuses to take.

In connection with the housing problem, just a few days ago our leader asked the Minister of Housing (Mr. Rhodes) for information on his plans to improve the situation and how he planned to do it. At that time he could not or would not make a statement. "We are awaiting federal guidelines," he said. Meanwhile, of course, yesterday a rent review action started, but we are still not addressing ourselves, I submit, to the real problem—lack of housing.

Surely we are going to recognize quickly —and we are going to support this concept— and it is being recognized internationally, that rent control solves no problem. As a matter of fact, it potentially could create havoc.

An hon. member: Come off it!

Mr. Shore: I would not be surprised if you could even find blackmail going on in the housing market in the next year or so. I hope not.

Mr. Moffatt: This must be party policy.

Mr. Shore: Whose party?

Mr. Davidson: The black market.

Mr. Singer: Why are you so worried?

Mr. Moffatt: We're not. I don't have to worry; I am not a landlord.

Mr. Shore: Are you all through for a minute?

Hon. Mr. Davis: The member is quite right, it is not a long-term solution. They don't know that over there.

Interjections.

Mr. Moffatt: It does solve the problem, though.

Mr. Shore: I think they are going to recognize it, Mr. Premier.

Hon. Mr. Davis: I doubt it.

Mr. Shore: We will try to show them. At any rate—

Hon. Mr. Davis: I don't think they will.

Mr. Shore: No. In relation to government expenditures, much has been said of the government's intention and what action ostensibly has been taken to date. Let's spend a minute on this subject if we might.

The Chairman of Management Board (Mr. Auld) spoke the other day of his pride on the cutbacks and so on. The Treasurer states he will bring down a new budget early in the new year. At that same time he informs us his plan for the next fiscal year is to adopt a provincial expenditure target, holding expenditure increases to 10 per cent and showing revenue growth of 12 to 13 per cent.

I submit to you, Mr. Speaker, and to the government, to the Premier, that if this government truly appreciated the gravity of this situation as I hope they do, a budget would have been prepared for this first session of the 30th Parliament clearly demonstrating how it is planning to meet the stated targets and how these plans will affect the people of Ontario.

It is vital to municipalities and school boards across this province, and essential for effective planning and the solution of serious problems, that we, through this Legislature,

have information available which will facilitate the establishment of new and changing priorities. We must consider our present situation against the background of historical development, taking into account the financial resources of this province, and I cannot place sufficient stress upon the real necessity for the Treasurer of this province to clearly outline, not only his objectives but the method by which he intends to attain them.

In recent years, massive deficits have accumulated in the budgetary transactions, not to mention the non-budgetary transactions. For the most part, the actual deficits have ultimately been far in excess of even the planned deficits.

Let us consider just for a moment the projected expenditures for 1975. The original budget came down in April. In July supplementary actions came down; in July, 1975 the actual financial report came out and on Sept. 30 an interim report came out.

It is truly surprising how massive changes can take place in two and three-month periods. To me that requires massive and important attention. It takes very little imagination to recognize this. The original budget called for a deficit of $1.2 billion and now, based on the government's own figures and projected figures, it is $1.5 billion.

It takes, as I say, very little imagination to envisage that before this fiscal period is out the operational deficit of this province will be close to $2 billion. I'm prepared to challenge it and receive an answer to prove me wrong. That does not take into consideration the $500 million that will likely be a deficit from the non-budgetary items.

Mr. Singer: You haven't even mentioned supplementary estimates yet.

Mr. Shore: I don't even know what that means yet.

Mr. Singer: That's when they spend stuff that isn't in the budget yet.

Mr. Shore: Mr. Speaker, in my considered judgement, regardless of which party is in government power, it cannot in good conscience, I submit, alter its accountability in this way. Possibly I should not find this fluctuating deficit situation as astounding when one considers that the government found it even difficult to answer a very simple question such as: "How many staff do you have on the payroll as of Nov. 1, 1975, and how many did you have on Nov. 1, 1974?" I submit that when we have a document like this which outlines the staff position of this province very clearly here, it should not be a massive difficult situation to update it periodically.

Mr. Singer: What's the document?

Mr. Shore: It is the Ontario budget of 1975, that's where it is pulled from. Budget deficits are not in themselves unacceptable in certain situations, although they are frequently queried. However, a budget deficit which will in fact be up to almost two-thirds over the original anticipated budget must be subject to question and examination.

In these circumstances, it is hardly surprising that the credit rating of Ontario has been seriously reviewed, and I've now got the official version. I didn't ask one of the questions the other day, because I had a very clear indication that it was going to be triple-A because I heard how it became triple-A. I had the greatest faith in the Province of Ontario but I heard that they were relating it to the city of New York, and that's how we became triple-A. I hope it will continue to remain triple "A", believe me.

Hon. Mr. Davis: What I find very impressive is that a year ago when we got the triple-A a lot of the member's colleagues really thought that was a membership in Alcoholics Anonymous or something.

Mr. Shore: No.

Hon. Mr. Davis: They didn't think it was significant at all.

Interjection.

Hon. Mr. Davis: I remember it so well. The member for Kitchener (Mr. Breithaupt) was one of those who said it didn't mean a thing and he wasn't impressed. Then when it looked as though it might be altered, it became a very relevant problem.

Mr. Singer: How come the Treasurer (Mr. McKeough) didn't read the note of warning in the telegram?

Mr. Speaker: Perhaps the hon. member might find a convenient place to break his remarks and move the adjournment of the debate.

Mr. Shore moved the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to.

Hon. Mr. Welch: Mr. Speaker, before I move the adjournment of the House—

Hon. Mr. Davis: We thought members were applauding the House leader.

Hon. Mr. Welch: This is the first time I've ever been applauded for an adjournment.

Interjections.

Hon. Mr. Welch: Before moving the adjournment of the House, I could say we will be standing adjourned until Wednesday afternoon. On Wednesday we will go into committee of supply and commence the estimates of the Ministry of Health, and we will sit Wednesday evening. The standing committee will be at work with the estimates of Labour, followed by Energy and then Housing in that order. On Thursday of next week, we'll go back to legislation, meeting in the afternoon and the evening, when we will continue with this debate.

Hon. Mr. Welch moved the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to.

The House adjourned at 1 p.m.

CONTENTS

Friday, November 7, 1975

Food price increases, questions of Mr. W. Newman, Mr. Handleman and Mr. Auld: Mr. Lewis, Mr. MacDonald 373

Money for mental retardation branch, question of Mr. Taylor: Mr. Lewis 374

Minister's view of PC party, question of B. Stephenson: Mr. Lewis 374

Highway speed limits for government vehicles, question of Mr. Auld: Mr. Breithaupt 375

Space for government offices, question of Mrs. Scrivener: Mr. Breithaupt 375

Minister's duties, questions of Mr. Henderson: Mr. Breithaupt, Mr. Bullbrook 375

Eganville creamery, questions of Mr. W. Newman: Mr. Yakabuski, Mr. Conway, Mr. MacDonald 376

Educational television in Northern Ontario, question of Mr. Welch: Mr. Martel 377

Sales tax rebate on automobiles, question of Mr. Meen: Mr. Shore 377

Overcrowding in Ottawa hospitals, question of Mr. Miller: Mr. Morrow 378

Community home programme, question of Mr. Taylor: Mr. McClellan 379

Metro Centre, questions of Mr. Rhodes: Mr. Givens, Mrs. Campbell 379

Etobicoke Valley lands, question of Mr. Rhodes: Mr. Philip 380

Payments to Robert Macaulay, question of Mr. Timbrell: Mr. Sargent 380

Use of hazardous chemicals, questions of Mr. Miller: Mr. Mackenzie, Mr. Moffatt 381

Compulsory use of seatbelts, questions of Mr. Snow: Mr. Swart, Mr. Young 382

Anti-inflation programme, question of Mr. McKeough: Mr. Bullbrook 382

Gogama water supply, question of Mr. Kerr: Mr. Laughren 383

Report, select committee on reports 4 and 5 of the Ontario commission on the Legislature, Mr. Morrow 384

Reports, Ontario Development Corp., Northern Ontario Development Corp., Eastern Ontario Development Corp., Mr. Bennett 384

Reports, University of Toronto, University of Western Ontario, Ryerson Polytechnical Institute, Mr. Parrott 384

Motion that select committee on Ontario Hydro sit concurrently with the House, Mr. Welch 385

Medical Data Bank Act, Mr. B. Newman, first reading 385

Resumption of the debate on the Speech from the Throne, Mr. Grossman, Mr. Breaugh, Mr. Shore 385

Motion to adjourn debate, Mr. Shore, agreed to 406

Motion to adjourn, Mr. Welch, agreed to 407

SPEAKERS IN THIS ISSUE

Auld, Hon. J. A. C. Chairman, Management Board of Cabinet (Leeds PC)
Bennett, Hon. C. Industry and Tourism (Ottawa South PC)
Bernier, Hon. L. Natural Resources (Kenora PC)
Breaugh, M. (Oshawa NDP)
Breithaupt, J. R. (Kitchener L)
Bullbrook, J. E. (Sarnia L)
Campbell, M. (St. George L)
Conway, S. (Renfrew North L)
Davidson, M. (Cambridge NDP)
Davis, Hon. W. G. Premier (Brampton PC)
Deans, I. (Wentworth NDP)
Germa, M. C. (Sudbury NDP)
Givens, P. G. (Armourdale L)
Gregory, M. E. C. (Mississauga East PC)
Grossman L. (St. Andrew-St. Patrick PC)
Handleman, Hon. S. B. Consumer and Commercial Relations (Carleton PC)
Henderson, Hon. L. C. Minister without Portfolio (Lambton PC)
Kerr, Hon. G. A. Environment (Burlington South PC)
Laughren, F. (Nickel Belt NDP)
Lewis, S. Leader of the Opposition (Scarborough West NDP)
MacDonald, D. C. (York South NDP)
Martel, E. W. (Sudbury East NDP)
McClellan, R. (Bellwoods NDP)
McKeough, Hon. W. D. Treasurer, Minister of Economics and Intergovernmental Affairs (Chatham-Kent PC)
Meen, Hon. A. K. Revenue (York East PC)
Miller, Hon. F. S. Health (Muskoka PC)
Moffatt, D. (Durham East NDP)
Morrow, D. H. (Ottawa West PC)
Newman, B. (Windsor-Walkerville L)
Newman, Hon. W. Agriculture and Food (Durham North PC)
Peterson, D. (London Centre L)
Philip, E. (Etobicoke NDP)
Reid, T. P. (Rainy River L)
Renwick, J. A. (Riverdale NDP)
Rhodes, Hon. J. R. Housing (Sault Ste. Marie PC)
Ruston, R. F. (Essex North L)
Sargent, E. (Grey-Bruce L)
Scrivener, Hon. M. Government Services (St. David PC)
Shore, M. (London North L)
Singer, V. M. (Wilson Heights L)
Smith, S. (Hamilton West L)
Snow, Hon. J. W. Transportation and Communications (Oakville PC)
Stephenson, Hon. B. Labour (York Mills PC)
Stokes, J. E. (Lake Nipigon NDP)
Swart, M. (Welland NDP)
Taylor, Hon. J. A. Minister of Community and Social Services (Prince Edward-Lennox PC)
Timbrell, Hon. D. R. Energy (Don Mills PC)
Welch, Hon. R. Culture and Recreation (Brock PC)
Williams, J. (Oriole PC)
Yakabuski, P. J. (Renfrew South PC)
Young, F. (Yorkview NDP)

No. 11



Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT — DAILY EDITION

First Session of the Thirtieth Legislature

Wednesday, November 12, 1975

Afternoon Session

Speaker: Honourable Russell Daniel Rowe
Clerk: Roderick Lewis, QC

THE QUEEN'S PRINTER
PARLIAMENT BUILDINGS, TORONTO
1975



CONTENTS

A list of the speakers taking part in the debates in this issue of Hansard appears, in alphabetical order, at the back of this issue.

Daily contents of proceedings also appears at the back of this issue. Reference to a cumulative index of previous issues can be obtained by calling the Hansard Reporting Service indexing staff. Phone 965-2159.

Hansard subscription price is $15.00 per session, from: Sessional Subscription Service, MGS, 9th Floor, Ferguson Block, Parliament Bldgs., Toronto, M7A 1N3. Phone 965-2238.

LEGISLATURE OF ONTARIO

WEDNESDAY, NOVEMBER 12, 1975

The House met at 2 p.m.

Prayers.

Mr. Speaker: Statements by the ministry.

DISTRIBUTION OF GAINS CHEQUES

Hon. Mr. Meen: Mr. Speaker, my ministry has now finalized arrangements for distribution of November GAINS cheques during the mail strike. Details of our procedures are contained in the information kits that have been placed on the desk of each member, and I would like to take a moment now to outline them.

Outside of Metropolitan Toronto, on and after Tuesday, Nov. 18, GAINS cheques will be available for pickup at local municipal offices, except in the cities of Hamilton, Kitchener, London, Ottawa, Sudbury, Thunder Bay and Windsor. In these seven cities, GAINS cheques will be available for pickup through Ministry of Revenue district retail sales tax offices.

Within Metropolitan Toronto, cheques may be picked up at the St. Lawrence Market under the procedures outlined in the information kit, or after Nov. 25 at the Ministry of Revenue office at 77 Bloor St. W.

Undoubtedly, hon. members are aware of the problems we face in distributing 272,000 cheques across the province without the mail service. There will certainly be delays and I want to assure this House that as soon as postal service resumes, my ministry will give top priority to mailing out GAINS cheques to those who do not, or are unable to, pick up their cheques.

The advertisements in the kits will appear in all Ontario daily newspapers during the latter part of this week. I would ask the members to do their utmost to bring this information to the attention of their constituents.

In conclusion, I will be making a special request of all media to publicize these arrangements as broadly as possible. To help in this effort, I have asked them to meet with my GAINS staff and I in the media studio following question period.

TAPED TELEPHONE HATE MESSAGES

Hon. Mr. McMurtry: Mr. Speaker, as the members of this Legislature may be aware, the matter of taped telephone hate messages has long been a matter of personal concern to me. Since assuming the office of the Attorney General, I have pursued this matter with the officials of my ministry and more recently I had the opportunity of discussing this matter at the federal-provincial meeting of Attorneys General in Halifax. I have also had correspondence with the former federal Minister of Communications and the chairman of Bell Telephone of Canada.

Our experience in recent years has shown us that existing laws, including the hate propaganda sections added to the Criminal Code, are ineffective and, because loopholes and exceptions abound, a conviction is almost impossible to achieve.

With the co-operation of my colleague, the Minister of Labour (B. Stephenson), we hope to convince the federal government that Bill C-72, the proposed Canadian human rights Act presently before the Parliament of Canada, be amended by including taped hate messages to the list of discriminatory practices in Part I of the bill. We also suggest that the proposed Canadian Human Rights Commission be given overriding authority, upon ex parte application by any person, to order Bell Canada or any similar utility in Canada to cut off service forthwith to any number offering a taped hate message.

I would appreciate the support of all members of this House in attempting to influence the federal Parliament with regard to the proposals so that these repugnant activities can be stopped.

Mr. Speaker: Oral questions.

AIR POLLUTION STUDY

Mr. Deans: Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the Minister of Health. Can the minister explain, so that any reasonable person might understand it, why a report, prepared under the joint auspices of the federal and provincial governments on the state of air quality in the

Sudbury area and the effects of it, was suppressed by this government during the months of July, August, September, October and to this date?

Hon. F. S. Miller: Mr. Speaker, first of all, that is not a true statement. That report was not suppressed by this government. In fact, this government has not yet received that report.

Mr. Martel: Does the minister want my copy?

Mr. Deans: Why?

Hon. F. S. Miller: I want to tell members a few things about the report.

Mr. Nixon: The CBC has it.

Mr. Martel: I have it.

Mr. Speaker: Order.

Hon. F. S. Miller: Lots of people have it, but I don't.

Mr. Laughren: Why doesn't the minister have it?

Hon. F. S. Miller: Give me a chance and I'll explain to the House. I think it was in 1971 or 1972, on a routine application for a research grant, the kind of thing we give to many people in the health or related fields, a professor at a university in Ottawa—

Mr. Martel: Dr. Neri.

Hon. F. S. Miller: Yes, Dr. Neri. He applied to this ministry, and I believe at the same time to the federal government, for moneys to pursue a relatively interesting project. That was to see the effect of chest diseases and try to relate it to the amount of sulphur dioxide in the air in two cities, Ottawa and Sudbury. I understand the funding for Ottawa was federal; the funding for Sudbury was provincial.

It is the kind of grant that we give to technical people all around the province. The funding for the last section of it ended in March of this year, I believe. There was $6,000 for that section. The stated requirement was that he turn over to us a copy of his report by Sept. 30, 1975. We have been in contact with Dr. Neri, because naturally we are embarrassed at the comments made through the press that we were suppressing it. He is rather concerned because as yet he hasn't produced a final report. But what mystifies me is that: (a) He has given a speech in England last year on the topic—

Mr. Martel: Dr. Cowle from the ministry did.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Hon. F. S. Miller: —(b) He gave a copy to the Canadian Medical Association for publication, which I understand will be published in December; and yet he has never honoured the obligations of the commitment. He has sent us status reports which were received in a routine way at a low level and have never come to the deputy's attention or mine, because they were simply information. My staff at that time countered in documented form saying: "Look, we disagree with some of the things in terms of procedures that are going on in your report." In his latest comment to us he said that he is embarrassed, or wondering where these copies are all coming from. He admits that as yet he hasn't given us the report requested of him, even though we have asked him to do so.

Mr. Deans: One supplementary question: Do the status reports normally contain the information that has been gathered up to the point of that interim report being made? If so, why would the ministry not call him in, given that the minister says his ministerial officials disagree with some of the findings that he had reported, to discuss the matter with them and determine whether or not there was a danger to the health of the people in the area?

Hon. F. S. Miller: First of all, it wasn't a question of disagreeing with the findings. I think that should be clarified. It was an argument between two doctors as to methodology and whether the methodology was going to result in meaningful conclusions at the end of it. That was done by Dr. Cowle, who died some months ago, and it was done at that level.

We simply took as information the material coming forward, because I think one must realize many of these individually-handled research projects are open to considerable technical scientific argument; and that is the nature of this one. I am not going to say it is or is not accurate. I had no need to hide the information from anyone. Since it was never brought to my attention, I can assure the House it wasn't suppressed in any political sense at all.

Mr. Nixon: Supplementary: Since the report makes it quite specific that the pollution still in the atmosphere in the Sudbury area is a serious health hazard, is the minister

moving toward checking the results which he may question, or is he moving toward taking some position that will remedy the situation?

Hon. F. S. Miller: Certainly, I am going to listen to the arguments. I think the steps to remedy it were taken some while back and are better answered by the Minister of the Environment (Mr. Kerr) than myself, because they involved, as I understand it, the restrictions put on Inco's Sudbury operations and the high stack in 1971. When I see the evidence and listen to the counter arguments, I will be in a better position to answer the member's question.

Mr. Martel: Supplementary: Is the minister aware that we became aware that this document existed as a result of Dr. Cowle's making reference to it in articles he was writing concerning Elliot Lake; and if Dr. Cowle knew, why didn't the rest of the ministry know?

Hon. F. S. Miller: Mr. Speaker, the very fact that we weren't trying to suppress it is proven by this kind of point. There is nothing secret about the thing. Any time somebody stands up at a joint international conference and talks about a paper, I think one cannot be accused of secrecy. Any time the report is handed in to a magazine for printing, one cannot be accused of secrecy. It is simply that this is being dealt with like hundreds of research projects by the ministry in routine ways.

Mr. Cunningham: The report indicates that both Ottawa and Sudbury have a much higher standardized rate of mortality. I am wondering, in the light of what appears to be a clear definition of this, what direction the ministry is going to take to rectify this rather sad situation, especially in Sudbury?

Hon. F. S. Miller: I know one of the conclusions that Dr. Neri has come to somewhere along his line is that he finds cigarette smoking has an important effect. That is what he told us on the telephone today.

Mr. Martel: Well, much less than the sulphur dioxide.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. There have been several supplementaries on this. There will be opportunity for further questions. Does the hon. member for Wentworth have further questions?

[2:15]

FALCONBRIDGE SMELTER EMISSIONS

Mr. Deans: A further question of the Minister of Health: Can the minister explain how it could be that Falconbridge, which was under ministerial order to clean up the environment in the Sudbury area to the tune of nearly $90 million and to eliminate the degree of SO_2 emissions, have had that project either curtailed or drastically reduced?

Hon. F. S. Miller: Mr. Speaker, that should be addressed to the Minister of the Environment.

Mr. Speaker: Would you like to readdress it?

Mr. Deans: I'll readdress it to the Minister of the Environment.

Hon. Mr. Kerr: I didn't quite hear the question, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Repeat the question.

Mr. Deans: Can the minister explain how it can be that the ministerial order, which has been in place for some time on Falconbridge, to reduce the SO_2 emissions at a cost somewhat in the order of $90 million over three years or thereabouts, has been either curtailed or eliminated?

Hon. Mr. Kerr: Mr. Speaker, I am not aware that the ministerial order to which the hon. member is referring has been curtailed or eliminated. They are still under a ministerial order. There has been a request by the company to extend the completion date of that order, but certainly nothing has been done by our ministry in that regard.

Mr. Laughren: Mr. Speaker, is the minister not aware that when Falconbridge announced plans for their massive layoff, that in part meant not completing the new smelter which would have allowed them to meet the new emission standards set down by his ministry?

Hon. Mr. Kerr: I'm quite aware of that, Mr. Speaker. Those are plans and announcements by the company. All I'm saying is that the order that is placed on that company has not been changed nor have any dates been changed. The order still exists and it will continue to exist.

Mr. Singer: Is the polluter, paying, like the minister said?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The original question had to do with ministerial orders,

not the whole broad subject. Is this on the ministerial order part of the question?

Mr. Laughren: This is the final supplementary, Mr. Speaker: How does the minister propose that the company will meet the new emission standards without that new smelter? Does he propose to let them start up operations again with the old smelter after the ministerial order deadline has passed?

Hon. Mr. Kerr: Mr. Speaker, the ministerial order provides for certain levels to be reached at certain times and certain dates over a period of four or five years. As of now they have complied with and met those emission standards. The next date, I believe, is sometime in 1976—

Mr. Martel: Right; 1976.

Hon. Mr. Kerr: Yes, and we expect that date will be met—otherwise they will be in breach of that order. The company realizes, as a result of discussion with officials of my ministry, that it must meet that criteria; and I expect that it will.

Mr. Speaker: Final supplementary on this.

Mr. Martel: Would the minister tell us that there is no way in which he will allow Falconbridge to go back to using the old smelter and dumping the amount of effluent they are dumping presently when they go back into full operation next year?

Hon. Mr. Kerr: I will repeat, Mr. Speaker, that they will be required to reach the emission standards we have set.

HEALTH OF STELCO COKE OVEN WORKERS

Mr. Deans: I have a question for the Minister of Health. Can the Minister of Health explain how it can be that those working in Steel Company of Canada coke ovens, who it is becoming more evident are suffering lung disease as a result of their employment—

Hon. Mr. Bernier: The onus will be on members opposite.

Mr. Laughren: The fearmonger.

Mr. Deans: —are not being given the same close attention with regard to x-rays and tests that is being given to uranium workers in similar situations?

Mr. Laughren: The member for Algoma-Manitoulin (Mr. Lane) tried that in Elliot Lake.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The Minister of Health is answering a question.

Hon. F. S. Miller: When the leader of the NDP is here, I get a lot fewer questions. I've been enjoying the relatively easy time of the last week or so.

Mr. Deans: He likes the minister.

Interjection.

Mr. Deans: That doesn't say I don't.

Hon. F. S. Miller: But not as much.

Mr. Speaker: Let's get on with the questions and answers.

Hon. F. S. Miller: Mr. Speaker, first of all I think one will have to determine that the premise the member made in his question is correct. The issue of lung cancer relating to tars in the coke ovens is a relatively new one, compared to the silicosis problems in the mines. I became interested in it about a year ago. I know a good deal of research is going on and I'll be pleased to find out if the member's statement is correct; that they are not receiving a high degree of attention.

Mr. Mackenzie: Has the minister done recent testing at Stelco and has he set threshold limits for the coke oven workers? If he has, when will the union and the safety committees be notified. If not when can we expect those limits to be set?

Hon. F. S. Miller: I cannot answer that out of my head, Mr. Speaker. I'll be glad to get the answers to it. I have looked at the problem but I can't be categorical by memory. I know the whole question of setting threshold limits is the purpose of the occupational and environmental health group that we named last week. We recognize that setting limits when diseases are hard to define is not easy. That group's going to have to look at the amount of data available and decide on practicable threshold limits for such eventualities.

Mr. Speaker: Further question, the member for—order please. We're spending a lot of time on original questions and supplementaries which—

Mr. Mackenzie: A further supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Cassidy: Very important question, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: That's allright. Order, please. There are complaints that we have too many supplementaries.

Interjections.

Mr. Speaker: One more supplementary. Who wishes it? All right, the member for Hamilton East.

Mr. Mackenzie: Has Stelco given any information to the Ministry of Health as to the number of workers being found to have lung problems as a result of a stepped-up medical examination? What is being done at Dofasco where there is not the double-check involved at Stelco with the union safety committees?

Hon. F. S. Miller: Mr. Speaker, as I said, I'm glad to get the information for the hon. member and I'll make it available.

FLOOD DAMAGE

Mr. Deans: Does the Premier intend to declare the north shore of Lake Superior and Lake Erie disaster areas and eligible therefore for whatever grants are available in Ontario? Does he intend also to take any further action similar to the action undertaken with regard to the flooding a year and a half ago and to make moneys available to those who hve suffered severe losses?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, this matter has not been determined by the government. If there is any such thought, we shall communicate it to the House.

Mr. Haggerty: Has the Premier considered meeting with the mayors of the municipalities of Fort Erie, Port Colborne and Wainfleet to discuss the problems of flooding along the Lake Erie shoreline, particularly as it relates to the storm on Nov. 10? Are there any changes in government policy as it relates to the financial assistance given to municipalities in case of a disaster such as the storm which occurred on Monday last?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I'm informed that the Minister of Natural Resources (Mr. Bernier) is having a meeting on this subject this afternoon.

PAYMENT FOR CATTLE PURCHASES

Mr. Deans: I have a question for the Minister of Industry and Tourism. Is the minister in a position to indicate whether or not his ministry is going to make a grant available to Essex Packers in Hamilton in order that it might continue the operations there and secure the jobs of some 550 people?

Hon. Mr. Bennett: Mr. Speaker, first of all may we be very careful that the ministry does not make grants; we're in the position of loaning funds.

There have been discussions with Essex Packers and with the receivers as to the position they are in and what viable position we would be in if the loan was to be extended. We believe from the information we have that the principals who own the firm at the moment have sufficient personal capital to put the firm back on solid ground. The advice given to me, as the minister, and to the development board is that we should not be participating because the line of equity, as far as we are concerned, to confirm or to back up our loan is not there.

Mr. Deans: A supplementary: Is the minister prepared to put before the House the information available to him which brings him to that conclusion, in order that the people of Hamilton, the employees in the plant and the people who are served by that operation might fully understand all of the ramifications of this near bankruptcy?

Hon. Mr. Bennett: Mr. Speaker, I am not in a position to produce for this House information which is of a confidential nature; that is the property of the firm and the receiver. I will not table the information I have in the House.

Mr. Nixon: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker, on that matter. Can the minister assure us that everything is being done to see that, since the provincial government has assisted Essex in the past, at last some of its resources are going to be directly allocated to pay off the farmers who are still holding NSF cheques in payment for livestock delivered?

Hon. Mr. Bennett: Mr. Speaker, the commitment the Ministry of Industry and Tourism, through the development corporation, has with Essex Packers, of course, is the export credit loan of which most has been repaid. We have sufficient shipments in other countries to pay off the balance of that export loan, which is against goods shipped out

of the country. As far as payments to the farmers or to other creditors are concerned, that is a decision that obviously will have to be made by the receiver.

Mr. Nixon: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker: Wouldn't the minister think it would be part of his responsibility to discuss this matter with his colleague, the Minister of Agriculture and Food (Mr. W. Newman), who has already indicated his personal concern for the farmers in this area? Why should the minister give us an answer like that, which has involved, in the past, a decision to assist this company, when we cannot bring some pressure to bear on them to fulfil their commitments, and their legal commitments to the farmers who have been supplying these cattle? How can he sit there and indicate that—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I think the question has been asked.

Mr. Nixon: —he has not consulted with the Minister of Agriculture and Food on that?

Hon. Mr. Bennett: Very obviously, Mr. Speaker, if the leader of the third party would look at the situation—

Mr. Nixon: You and your external commitments; what good are you as a minister?

Hon. Mr. Bennett: —and listen just for half a moment—

Mr. Roy: Get your hands out of your pockets.

Hon. Mr. Bennett: —he would find out that the development corporation's loan is to develop and expand an operation. We were never brought into being to bring people out of an insolvent position. We are not the bankruptcy specialists.

Mr. Nixon: Leave it to the receiver, the minister says.

Hon. Mr. Bennett: The fact is, if the leader of the third party would read the Bankruptcy Act he would find out exactly the credit position therein.

Mr. Nixon: The minister can do nothing but let the farmers rot.

TORONTO TEACHERS' NEGOTIATIONS

Mr. Nixon: I'd like to put a question to the Minister of Education pertaining to the unfortunate situation which none of us wanted, and the minister predicted might not happen but has now happened—that is, the strike of the secondary teachers in Metropolitan Toronto.

Can he clarify for us the position taken by those people applying the price and wage control legislation federally, as to what extent this present situation comes directly under their jurisdiction? Has there been an indication from Ottawa that there will be a partial exemption because of the dating of the previous agreement, or are we to accept at face value, statements that have been reported and allegedly made by the Minister of Finance that this particular situation falls directly under the regulations, and that, in fact, no wage settlement of more than 12 per cent would be permitted?

Hon. Mr. Wells: Mr. Speaker, I think I can clarify that for my friend. In fact, I clarified it for both sides in the dispute yesterday in the meeting that I had with them. I indicated that I hoped they would understand the implications of the federal wage and price guidelines regulations. Insofar as they apply to this particular dispute, and this was agreed to by both parties, the parties are not exempt under the guidelines; I think everyone agrees to that. The guidelines apply to the secondary school teachers and the Metropolitan Toronto school boards.

However, there are sections in the guidelines which indicate that, perhaps, special considerations might be given. There are a couple of sections. One says: "Special consideration will be given for those who are negotiating a new contract for one that was signed prior to 1974." The other is a very unexplained section, and certainly one about which no one has given any explanation as yet, concerning historical relationships. Under both of those, I think these people could put a case to the Anti-Inflation Board.

The procedures that we outlined to them, and the procedures that Ottawa has outlined to us, say that they should get a settlement, and when they have a settlement, both parties should go down with their settlement to the Anti-Inflation Board and seek clarification from that board at that time. But the board doesn't want to hear or see them until they have a settlement.

Mr. Nixon: A supplementary: Wouldn't the minister agree, since the area of negotiation is far beyond the boundaries of wage control as enunciated by the federal legislation, that it might be, at least, what politicians would call a step in the right direction if the minister would use his good offices to allow the people from Ottawa to sit down with the negotiating sides here in Toronto,

because it may be that this whole strike is a bit academic in that—

Mr. Speaker: Question?

Mr. Nixon: —we don't know, as the minister says?

Mr. Foulds: That would be quite a problem.

Mr. Nixon: Is there no way that the minister can do anything but just sit back and say, "It will have to take its regular course"? If it does, I'm afraid the classrooms are going to be closed for a long period of time.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. Does the minister have an answer?

[2:30]

Hon. Mr. Wells: I feel that in the general discussions of how these guidelines will apply in this province and in the specific way that the Anti-Inflation Board will handle the problem from this province—for all sectors, public and private—they've suggested people under the normal collective bargaining procedures should go ahead, bargain and get an agreement and, when they have an agreement, then see the Anti-Inflation Board.

I've given assurances to both sides that, once they have an agreement, we will do everything possible to be sure that the board hears their case very quickly. We'll add our support to them hearing their case very quickly so they can get an answer.

Mr. Nixon: Meanwhile the classrooms are closed.

Mr. Foulds: Mr. Speaker, is the minister prepared to go with both sides, if a mutually satisfactory agreement is reached, to Ottawa to make representation on their behalf?

Hon. Mr. Wells: No, I'm not prepared to do that.

Mr. Singer: Could the minister explain what sense it makes to have two parties to a bargaining dispute arguing about something obviously over the guidelines and to have the minister saying that if they come to an agreement about a figure, he'll go with them and see what Ottawa might do? The minister is not even saying he is going to say that Ottawa should accept what they agreed upon.

Mr. Speaker: The question?

Mr. Singer: What's the necessity for the exercise in frustration?

Hon. Mr. Wells: It is not an exercise in frustration. If my friend understood how this programme was working and was a little more co-operative toward it, he might understand—

Mrs. Campbell: Well, the minister doesn't.

Mr. Nixon: It's not working very well.

Mr. Singer: The minister's statement adds confusion.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Hon. Mr. Wells: There is no confusion on the part of the parties who are negotiating in Metropolitan Toronto.

Mr. Singer: No, that's why they are out on strike.

Hon. Mr. Wells: I met with them face to face yesterday. They understand how the procedures work.

Mr. Nixon: It didn't take long to dispose of the minister.

Hon. Mr. Wells: The way the procedures work is that they get an agreement first and then go to Ottawa and see what the Anti-Inflation Board has to say about that agreement.

Mr. Nixon: Oh, nonsense!

Hon. Mr. Wells: If the member is suggesting that the Anti-Inflation Board should offer some suggestions as to what it would do beforehand, I just don't think they want to do that.

Mr. Singer: It is obvious the minister doesn't understand.

Hon. Mr. Wells: Oh, yes, I understand.

Mr. Foulds: Why did the minister leave it so late to meet personally face to face with the two sides in that dispute to explain to them what—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. That is not supplementary to the original question; it's branching out into a much broader field.

Mr. S. Smith: When the federal government pointed out that the collective bargaining procedures should take place first, an agreement be reached and then be taken to Ottawa, is it the minister's understanding that this bargaining procedure included a prolonged and difficult strike which is completely contrary to the public interest? Is it his understanding that this was considered part of the bargaining procedure which had

to be placed before a solution could possibly be obtained from the tribunal in Ottawa?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I believe the question was asked.

Interjections.

Hon. Mr. Wells: I'm not so sure what my friend is trying to suggest, except that perhaps he feels the teachers—

Interjections.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. A question has been asked; we'll allow the opportunity for an answer.

Hon. Mr. Wells: Mr. Speaker, I guess we are witnessing the kickoff for the leadership campaign.

Interjections.

Mr. Nixon: That is the minister's best answer? That every classroom in the Toronto area close?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. We are wasting time.

Mr. Nixon: The minister is taking his reviews too seriously.

Interjections.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. Can we get on with the question period?

Hon. Mr. Wells: All I can interpret from the question that my friend has put is that he would remove the rights that labour has in this province to certain sanctions during a contract dispute. The federal people have not said that should happen. No one wants a strike. No one wants a strike that is perhaps not going to be fruitful, but that is part of the rights that these and other workers in this province have. The federal legislation doesn't take that right away.

Mr. Nixon: There isn't one person who can do anything about it.

PAPERWORKERS' STRIKE

Mr. Nixon: A question of the Minister of Labour: Now that the negotiations between the pulp and paper workers at Abitibi seem to be where they were, that is, before the minister used her good offices to bring them together a week ago, has she got any comments to make as to where the negotiations may proceed? Is she contemplating the BC solution or is she just going to let it continue to take its course after a three to four-month strike?

Hon. B. Stephenson: Mr. Speaker, I would tell my worthy colleague that in fact the position is not exactly the same as it was before the meeting last week; there is a difference.

Mr. Haggerty: There hasn't been a settlement.

Hon. B. Stephenson: There isn't any settlement as yet. They are presently in a recess, one might call it, because the negotiator for one side is presently off in another part of Ontario discussing problems with yet another paper company. We would hope as a result of his efforts this week and as a result of some further discussions which we are to have this week, that there may be a further return to the bargaining table.

The BC solution looks very intriguing, I must say. Whether we'll wait for that, hold it up for examination or put it on the train and see if it gets off at Whitby—

Mr. Nixon: I have a supplementary: I would like to ask the minister if it is part of the intended procedures of her negotiators to deal with all of the companies or are they just directing a solution toward Abitibi as sort of the benchmark or bellwether of the industry?

Hon. B. Stephenson: The answer to that question, as I said almost two weeks ago, is maybe.

Mr. R. S. Smith: I have a supplementary to the minister, Mr. Speaker. Could she explain to me what she meant by saying one of the mediators, or one of the people taking part in the negotiations, was off somewhere else? The company put its offer on the table last Thursday; the union put its counter-offer on the table and the company got up and walked out. Is that not the end of negotiations or does she consider that to be a recess?

Mr. Singer: Maybe.

Mr. Nixon: Maybe.

Hon. B. Stephenson: Mr. Speaker, I think my learned colleague has been somewhat misinformed, nonetheless, the two offers are presently on the table. I should perhaps have said one party to the negotiations was required to leave for a previously-made commitment to discuss problems with yet another paper company.

Mr. R. S. Smith: A further supplementary?

Mr. Speaker: I'll allow one more supplementary. We are just about out of time. The member for Welland with a supplementary.

Mr. Swart: A supplementary on the negotiations: Is the minister then prepared, through her department, to call together some of the other companies and the Canadian Paperworkers Union to start negotiations in that area?

Hon. B. Stephenson: Mr. Speaker, my ministry is prepared to go to almost any lengths to ensure that negotiations will continue between the Canadian Paperworkers Union and the paper companies.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Oriole.

Mr. Ruston: Here we go again—another planted question.

Mr. Gaunt: The tiger from Oriole.

Mr. Cassidy: You have now asked more questions than the entire Conservative caucus.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. We are wasting valuable time.

HYDRO RIGHTS OF WAY

Mr. Williams: Mr. Speaker, a question of the Minister of Energy.

Mr. Ruston: He's right in front of you, just lean over and ask him.

Mr. Williams: There appears to be a conflict between the recommendations of the Solandt commission with regard to the location of new Hydro transmission line rights of way north of Metropolitan Toronto and the location as recommended in the parkway belt plan. This conflict is causing a great deal of concern—

Mr. Speaker: Your question is?

Mr. Williams: My question is coming.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. You must get to the question.

Mr. Cassidy: Is this of urgent public importance?

Mr. Williams: It is.

Mr. Nixon: He wants to get into the cabinet. He is knocking hard.

Mr. Williams: The residents, industrial owners—

Mr. Nixon: He could replace any one of them.

Mr. Williams: The residents, the institutional, commercial and industrial owners in the area of Highway 7 located east of Yonge St. are apparently threatened with expropriation of their lands.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. You must ask the question.

Mr. Williams: I ask the Minister of Energy if he is prepared, through his good offices, at the earliest opportunity to arrange a meeting between the top officials of his ministry—

Mr. Singer: What are you going to do about it? He comes from North York.

Mr. Cassidy: You made a mistake putting him in the corner.

Mr. Williams: —the Ministry of TEIGA, the Ministry of Transportation and Communications and representatives of the Langstaff community to meet to clarify and resolve this problem?

Mr. Singer: Order.

Mr. Roy: You should dock some time; that was a statement actually.

An hon. member: He didn't hear the question.

Mr. Singer: Repeat the question.

Mr. Williams: I will be willing to repeat the question, Mr. Speaker.

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: No, I heard it.

Mr. Cassidy: Because you are in the cabinet—you should still speak to the backbenchers, your know.

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: Mr. Speaker, I have met with the representatives of the Langstaff community association on, I think, three if not four occasions now.

Mr. Stokes: You need a parliamentary assistant.

Mr. Foulds: Don't you talk to each other in caucus?

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: The last time I met with one of the representatives was last Friday at my riding action centre. The president of the association and one other gentleman did, at the time, bring me up to date on their negotiations with staff, with whom I put them in touch several weeks ago, and indicated that due to a change in staff in one

of the ministries they would like to sit down with some of the ministers. I gave a commitment that I would try to set up such a meeting involving the Ministry of Energy; the Ministry of the Treasury, Economics and Intergovernmental Affairs; the Ministry of Transportation and Communications, and Ontario Hydro, and I will try to live up to that pledge.

Mr. Philip: Can the minister give us some rationale why the Langstaff jail farm was excluded from the parkway belt?

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: The question should be directed to the minister responsible; namely, the Treasurer (Mr. McKeough).

FRENCH-LANGUAGE BROADCASTING

Mr. Samis: Monsieur le président, le voudrais diriger une question au ministre de la Culture et des Loisirs. Quelle ligne d'action le ministre est-il prêt à prendre afin que le présent pourcentage de langue française télédiffusé sur les ondes du canal 24 à Ottawa, soit augmenté du minable 17 pour cent présent à un niveau plus représentatif du caractère bilingue de la région d'Ottawa?

Knowing of your concern that this would be an unfair question to the minister, Mr. Speaker, I have given him an advance copy of it in English.

Mr. Cassidy: Excellent.

Hon. Mr. Welch: The member spoiled it; I was going to answer just as if I understood.

Mr. Cassidy: Let's hear the answer. Are you better than Diefenbaker?

Hon. Mr. Welch: What a spoilsport.

Mr. MacDonald: You should answer en français.

Mr. S. Smith: En anglais.

Hon. Mr. Welch: What do you think this is? Good gracious.

Meanwhile—

Mr. Nixon: Back at the lottery.

Hon. Mr. Welch: Meanwhile, I am advised by officials at the OECA that there has been an increase this year of about 10 per cent in French-language broadcasting over channel 24, and that the board itself is very anxious to study the ways by which this can be increased and is presently planning to establish a French advisory committee to advise it on French-language broadcasting. I will be in a better position to respond in a more detailed and precise way once I have that particular report.

Mr. Nixon: The member for Ottawa West (Mr. Morrow) could chair that committee.

Mr. Samis: En anglais ce fois: Could the minister assure the Franco-Ontarian population that he will do everything within his jurisdiction to increase the two-hour-a-week prime-time broadcasting in French on that channel to something more equitable?

Hon. Mr. Welch: The members of the board of OECA are very anxious to see this expanded and this is why they are asking for the establishment of the advisory committee before they take any further steps.

MISSISSAUGA INQUIRY

Mr. Singer: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Attorney General. In view of the statement in writing by His Honour Judge Stortini that there were facts in the municipality of Mississauga that warranted a judicial investigation, and in view of the fact that the divisional court ruled the investigation that Judge Stortini had commenced an invalid one because of its terms of reference, does the Attorney General intend to take any steps that will bring about an investigation, as Judge Stortini recommends?

Hon. Mr. McMurtry: Firstly, with respect to the ruling of the divisional court, Mr. Speaker, it was more than that the terms of reference were certainly invalid in the widest sense; as a matter of fact, the court referred to denial of natural justice.

I would like to inform my hon. colleague that Judge Stortini's counsel, Mr. Bates, was advised over a period of many weeks with respect to whether or not there would be certain extraordinary powers granted to the commission. The counsel, Mr. Bates, was advised that unless he indicated some very good grounds for the granting of these extraordinary powers they would not be granted.

The fact that the divisional court has ruled the inquiry invalid, as stated by my friend, would indicate the wisdom of that course. I should like to state that Mr. Bates was also in receipt of some correspondence from Mr. Greenwood, in my ministry, the director of Crown attorneys, indicating to Mr. Bates that a full police investigation had been carried out with respect to some of the allegations of the laying of possible

criminal charges and that there was no possible information made available to the police authorities to warrant the laying of any such charges. In view of the information which I have at the present time, there certainly would appear to be no action that I intend to take as Attorney General at this point in time.

[2:45]

Mr. Singer: By way of supplementary, Mr. Speaker, what the Attorney General has stated is based on information of early last week. Judge Stortini's letter apparently was written on Thursday or Friday, and in view of Judge Stortini's apparently positive statement that there were still facts that warrant a judicial investigation, is the Attorney General prepared to ignore that recommendation or is he prepared to take any action about it?

Hon. Mr. McMurtry: I should hasten to add, and perhaps I should have made this clear to my friend in the first instance, I have not seen Judge Stortini's letter, and if Judge Stortini were able to particularize any specific circumstances that would warrant an investigation, I would certainly consider the matter very seriously—

Mr. Singer: Why doesn't the minister talk to him?

Hon. Mr. McMurtry: —but at the present time, my information, and it may not be complete, is that Judge Stortini did not particularize the circumstances that he felt warranted further investigation. If Judge Stortini would like to do that, we will certainly consider the matter further.

Mr. Singer: The minister and he should talk together.

BEAR DAMAGE COMPENSATION

Mr. Wiseman: I have a question for the Minister of Agriculture and Food.

Mr. Roy: The minister ought to get his back-benchers and cabinet together some time.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. We are wasting valuable time.

Mr. Wiseman: Is the minister aware that the farmers of eastern Ontario are having a problem with bears killing their livestock, and six such kills have been reported in Lanark county alone? Would the minister consider some sort of compensation similar to the compensation paid for damage done by wolves; and if so, would he consider making this retroactive to Sept. 1, because most of these kills occurred in September-October?

Mr. Roy: Tell him what you think of wolves.

An hon. member: We are right behind you, Albert.

Hon. W. Newman: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the problems the member for Lanark has brought to my attention, not only here but by correspondence on this matter. I have looked at the matter very recently and am prepared to allow compensation for damage done by bears. Whether I can legally make it retroactive or not, I am not sure at this point in time, but if it's possible I will do just that. I am aware of the particular problems the hon. member is faced with this year.

ANTI-INFLATION PROGRAMME

Mr. Swart: Mr. Speaker, I would address this question to the Treasurer: In view of the strong objection voiced by the municipalities and by the school boards to the Treasurer's announcement that the increases in assistance to school boards and municipalities next year will be cut back to a five or six per cent increase, and in view of the fact that they have indicated that it will be difficult for them to keep their expenditures to even a 10 per cent increase, which would mean—

Mr. Speaker: No debate, just ask the question.

Mr. Swart: —a property tax increase of at least 15 per cent—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Mr. Swart: —on average, is he willing to reconsider his indication that he is only going to give them a five or six per cent increase?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Mr. Speaker, I am sorry. I wasn't paying as close attention to the question as I should have. I thought it was to my colleague.

Mr. Cassidy: He sure wasn't.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: I gather the question is, are we prepared to reconsider our decision?

Mr. Swart: That's correct.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: No.

Mr. Swart: Supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Nixon: Supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. We are just about out of time. Is it an essential supplementary? All right, the hon. member may ask one supplementary here.

Mr. Swart: If the minister is not prepared to reconsider, is he going to budget sufficient funds in the property tax credits so that there will be, on the average, no municipal tax increase above 10 per cent in next year's property taxes?

Mr. Speaker: That is not supplementary to the original question but we will allow it. Does the minister have an answer?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Mr. Speaker, that would be in the following year rather than the next year.

Mr. Nixon: Supplementary, Mr. Speaker: Would the minister then indicate that he is going to restrict the expansion of our own expenditures to five per cent if he is prepared to impose—

Mr. Speaker: That's not a supplementary.

Mr. Nixon: Sure it is.

Mrs. Campbell: You allowed that one.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The member for Ottawa East, a new question.

Mr. Cassidy: You are trying to act like Gerry Ford on New York city.

VIOLENCE ON INDIAN RESERVES

Mr. Roy: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to ask a question of the Provincial Secretary for Justice and Solicitor General; I guess that is his full title, is it? I wonder if the minister might advise what steps he's going to take to curb the increasing violence on the Indian reserves; more specifically, on the Whitedog reserve, which we've been hearing about lately? What steps is he going to take to curb that, apart from stationing maybe a couple of police officers there?

Mr. Yakabuski: Been watching television again, Albert?

An hon. member: The law and order Liberal.

Hon. Mr. MacBeth: Mr. Speaker, we have been proceeding with our plan in connection with the native police constables and they are working out very well. I would hope that a continuation of that plan would help solve the problem. It's not an easy one. That, among other initiatives, will be followed up.

Mr. Roy: Just a quick supplementary: If the plan is working so well, how come violence is increasing? Secondly, what steps has he taken to satisfy the Indian chief of the Whitedog reserve who mentioned that one of the reasons for the violence is that their livelihood has been taken away?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. This is a quick supplementary?

Mr. Roy: Yes, it is.

Mrs. Campbell: About as quick as some of the others.

Mr. Roy: How about an answer?

Mr. Speaker: Does the hon. minister have an answer?

Hon. Mr. MacBeth: I'm afraid I don't have a quick answer.

Mr. Roy: He doesn't have any answers.

Mr. Singer: Consult with Ed Havrot.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Renfrew South.

Mr. Cassidy: This is a put-up job.

Mr. Ruston: Who is the next one?

WINTER TRAILS PROGRAMME

Mr. Yakabuski: Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the Minister of Natural Resources.

Interjections.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Mr. Yakabuski: Does the ministry have any plans, similar to what it had the past winter, to assist snowmobile associations, cross-country skiers and other similar groups for developing and maintaining trails this coming winter?

Mr. Reid: That's a high priority!

Mr. Roy: Mr. Speaker, since we've had no snow it is not of urgent importance.

Hon. Mr. Bernier: Yes, Mr. Speaker, about a week ago I had the pleasure of meeting with the new Ontario Provincial Trails Coun-

cil at its inaugural meeting. I announced to the council that cabinet had given approval for an extension of last year's programme, which will basically be the same.

Mr. Cassidy: Does the member sell Ski-Doos?

Mr. Roy: Does he sell snowmobiles on the weekend?

Hon. Mr. Bernier: I also indicated that in response to a number of requests, as the member has mentioned, we will include some form of assistance to long-distance skiers to assist them in a trails programme. Those programmes will go ahead this year and the exact amount of the funding will be determined by Management Board.

Mr. Cassidy: Would you buy a Ski-Doo from a man like Yakabuski?

Mr. Moffatt: A supplementary: Will the funding be equal to or better than last year's funding?

An hon. member: It's got to be better.

Hon. Mr. Bernier: Mr. Speaker, those details have yet to be worked out.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The oral question period has expired but the Minister of Transportation and Communications wishes to table a couple of answers. I think we would allow him to do that.

ONTARIO NORTHLAND RAILWAY STAFFING

Hon. Mr. Snow: Mr. Speaker, I have the answers to two questions asked on Nov. 4 by the hon. member for Timiskaming. In order to save time, if I may, I will just table these and forward a copy to the member.

Mr. Speaker: Petitions.

Presenting reports.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the select committee reviewing the proposed Hydro rate, I'd like to make a report to the House concerning the situation that has developed in connection with the media. I understood that it was the right of a select committee to order its own business as it saw fit. Therefore, when approached on the first two days' meetings of the committee by the media as to whether or not they could take camera shots, I granted approval subject to any objections from the committee in review of the issue. There were no objections during those first two days. Today, further camera shooting took place but with more light and there were no objections to that taking place by members of the committee although it was pointed out that it was in violation of what have been the rules of the House until now. Those rules apparently require that a committee get permission from the House if it wishes to permit camera shooting.

I repeat, members of the committee have no objection to this procedure continuing, particularly since this whole issue of TV coverage is now before another select committee investigating the Camp commission recommendations in that connection. Therefore, it would be my request to have House approval to permit this procedure, pending a report from the select committee reviewing the Camp commission proposals.

Mr. Speaker, perhaps in all fairness I should say that it was raised today because of lights that were shining in the eyes of some people who happened to be facing the lights and the heat and the request was made of the media people to reduce that as often and as quickly as possible, and they did.

Mr. Speaker: I think before we make that decision we should enlighten the House, particularly the new members, concerning the situation. This came to my attention just a few moments ago, and I have had a ruling prepared.

The question of the coverage of proceedings in the House and its committees is, as all members are aware, one that has been raised in the House many times over the years.

Except for one or two special exceptions, the rule that has been followed is that no such coverage will be permitted until such time as the House itself may decide to change the practice.

Specific mention should be made of the exceptions. Firstly, the ceremonial part of the opening of a new session has customarily been televised and broadcast, but even here it is to be noted that such coverage stops as soon as the Honourable the Lieutenant Governor has left the chamber and the House enters upon its own business. Secondly, on two or three occasions, by unanimous agreement, the presentation of the budget has received such coverage.

Committees are emanations of the House and they are bound by the rules and precedents of the House itself. No committee, and certainly no chairman of a committee, has authority to give permission for coverage which is not permitted in the House.

However, the most important aspect of this incident is that the commission on the Legislature has made a specific recommendation to the House that coverage by the electronic media be permitted in the House itself and all its committees. The report containing this recommendation has been referred to a select committee for consideration and recommendation.

It would seem to me, therefore, that it would be an affront to that committee and to the House to anticipate what its recommendation in this area will be, and to take the action that was taken before the committee has had a chance to make its recommendation.

I think the select committee has been especially delegated to study this question, and I really believe we should wait for that report to come before the House and be adopted or otherwise. To make a ruling in the face of that study going on right now would, I think, be taking the place of the committee. So I would think the chairman, and the committee, is out of order to continue to televise its proceedings.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Speaker, may I make clear what I am requesting. Since that committee is considering a recommendation from the Camp commission to permit televising, and since the select committee of which I am chairman has, without objection from any member of the committee, agreed to permit televising, on an experimental basis if you will for guidance of the other committees, my request to this House is that we permit this procedure to continue for the sittings of this committee.

Mr. Speaker: Really, this should be a decision of the House, and I think it is wrong to make this decision. I think the committee should make its recommendation first of all, and then the House decide whether it shall report. I think you are negating the function of the committee if you go ahead and unilaterally make a decision on your own. I think the committee is completely out of order and that—

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Speaker, I move that the House give permission to the select committee investigating the Hydro rate increase to permit television coverage—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I might point out to the member that such a motion would require notice. You may, if you wish, give notice to the Clerk. But we are really arguing about a technical point; we are really talking about changing the rules of the House, not just one committee.

Mr. MacDonald: That is what I am asking the House to do, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: A procedure has been set up in order to facilitate that, if that is the wish of the committee and the House leader, but we are out of tune and out of time to do it now.

Hon. Mr. Welch: Mr. Speaker, I have listened to your ruling with some interest and I know of the interest of the members of this committee.

In view of the fact that the matter can't come forward as a motion today, we might want to consider the possibility of using what is going on in that particular committee as some type of an experiment. It might be of some assistance to the select committee of the Camp commission to have some first-hand experience as to how it does operate in a committee.

[3:00]

Mr. Speaker, you may want to consider that strictly on an experimental nature. I assume, if the House generally agreed with respect to this matter without creating a precedent, this would not necessarily determine the outcome of the consideration of any particular recommendation by the select committee considering the Camp recommendations.

I'd like to put that forward as a possible solution to this particular issue, providing it be confined to this particular committee and its hearings, that it be without precedent and that it be part of the experimentation which would help the other select committee in giving some consideration to the recommendations.

Mr. Singer: Why doesn't the member give notice of motion?

Mr. Roy: Give your decision in writing.

Mr. Breithaupt: Mr. Speaker, we find most acceptable the approach taken by the government House leader. I think it would be a useful experimentation to give the opinion of this committee as to how this whole procedure might develop, for the convenience not only of the members but also of the various areas of the media. If this is acceptable as an experiment for the future guidance and benefit of the committee dealing with the Camp commission report, without the acknowledgement that it must be a precedent, then we would certainly support it on this side.

Mr. Deans: Before you decide to ask for unanimous consent, which I'm sure you are going to do, I would like to point out that we agree with the House leader for the government, but beyond that it is quite within the right of the House at any time to alter the rules by unanimous consent. In fact, we do it relatively frequently. I would like to suggest that it's in order at any time for any member to ask for unanimous consent, and if it's the opinion of the House that unanimous consent should be given, then that is the end of it. It is not a matter of whether it's in keeping with what the Speaker thinks the rules should be or what the Clerk thinks the rules should be.

Mr. Singer: Why doesn't the member challenge his ruling and divide the House?

Mr. Speaker: I just want to make the position quite clear that we really are changing the rule of the House, if this is considered a precedent. I'm perfectly willing to allow it to proceed, with the unanimous consent of the House, providing it's not considered a precedent and doesn't subvert the work of the committee, because they may decide otherwise or they may decide that way. As a matter of fact, I'm quite familiar with most of the argument.

Do we have the unanimous consent of the House to allow the televising of the proceedings of this particular committee?

Some hon. members: No.

Mr. Speaker: We didn't have unanimous consent.

Mr. Williams: Mr. Speaker, I don't think that we can legitimately classify this undertaking as an experimentation unless we first have the consent and approval of the commission that is studying the subject. Without their consent—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I think the arguments have been put forward. I asked for unanimous consent of the House and we did not get it.

Mr. Cassidy: Could you try again, Mr. Speaker? They may have been facetious.

Mr. Speaker: Do you think they didn't hear me? I think it was quite clear. That is not to say that the appropriate standing committee may not make a further recomendation.

Mr. MacDonald: Do you mean to say that unanimous consent was not granted?

Mr. Speaker: Yes.

Mr. MacDonald: Could I have an indication as to who objected?

Mr. Speaker: There were a number of objections from around the House.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Speaker, I would like clarification of that because I think unanimous consent was granted, except for facetious interjections. It wasn't?

Some hon. members: No.

Mr. Speaker: No, I heard several nays.

Mr. MacDonald: I would ask for a recorded vote on that, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: How do you get a recorded vote on that? It was not unanimous. Many other people heard nays too.

Mr. Martel: Challenge the ruling.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Speaker, I have no alternative in this instance but to challenge your ruling. I think there was unanimous consent given. We'll call for a recorded vote.

Mr. Speaker: Do you want me to ask for unanimous consent again? Would that simplify matters?

Interjections.

Mr. Speaker: All right. Order, please.

Do we have unanimous consent—let's get clear on this—to televise the proceedings in this particular select committee?

Some hon. members: No.

Mr. Speaker: I heard some noes down here someplace.

Interjections.

Hon. F. S. Miller presented the annual report of the Ministry of Health, 1974-1975.

Hon. Mr. McMurtry tabled a copy of an order in council approved in regard to expropriation approved under subsection 3 of section 6 of the Expropriations Act, as required under subsection 5 of section 6 of that Act.

Hon. Mr. McMurtry tabled part 2 of the report of the Task Force on Legal Aid.

Mr. Speaker: Motions.

Mr. Bain: Mr. Speaker, I stand on a point of privilege.

Mr. Speaker: A point of privilege. The member for Timiskaming.

Mr. Bain: I would like to thank the Minister of Transportation and Communications for this report, but if you'll check Hansard, the question was asked on Oct. 31, not Nov. 4, if that correction could be made when it is printed. Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: Introduction of bills.

PROFESSIONAL FUND-RAISING CORPORATIONS CONTROL ACT

Mr. B. Newman moved first reading of bill intituled, An Act to control Professional Fund-Raising Corporations.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Mr. B. Newman: Mr. Speaker, the purpose of the bill is to provide for the licensing and control of professional fund-raising corporations. The bill is not aimed at Red Feather, United Appeal or other similar drives where a great deal of the organizational work is voluntary and expenses incurred are a very small proportion of the total proceeds.

There have been many instances of charities netting only a very small percentage of gross proceeds from fund-raising drives organized by professional fund-raising companies and it is these boiler-shop operations which must be licensed and controlled. These professional fund-raising companies that I want to see controlled at present operate on a basis of splitting net profits after expenses, and the split is usually on the basis of 60-40 or 50-50, and without adequate controls there is a possibility of overstating expenses in addition to skimming off extraordinary profits.

Mr. Speaker: Orders of the day.

Clerk of the House: The 12th order, House in committee of supply.

ESTIMATES, MINISTRY OF HEALTH

Mr. Chairman: Estimates of the Ministry of Health. Vote 2901, items 1 and 2 are carried; we start on item 3, health services.

Hon. F. S. Miller: Mr. Chairman, in view of the considerable interval since the discussion of the last part of this vote some six months or thereabouts, and in view of the fact that there are a number of members in the Legislature who were not here for the first section, I would like to make a brief statement to summarize not only what went on but perhaps also what's happened since we last sat here. As the members are no doubt aware, the estimates for my ministry were discussed in a series of sessions commencing June 2 last. The questions raised, and ensuing comments, covered a large number of the programmes within my ministry, although I believe we were still on vote 2901—as you just mentioned—in the final session on June 9. In all honesty, I wasn't sure we had passed any up to that point. I'm glad that the Clerk claims we did.

Mr. Foulds: That may be all you get.

Hon. F. S. Miller: It's true. If by doing that you can stop the spending, I'm right with you.

Mr. Foulds: Is your salary passed?

Hon. F. S. Miller: My salary? No, it's coming up. I've already pledged it to the bank.

I do not think it's necessary to review any events prior to June, but I believe it would be helpful to summarize important developments, in various sectors of the full circle of health care, that have occurred since the last session.

Successful negotiations with the Ontario Nurses' Association were conducted by representatives of the public hospitals and a further contract covering the period July 1, 1975, to Sept. 30, 1976, has been concluded. This provides the registered nurses with salary and fringe benefit gains of about 15 per cent over that period. In respect of conception control and family planning, developmental work related to the family planning programme has been conducted with local boards of health throughout the province. Funding for 41 programmes has been provided so far and, of these, 25 clinics are already in operation.

Following the discussions which took place concerning health service organizations, the council of health, the senior advisory body to the Minister of Health, has submitted its report on methods by which the operation of health service organizations should be evaluated. Their recommendations have been accepted and I've asked my staff, who have the responsibility in this connection, to proceed along the lines outlined.

In the area of occupational and environmental health, the advisory council has now been formed and its membership was announced last week. One of the early considerations of the council will be the possible establishment of an occupational and environmental institute. Such an institute should be able to help with this difficult problem by organizing expertise to deal with both known and suspected occupational and en-

vironmental conditions and with substances used in industrial settings that could be harmful to human health.

Also in connection with occupational and environmental health, I can report that with the co-operation and under the direction of the medical officer of health for the borough of Scarborough, arrangements have been made extending the study of asbestos-related illnesses to anyone who lived three months or more in the same homes as past or present workers with 20 or more years service in Canadian Johns-Manville's asbestos plant in the east end of Scarborough.

Arrangements have also been made to examine families of former employees of the Reeves mine in the Timmins area for possible identification of any health symptoms related to absestos.

On the question of federal-provincial cost sharing, members will recall the budget speech made in Ottawa in June by the Minister of Finance, then the Hon. John Turner. His announcement, made without any prior consultation with the provinces, and at variance with the spirit of federal-provincial negotiations of only one month earlier, applied arbitrary and unrealistic limits to federal cost sharing on the medical component of health care, while also giving notice of termination of the existing Hospital Insurance and Diagnostic Services Act in the shortest time permitted under that Act.

Taken at face value, the changes proposed carried the gravest implications, since our own projected estimate of the barest essential increases in health care costs went considerably beyond the arbitrary percentages announced. Since then, I have discussed the proposed legislation with other provincial health ministers, who view it with as great concern as we do. The Hon. Marc Lalonde embarked on a province-by-province fence-mending tour with the purpose of giving reassurance of a greater flexibility in federal thinking than Mr. Turner's speech had indicated.

I met with the Hon. Marc Lalonde myself in Toronto last month. I can only tell you that he appeared to show an understanding of the points that I expressed and that he told me that it was his intention to call another federal-provincial meeting of health ministers either before the end of this year or early in 1976.

[3:15]

In the meantime the general economic climate of our country and province is inevitably continuing to put special pressures on the cost of health services since most of them are highly labour intensive. While the recently announced federal prices and incomes guidelines should assist somewhat in 1976 in easing the continuing rate of cost escalation for health services, they will have limited effect on the cost of services contained in the estimates now before you.

I think at this point the critics for the other two parties have indicated they'd like to give their points of view on how to run my ministry.

Mr. Chairman: Before the member for Parkdale continues I would like to remind the committee that we are down to 21 hours and three minutes in total, for supply in the committee. While I think it's understood that the critic for the official opposition and the critic for the Liberal Party have general statements to make, I hope you will keep in mind that time is passing and will keep your general remarks in response to what the minister has said to a minimum so we'll provide maximum time for all the members who have something to say on the remaining votes. With that caution or admonition, the member for Parkdale has the floor.

Mr. Good: Did you stop the clock while you made your speech?

Mr. Dukszta: Mr. Chairman, I will speak at some length but I promise not to come in again to allow everyone else to have their say. Imbedded in my speech there will be a number of very strong statements and also questions directly to the minister which he can answer. As I said, I promise not to enter again.

Mr. Foulds: You may not be able to.

Mr. Dukszta: I wish to take this opportunity to address myself not only to the specific issues raised by the current estimates of the Ministry of Health but also to some more general issues of health care, specifying their applicability to the Ontario situation and using them to put into perspective what needs to be done, what is not being done and what must be done in the field of health care.

In other words I want to do what this government and this minister have so far failed to do: Namely, to put health care problems into their proper context rather than dealing with them as ad hoc problems in watchdog accounting.

I want to bring forth proof of the government's continued and increasing mismanagement of the health care delivery system in this province and the inability of the present minister to perceive or define, let alone act upon,

health care problems in their broader environmental, social and self-imposed lifestyle aspects.

Health care problems can be broadly organized into four categories. First, health and lifestyle; second, health and social organization; third, health and biological problems; and finally, health and the environment.

Each of these problem areas is affected by a number of contemporary factors. The first of these are rising societal expectations. People expect, in fact demand, that their doctors will keep them healthy and even happy and that they will do so free of charge.

Then there is the rapid growth of the elderly, financially and medically-dependent population. In Canada over the next 10 years, the number of people of retirement and, I may say, of doctor-badgering age, will increase faster than the size of the working population which supports the health care system.

In addition, there are the consequences of those advances in medical science and technology which all enlightened people welcome. Doctors understandably want to employ costly and sophisticated new equipment and techniques which they know will enable them to do a better job. An ever-increasing number of chronic patients, kept alive by science, need more care for longer periods of time.

Against all this is our increased awareness of the importance of prevention. We know that public health measures are more efficient, more economical and more effective than treating clinical problems when they occur. Prevention must be seen as a three-fold activity: Primary prevention eradicating the potential health problem before it occurs and requires treatment; secondary prevention, immediate curative action to combat the problem which has become clinical; and tertiary prevention, treatment of after-effects, rehabilitation and so on.

Many may ask why we must go back to such a dull-sounding preventive approach when medical science is glamorously producing for our edification, if not for our benefit, a new wonder surgery almost daily. A heart transplant operation is rather like a circus: The media, the surgeons, the team, almost everyone in the hospital, not to mention the patient, are involved in a dramatic event. Two hundred and fifty people work for days and rejoice when the last stitch is finally sewn.

This is modern medical science at its most miraculous and dramatic. But after all, do such isolated incidents not pale into insignificance in juxtaposition to the much more fundamental and ongoing failure to reduce or even contain deaths and injuries from environmental pollution, from industrial disease such as asbestosis and silicosis, and from automobile accidents?

We must bear in mind the historical lesson that the major advances in health care, and the consequent improvement in general health and the prolongation of life, have come about not from advances in medicine per se but from such improvements as better nutrition; safe water; domestic sanitation; control over pests, rodents and bacteria; sterilization and vaccination.

We are still faced with a plethora of obvious social problems such as environmental pollution, and yet we continue to devote almost all of our health care resources to dealing with the consequences of these problems, in terms of treatment or secondary prevention, rather than attacking them at their sources.

With this basic principle in mind, let us look more closely at the four broad areas in which I feel this ministry's shortcomings can clearly be seen: health and life-style, health and social organization, health and biological problems, and health in the environment. Granted, not every aspect of each of these categories can be laid at the minister's door alone. The gross failure to protect the health of Ontario's miners, for instance, is an ongoing disgrace to at least four different ministries.

It is the government as a whole, and the minister in particular, who must take responsibility for this failure to treat health-care problems within a broad social context—the only way in which they may be properly understood and solved.

It is precisely this broad social context to which I wish to draw attention in the first and second of my four health categories—health and lifestyle, and health and social organization. On the subject of Ontario lifestyles, the minister is most eloquent, in a highly moralistic vein. "Moderation in all things," he says. "Behave reasonably and many of our health problems will disappear." Not without some smugness, he points to cigarette-smoking, out-of-shape individuals both inside and outside this chamber.

Granted, those health problems which arise from one's lifestyle are by and large self-imposed problems. This does not alter the fact, however, that once they manifest themselves clinically, they become serious and expensive. They stop being private problems and start being public problems, because

they are a major drain on our health-care resources. Among these self-imposed risks are excessive use of alcohol, cigarette smoking, abuse of pharmaceuticals of all sorts, obesity and automobile accidents.

With this list in mind, it is instructed to look at the principal causes of early death and the chief demands made on acute hospitalization time.

On the basis of years of life lost, measured against a life expectancy of 70, the principal culprit in 1971 was motor vehicle accidents followed by ischaemic heart disease. All other accidents, including industrial, were in third place.

> Looking at acute treatment hospitals morbidity measured by the number of hospital days, one finds that diseases of the cardiovascular system, injuries due to accidents, respiratory diseases and mental illness, in that order, are the four principal causes of hospitalization, accounting for some 45 per cent of all hospital days.

It is clear that these self-imposed lifestyle-related health problems are most expensive, both in terms of human lives and in terms of their significance to the financial, capital and manpower resources of the health care delivery system.

I mentioned earlier that prevention, properly understood, includes three levels: primary—before the problem manifests itself; secondary—curative, clinical action; and tertiary —mopping up of after-effects and preventing recurrence. These lifestyle-related health problems are particularly susceptible to the most effective, economical, efficient and humane level of treatment of all—primary prevention. But in order to stop these individual problems before they start, more than moralistic exhortation is needed.

An intensive educational programme should be instituted with the aim of teaching people about their bodies, about good health and good nutrition, and about the deleterious effects of alcohol, drugs and tobacco on the human organism. Such a programme should begin as early as possible in the school system—say at the grade 2 level. It should include a training programme for teachers to make them more aware of health care problems and to show them how they can inculcate desirable attitudes in their students. It should involve the public health nurse in educational programmes both inside and outside the schools.

Only after some time will we be able to see the results of a changed attitude on the part of people toward their own bodies and then only if concentrated educational efforts are applied to the problem, beginning at the earliest possible age and continuing throughout the rest of an individual's life. When will the minister be ready to start such a programme?

As for automobile accidents which, remember, were the principal cause of early deaths in the 1971 survey that I quoted a few moments ago, it is a fact that such accidents are reduced by a full 50 per cent if everyone who drives or rides in a car wears a seat belt. In the face of such statistics, when are you going to begin working hard for the introduction of compulsory seat belts in every car on the streets and highways of Ontario?

Of health and its relation to the overall organization of society, I shall speak only in passing on this occasion, for it is an issue of gigantic proportions in its own right. Suffice it to say that crowded, unsanitary and alternatively stuffy and draughty living conditions, insufficient and unbalanced nutrition and other physical effects of prologed poverty and social deprivation are in themselves likely to produce health care problems which will sooner or later manifest themselves at the clinical level, even though they do not have their source in organic disfunction at all.

I am not asking the minister to eliminate social inequity from our province with the resources at his disposal but I would remind him that here again primary prevention would do much and do it, in the long-run, more economically as well as more humanely. Widening the sphere of influence of public health to embrace housing, food and other social services can only help to nip such problems in the bud before they reach clinical proportions.

Health and the organism; the health care delivery system. The health care system has largely been devised to deal with illness after it has occurred with what I have been calling the secondary level of prevention. Let me now turn to some aspects of the Ontario health care delivery system as it attempts to meet the clinical needs of the human organism with particular emphasis, unhappily, on the many ways, in which our health care system as presently constituted falls far short of meeting the demands made upon it.

Dental care in Ontario. In a 1972 study it was found only 21 per cent of school children had no cavities. It was also found that the average number of decayed, missing or filled teeth per child was 4.4. Further, it has been found that only 25 to 30 per cent of the general public of Ontario receive adequate dental care, which is not surpris-

ing due to the fact of the high fee-for-service of dentists as well as the low ratio of dentists to patients. There is now one dentist for every 2,400 residents in Ontario; the last figures available were for 1974.

Clearly the emphasis must be placed on preventive care. The Saskatchewan model of preventive care using para-professionals—nurses in schools— and free dental clinics for children aged four to 12 is the reasonable answer to an increasing health programme. Again, the prevention of health problems should be the emphasis of the Minister of Health.

Pharmacare. In August, 1974, only 538,000 people were eligible to receive drug benefits from the government of Ontario. In British Columbia all prescribed drugs are free for all people of 65 years and over. Surely, a province of the status of Ontario could devise a more comprehensive drug programme for its citizens.

Availability of physician services. The regional disparity of the availability of health services is nowhere more clearly reflected than in the distribution of doctors by geographical area. The doctor-patient ratio for Metro Toronto was one to 426 patients in 1974; specialists were one to 915 patients. When this is compared to the doctor-patient ratio in northeastern Ontario, of one to 2,931 patients for specialists and one to 968 patients for all doctors, the fact of the inaccessibility of health services in northern Ontario becomes clear. What is the Minister of Health prepared to do to correct this imbalance?

[3:30]

Premiums. Residents of Ontario paid the highest health insurance premiums in Canada. The Maritime provinces, Manitoba and Saskatchewan have no premiums at all. Why should one of the richest provinces in the country continue to charge premiums which are regressive rather than finance health care from general revenues which are collected in at least a somewhat progressive fashion? Are you planning to abolish premiums?

Birth Control. $1.7 million was allocated by the Ministry of Health for the 1975-1976 fiscal year for birth control. This represents a minimal part of the total health budget. At the Planned Parenthood Ontario's Birth Control and Sex Education Conference in October, 1974, Dennis Timbrell estimated that it costs the province "$45.5 million for medical services, family benefit allowances and homes for unwed mothers for the 8,437 children born out of wedlock".

Hon. F. S. Miller: That's for him to know.

Mr. Dukszta: I wish the hon. minister would not act this way sometimes. That is one of the few times that I would just like to walk over and bash him on the head, when he talks like that.

Mr. Samis: You are talking to a psychiatrist now, Frank, be careful.

Hon. F. S. Miller: Don't get vicious.

Mr. Samis: He's just extending his inner aggressions, that's all.

Mr. Dukszta: Not inner aggression. It is very much outward aggression.

This does nothing to alleviate the circumstances of others having no opportunity to plan the births of their children. Further, there is no requirement that local medical officers of health provide these services, and no attempt made to involve Planned Parenthood which has already been in the field for 40 years in Ontario with almost no provincial support and has been providing an excellent service on a purely voluntary basis. Surely, this is a clearcut example of lack of leadership. Incidentally, the minister's attitude underlines what I am really talking about.

Community Health Centres. The province has for several years funded a number of community health centres across the province. Initial funding for these centres was provided in response to pressure from various communities as an experiment in finding a means of reducing the high cost of health care delivery. These centres, there are 10 in Metropolitan Toronto, are beginning to demonstrate their economic and social viability.

According to a national health and welfare study, in economic characteristics of community health centres "there is evidence to show that the community health clinic, as observed in a few communities in Ontario and Saskatchewan, has a lower hospitalization rate than either solo or physician-sponsored group practice."

A recently appointed committee, Spitzer et al, has produced an extensive document outlining methods of evaluation of community health centres. Of increasing concern to patients, workers and boards in these centres is the fact that there may be few of these centres around to evaluate in the near future if the ministry does not immediately begin to take a more encouraging and supportive role. Doctor and board turnover has been high, due in part to the frustration of work-

ing under oppressive contracts with the Ministry of Health.

These contracts impose far more control on the centres than they do on the existing physicians in the primary care sector, as well as a higher degree of interference with patients. For example, only full-time physicians are permitted to work in some centres, thus militating against employment of doctors who are mothers and often would prove to be ideal in these settings.

Under the contract, physicians employed in these centres are not permitted to do any other work, such as in emergency departments, or to see any non-health centre patients in their free time. These restraints are not placed on other practicing physicians.

These and a variety of other clauses in the contract indicate that the minister is attempting to control, and perhaps even to strangle, the community health centre movement. Staff members from such centres as the Niagara Neighbourhood Community Centre, Lawrence Heights and the Don District Community Centre are of like mind in the criticism of the contracts with the Ministry of Health. They are also very critical of the lack of definition on the part of the ministry as to what a community health care centre is and how it should relate to and involve the community it serves.

If the high turnover of doctors, board members and patients continues, or if the centres close voluntarily because of these restraints, no valid conclusions will ever be reached as to whether the community health centre can represent, in the long run, a cheaper, more comprehensive type of primary care than the more traditional forms of practice.

Clearly, in a province with rapidly accelerating health care costs, the ministry would be highly remiss if it contributed to the demise of such centres when they have clearly demonstrated their potential to cut down on these costs. I hope you'll continue supporting them.

Rehabilitation. For rehabilitation to be successful it must take cognisance of the individual and his environment. It must be concerned with the interaction between the disease, the individual, the community and the environment, and requires a broad ecological approach to care. Establishment of an accurate medical diagnosis is only the first step. Many needs can only be identified, at the moment, by agencies outside the health service. Assessment of disability and its correction requires an integrated team, with knowledge of medical, social, educational, psychological and vocational factors.

In this multi-disciplinary approach, communication, co-operation and continuity are all-important. This is another type of tertiary prevention which is equally important, and which is also grossly neglected by the ministry.

District health councils. The concept of district health councils, as recommended in the Mustard Report, has some attractive possibilities. I recognize the fact that the Ministry of Health has instigated five district health councils, and is regulating the existence of a further 21 councils.

The concept of involving the community in comprehensive planning seems to have been borrowed from basic New Democratic Party thinking. The basic divergence from NDP thinking on health policy is the total impotence of these councils and the lack of elected representation.

It seems ludicrous to me to conceive of an effective district health council where planning and financing are not related. I wonder if the minister would consider giving these councils elected representation, and the necessary power to function effectively.

Further, since the British Columbia experience with district health councils shows that there are problems with these councils in large urban areas, I would like the minister to address himself to this problem, especially in Toronto. Is Toronto to have one or five councils? And when?

Teaching hospitals. In 1973, 14,620 out of a total of 43,348 general hospital beds were in teaching hospitals. This is 34 per cent of the total acute care beds. These teaching hospitals are scheduled to receive 57 per cent of the ministry's transfer payments for capital construction and acquisition. They are all located in the major urban areas. There are 23 of them; 12 in Metro, four in Hamilton, two in Ottawa, two in Kingston and three in London. Why this discrepancy? At a time like this, increasing funding of the tertiary centres —centres for highly specialized and very expensive care—seems inappropriate. Is it reasonable to expect, for example, that students trained in centres such as this will want to practise outside cities? Why should programmes not be expanded to hospitals which more accurately reflect subsequent practice possibilities?

General hospital beds. The Hospitalization International Comparison, 1969, from the report of the Ontario Council of Health, states that Canada has 5.7 beds per 1,000 population

—which puts Canada ahead of England and Wales, with 4.1 beds per 1,000. We don't need that many beds. Incidentally, in 1932, the bed capacity in Canada was 3.95 per 1,000.

In Ontario, hospital beds are now often used inappropriately. One in five of the patients now occupying beds could be treated either on an ambulatory basis or in a different setting, depending upon conditions. Some of these patients could be treated in the doctor's office, the community health centre, or even the hospital outpatient department. Some of the psychiatric patients undoubtedly could be treated in day care or other types of partial hospitalization programmes.

Some people are in fact chronically ill and in need of institutional or nursing care, yet no bed can easily be found for them. However, let me tell the minister very plainly that though he and I both agree, this time, that this type of patient does not belong in hospital, you cannot cut one in five beds until you provide alternate community based services. You are taking a real risk with your heedless, unplanned economizing.

[3:45]

Long-term psychiatric patients. During the years 1960 to 1971, there was in provincial psychiatric hospitals a decrease of 43 per cent in the in-patient population. In 1961 there were nearly 16,000 patients in Ontario psychiatric hospitals, a small percentage of whom were mentally retarded, and hence, the responsibility of the Ministry of Community and Social Services. Now, there are 6,000 to 7,000 patients in the 15 provincial psychiatric hospitals.

This change has been welcomed by almost everyone in the mental health field and by the community at large. Large, overcrowded, prison-like wards began to open their doors—patients were admitted and discharged more easily. New treatment methods designed to rehabilitate patients were tried and the whole mental health field became more open, therapeutic and oriented toward problem- and goal-solving. Patients, at last, were becoming people.

What happened to these thousands of discharged patients? Are they living at home or with their families? If not, are they alone, are they working, are they able to care for themselves physically and mentally? If not, who supervises them and pays for their keep? Who ensures that they are capable of maintaining themselves in the community?

In the first flush of enthusiasm about clearing out these "total institutions," as Goffman describes mental hospitals, and getting people into the community and back to life, so to speak, many of these patients were placed in community and boarding homes. However, there have been increasing numbers of disquieting reports about the living conditions of discharged ex-patients published recently in Great Britain, the USA and Canada.

These facts can only lead me to believe the Ministry of Health is merely paying lip service to the policy of integrating these patients into the community. The lack of adequate resources for them—financial, recreation, employment and housing—is such that patients are merely vegetating in boarding homes throughout Ontario. This has created a situation which probably provides less sufficient supervision for those people than they have received in back wards of the mental hospitals.

These boarding houses have been condemned by the Psychiatric Hospital Patients Welfare Association and I quote, as "houses of ill repute." In a newsletter put out by the PHPWA, the following observations were made:

> The patients, heavily drugged, huddled together in a state of squalor reminiscent of Oliver Twist. There was no interest in clothing or in getting out of doors. Weak, and almost comatose from excessive sedation, these "lost" people—despite the potential for rehabilitation in some cases—spend their days staring at the walls, waiting for death.

Yet, these boarding houses have been paid handsomely for providing these dysfunctional services for patients. It was reported in the same article that one landlord, who does not live in the boarding house himself, had prospered to the point of being able to purchase two additional houses within the past four years.

Surely the minister must be ignorant of these facts, otherwise I am certain he would not allow such injustice to continue.

I must ask you, Mr. Minister, to tell me who is responsible for these disenfranchised people. I speak not merely of the financial responsibility, which I know belongs largely to the Ministry of Community and Social Services, but, more importantly, the responsibility of integrating those who are capable back into a productive role within our society. Is their physical and emotional care to be supervised by a family doctor, or by the hospital where they previously resided, since they are often still recorded as outpatients on daily census sheets?

Given that I recognize the incestuous relationship between the Ministry of Health and the Ministry of Community and Social Services, I charge both to define clearly their responsibilities and then ensure proper supervision and service for these people,

Mr. Moffatt: Don't strike him, now.

Mr. Dukszta: I am not going to do anything to him.

Regarding adequate services, why did the Ministry of Health "freeze" the hiring of social workers, occupational therapists and psychologists—and not the hiring of doctors and nurses—if the ministry did not intend to adopt simply a policy of custodial care? For example, the unit at Lakeshore Hospital known as the DARE project and responsible for these patients, has recently lost one-third of its staff. Such a loss virtually means that more and more "discharged" patients will be placed in homes where supervision, encouragement and support for self-sufficiency are left to chance. There is little doubt that this, in part, accounts for an increased readmission rate.

Surely, in the face of the evidence of successful programmes elsewhere, the ministry does not intend to allow such inadequate policies to continue, with a greater burden on themselves as more and more patients come to be readmitted. It has only to consider the success of part-time hospitalization programmes—daycare, night and weekend hospitals—to realize the therapeutic and economic advantages of an effective community psychiatric treatment model—not to mention, of course, the greater success rate for the integration of patients into a completely self-sufficient, productive community existence.

As to children and mental health, the CELDIC report of 1970 stated that up to 12 per cent of the child population needs some form of intervention for emotional problems, while only one in 10 receive the help indicated. There's little evidence to suggest that these forms of early intervention are any more readily available five years later, the result being that we are too often faced with adolescents with serious problems and an even greater lack of resources at that point.

It would appear that the young persons in conflict with the law Act will soon become law. This will mean that a whole new group of children under 14 years of age will need service from the community. While it seems a positive step that no child under 14 will be subjected to the court system, it raises even more urgently the problem in service delivery to children pointed out in the CELDIC report.

A year ago on Nov. 5, I'd like to remind you, the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Lewis) spoke in the House on Ontario mental health services during the debate on the estimates of the Ministry of Health. He started by discussing the death of Derek Halanen and pointed out to mental health workers, the public and the Legislature, the horrifying mess in Ontario involving mental health services for children. The death of 15-year-old Derek in the Queen St. Mental Health Centre shocked us all. I would like to refresh the members' memories with some of his statements, for he might just as well have been speaking in November, 1975 and not in 1974, 1973 or 1970.

Mr. Lewis: To read about the transfer of this young man (Derek Halanen) from institution to institution—some six of them I think, in a period of 18 to 20 months prior to his death—is to read an indictment of the system.

The leader of the New Democratic Party then elaborated on the desperate inability of Children's Aid Societies to find placement for disturbed teenagers. He concluded:

Mr. Lewis: There is some kind of desperate roadblock in the treatment facilities for disturbed children and adolescents. There is something profoundly wrong about it all. I don't know how it is allowed to happen.

The need became even more public in December, 1974, when the Toronto Daily Star published a series of four articles on the mental health problems of children and adolescents written by Marilyn Dunlop and entitled, "Nowhere to Treat Troubled Teenagers." In one of these articles, she reported that there were some 70,000 emotionally disturbed children in the province ranging in degree of disturbance from mild to severe. Again, the problem was clearly specified and case histories were given of typically disturbed "untreatable children."

Statistics were again given by the various Children's Aid Societies. Again Derek Halanen's death was described as a pointless death. Then based on the purported lack of facilities for these adolescents, the ministry undoubtedly felt that it had to devise a new system to provide a completely new dimension of service in addition to and presumably to be integrated with existing services.

What exactly did the ministry do? Lying on the shelves of the children's services branch, there was an old paper written in 1969 by a social worker and a psychologist working for the ministry. This paper was called "Treating the Untreatable Adolescents" or, simply, "The Four-Phase Pro-

gramme." Let us attempt to understand why this paper, which has been on the shelves of the children's services branch since 1969, was unearthed.

To begin with, we must take a look at our juvenile and family court system. Many new judges have recently been appointed by the government. These new judges, in their idealism and desire to understand and help children with social problems, have begun to refuse to send children to training schools. They have asked questions, and it bothers them what is happening around them.

As we all know, it takes some time for a judge to become accustomed to the system. As he does, he no longer asks questions. He simply does what he is told to do by the people who bring the child before him. Then the judge, who has become accustomed to the system, asks no questions when he's told that the best place for the child is training school. He does not see that the child before him has been psychiatrically assessed several times, and has been to foster homes, to group homes and to treatment centres and that the training school is yet another place where the child will be passed around.

The new judges perceive there is something very wrong about all of this. They might even ask themselves what happens to the child after training school. They do not like the possibilities which go through their minds and they refuse to send more children to the training schools. In combination, their refusals are so strong that they now want training schools completely abolished.

But then each considers "Where will I send the child? What am I going to do?" He puts pressure on the Children's Aid Society and a public outcry follows. Then there is the pressure on the ministry. The children's services branch of our present government has not been known to date for any creative or forthright thinking. The plan on how to treat the untreatable adolescent is then brought to the fore to appease the public and to save the ministry.

What are the phases? They can be outlined as follows. Phase (1). Assessment and recognition of degree of untreatedness. Phase (2). Treatment in a closed setting. It elaborates that the goal of this setting is the gradual establishment of a basic trust in the child's relationship to others. Phase (3). Placing the child outside the city. It is explained, "Some youngsters will need the chance to get away from the contaminating and/or disturbing influence of their home and community environment." Phase (4). This is seen as a city life re-integration programme.

Let us take a critical look at the four-phase plan.

Phase (1). Psychiatrical assessments are extremely variable from person to person and most often reflect both the personality and the orientation of a particular psychiatrist. The child found sadistic, dangerous to society and hence in need of at least two years of institutional care can be seen by another as anxious, tense, inhibited and in need of socialization with his peers.

Many children sent to me by social workers, psychologists or psychiatrists have been described as having brain disfunction or labelled as psychopaths or schizophrenics. To my amazement, I have found some of these children basically normal. But I have also found a great deal of confusion around them to have been generated by those who have assessed them previously.

One must question: who are the psychiatrists appointed by the government to delineate the untreatable child? How arrogant, blind and insensitive such an individual must be, to send to others a child he himself has deemed to be untreatable.

Phases (2) and (3). It is a known fact that no genuine sense of trust has ever been born out of enclosure and fear in those deprived of individuality and freedom; one only has to know children discharged from training schools or adults from penitentiaries. Even if the government premises were correct and trust could be established and could grow in such a situation, how does the ministry explain that a child, who has never before related to others, should be sent away as soon as he develops his first sense of trust to a placement away from society? Why should he be seduced to stay for a longer time when he has already been able to develop a sense of trust? It simply makes no sense.

Phase (4). The final phase is seen as a city life re-integration problem where it is described that social education is particularly emphasized. The programme is still designed to help adolescents who have a near-delusional misinterpretation of life and what it may have in store for them. If one thinks seriously about the stated purposes of the first three phases of the plan and how the adolescent is viewed when he reaches the final phase it becomes very clear that the basic lack of trust does not lie with that adolescent.

This paper, a plan from the ministry to help children, has been severely criticized by many others before me. What answers has

the ministry? They have said that not all children in need of help must go through the total four-phase plan. The plan applies only to the child who has been before the court or other helping agencies. It could be that the four-phase child is a child who can no longer be tucked away safely in a training school.

The minister says in defence of the plan that it is a system of alternatives. The child does not have to go from one phase to another. He can jump phases or he can even be returned from the last phase to the first. Is the ministry serious about that? Again, it does not make much sense.

Conceptually, it seems that the basic premise underlying this programme is that the unwanted child is seen as an industrial piece of goods on the assembly line as he passes through several hands and is completely robbed of his family and community. This is precisely what happened to Derek Halanen who was sent from one facility to another until he met his death at the Queen St. mental health centre.

I would like to ask the minister a few important questions about this programme. (1) How many people have been hired by the ministry to implement this plan? (2) How many beds have been taken away from psychiatric hospitals and other helping facilities for the ministry to be able to hire all these people? (3) How much money has already been spent on this project? (4) What has this four-phase plan achieved? (5) Have you actually dealt with any people? (6) How much does it cost, if you have dealt with one individual, to treat one adolescent?

[4:00]

To me, all this plan has accomplished is that children can now "jump" much more easily from one facility to another and all children who come to the attention of the four phase programme will be tracked until they are at least 20 years of age.

Recently I was told that some particularly enthusiastic four phase youth workers spend as much as 20 hours tracking adolescents in the community. I can easily foresee that the number of disturbed children will of necessity increase. I would like to suggest to the minister that the very idea of such a tracking plan verges on the absurd. It is scientifically unsound if, as presumed, basic research is the intent.

Except for the fact that the minister can now justify to the public that potential problems are being tracked down at all costs there seems to be little value to this new system. As one four-phase psychiatrist recently commented, when attempting to explain the benefits of the programme: "There is no longer any need to get stuck with any child. Don't you see how he or she can always be sent to another phase?"

As more and more adolescents are becoming disturbed and more and more workers are hired, not only to staff the places to keep them but also to track them through various phases and after, when they return to the community, it would seem that eventually the cost and confusion could reach such proportion to be a full time job for many just to keep track of those tracking.

To set up the four phase programme, the ministry is taking complement from psychiatric hospitals and regional centres. Does it make any sense that complement is being taken from the very facilities that the four-phase programme is dependent on for beds and treatment? Where will the adolescents who are being tracked be placed in time of crisis unless the ministry intends to continue to build more and more facilities at greater cost?

What seems to be happening is (a) more and more privately run institutions are allowed to select their patients—even suggesting as one did recently: "We must fill the beds quickly. Call any child in."—in an effort to receive their per diem rate; (b) other centres who have agreed to be part of the four phase programme are currently arguing with the co-ordinators of this programme as to who has first access to existing beds. (c) Still other centres which, as stated above have handled our most difficult adolescents are in danger of having to reduce their services due to the present proposed budget cuts.

In visiting several centres recently, I wondered why the ministry has never considered putting more funds into existing programmes which have a proven record of treating difficult and unwanted adolescents.

I think of the child and adolescent unit of Lakeshore Psychiatric Hospital which is presently in danger of another cut in budget. This facility, which manages to include all four phases of any child or adolescent treatment into one facility, has been asking necessary increases in staff and renovations for over three years now. The unit over the years has housed some of the most difficult adolescents, but it has not been fully renovated since it opened some four and one half years ago. At this centre, no child or family is refused an assessment and they rarely have a waiting list for admission.

I cannot help but comment that due to intelligent allocating of responsibility on the

part of the unit director (a child psychiatrist) they manage to run a programme of 32—I think now 26—in-patients and, at times, 200 out-patients, with approximately the same number of staff that another unit of the four phase programme has for six in-patient adolescents.

Additionally the ministry should consider combining its services with those of Community and Family Services as well as those of Education and Correctional Services to help understand the supposedly untreatable adolescent within the context of his society.

It should also consider increasing out-patient facilities for children, adolescents and their families across this province. These facilities would then hire experienced, competent people who in turn could keep children with their families in the community. Fewer treatment facilities would need to be built and those existing could then be easily seen as a backup resource to those larger, community involved, out-patient departments.

Psychiatrical care generally. Psychiatrical care in Ontario is provided (1) in general hospitals, and (2) in government-operated phychiatric hospitals. It is largely a bed- and hospital-oriented system of care with few and far between community based clinics that are social-psychiatric in orientation.

Additionally, there is private phychiatric practice, which in terms of social utility is on the level of body rub parlours partially supported by OHIP. One out of three hospital beds is occupied by an individual with an emotional, mental or social psychiatrical problem. Countless hours of productivity are lost with these three kinds of problems. The loss in well-being and the human misery involved is beyond calculation. Psychiatry in the general hospital is not integrated with psychiatric care in the government psychiatric hospital. The two systems meet on the level of occasional reciprocity. The general hospitals specify their need for backup facilities as they become necessary for dealing with the long-term, so-called "chronic" patient.

Additional to hospital-based psychiatry, there is a large amount of ambulatory psychiatric care called private psychiatric practice, conducted in private offices, sometimes provided gratis by the hospitals, but largely out of well-appointed offices such as those on St. Clair Ave. in Toronto, or in other equally socially-approved streets in other urban Ontario settings. There are very few rural-based psychiatrists in private practice. Private practice psychiatry has connections with the general type hospital psychiatry. The private practice psychiatrist often has a hospital appointment, but very rarely, if ever, is there any connection between private psychiatric practice and the provincial psychiatric hospitals. There are some major differences between the two subsystems. A different set of laws and regulations govern the patients in the two systems.

It is much easier for patients, in terms of their future, if they are psychiatric patients in a general hospital, where they can pass for patients with a physical ailment; while after a sojourn in a psychiatric institution like the Queen St. Mental Health Centre in Toronto, one tends to be stigmatized as being mentally ill. The nature of treatment in both settings tends to be now similar. In most hospitals, especially in a university setting, more socially oriented treatment like group psychotherapy predominates; though in some non-university psychiatric units the psychiatrists still zap patients somewhat indiscriminately. Zapping is slang for that intrinsically useless form of non-treatment known as electro-convulsive therapy. But the groups in general hospital psychiatric units are run largely by psychiatrists, while nurses and other staff do this in psychiatric hospitals.

Psychiatrists in general hospitals are paid on a fee-for-service basis, while in psychiatric hospitals they are on salary. The differential between the earnings of the two groups may be as much as $20,000, which in itself is enough of an incentive for the bright new psychiatrist to move immediately, upon completion of its requirements, to a general hospital—though at least two have moved to politics, I think. Consequently, psychiatric hospital staffing reflects a significant proportion of captive psychiatrists—psychiatrists who are not licensed to practice outside the psychiatric setting. Phychiatrists who do move to the general hospital—where not only do they get paid better, but often have more educational and social contacts with their medical colleagues—also say, as if it was a reason in itself, that the patients are "nicer." What do they mean by that? This statement needs to be examined in some detail.

Patients in general hospitals tend to be less disturbed; less acting out or violent; fitting more easily into the general hospital ambience; better educated, and employed; first time in hospital rather than second time around; referred by a physician or even a psychiatrist.

The psychiatric hospital patient, on the other hand, is more disturbed; occasionally violent; less well educated, and unemployed or under-employed; second time in hospital

or even a repeater; and referred quite often by the police. The social problems of the patient and his or her family are invariably multiple and more difficult to solve.

Private-practice patients, of course, are ambulatory. They are well-educated, well employed and well paid for their work, or at least married to well employed and high-earning partners. They are often of the same social class as their psychiatrist. The private-practice patients seek help for problems which are often minimal and cosmetic in nature, or in the form of a self-desired, self-prescribed course of self-employment. It must be sheer coincidence that this type of patient is believed by the psychiatrist to benefit most from the exalted attention.

A study conducted by me of the Queen St. Mental Health Centre on the characteristics of patients admitted during the years 1968 to 1970—a copy of which the minister has—shows that the patients admitted were of strikingly low socio-economic status.

Ninety per cent of the individuals served by the centre fall into the two lowest classes defined by Hollingshead. Individuals in the lowest class, that is class five, are described as semi-skilled or unskilled labourers who often do not keep regular jobs; whose median education is only the sixth grade and who recognize their low position in the community. Individuals in class four are described as skilled manual workers; semi-skilled employees; clerical and sales workers or petty proprietors who identify themselves with the working class.

The absence of the middle and upper classes from the population of Queen Street Mental Health Centre is not an indication of the relative mental health of the middle classes, for mental illness strikes at everyone generally; but it is a searing indictment of the psychiatric system in Ontario which allocates scarce treatment resources, including the expensive manpower of psychiatrists, according to clearly differentiated class lines.

Six hundred and seventy-eight psychiatric beds in general hospitals in Toronto are largely for the use of middle class patients consuming a significantly greater portion of psychiatric manpower, while over 1,000 beds in the three provincial psychiatric hospitals meet the needs of the more disadvantaged segments of our population and receive minimal attention from the psychiatric profession.

In bitter summary I can say that if the patient is poor, really mentally ill, out of control and in need of all the professional help he can get, he is hardly likely to see a psychiatrist at all, but to be referred by the police to a psychiatric hospital.

Who is responsible for the creation and persistence of this system? The departments of psychiatry at the Universities of Toronto, Ottawa, Queen's and elsewhere, who have trained residents in psychiatry for the nice middle-class private patient, deny their basic responsibility for the treatment of the mentally ill; the psychiatric profession which blithely accepts the high rewards of private practice; the governmental, university and professional complicity of general hospital psychiatry which implemented that intellectual abortion, the Tyhurst Report, and now perpetuate the two-class system in the psychiatric hospital; the government, the Minister of Health and his cowardly—and I say that consciously—short-sighted senior civil servants from the Ministry of Health who have allowed the progressive deterioration of the mental hospitals, the winding down of its community and social psychiatry programmes, abandoning virtually whole categories of mentally handicapped people in the new "backwards" in the community, while accentuating and rewarding general hospital psychiatry and psychiatrists in private practice. These are the people who are responsible.

Yet the intensity of the budget cuts continues to progressively demolish preventive and community programmes. For example, at the Lakeshore Psychiatric Hospital, about six months ago, the entire crisis intervention service (a relatively new service) was closed with only a few weeks' notice. The children's service was cut from 32 to 25 beds. At the last minute, the day care programme organized in co-operation with the Etobicoke Board of Education was not funded. The recreation staff of the hospital was reduced from eight in early 1975, to two in October, 1975. This recreation staff is responsible for rehabilitation, for managing programmes like sheltered workshops, and in co-operation with occupational therapy, for running industrial therapy programmes.

The Lakeshore Psychiatric Hospital is not the only one that has suffered immense and destructive cuts. Over the last year I have repeatedly brought to the hon. minister's attention how destructive his cuts in psychiatric hospital budgets have been.

In the Whitby Psychiatric Hospital, the letting go of part-time physicians, cutting down children's services. At the Queen Street Mental Health Centre, not allowing new community-based programmes. Even at the Toronto General Hospital, the Medical Advisory Board has ordered the cutting back to half

of the social work department, a department which more than any other is charged with responsibility for the chronically ill and emotionally disturbed.

All these examples show the consistency of the minister's approach; the wholesale cutting back of all preventive psychiatric services.

Physicians are in the midst of demanding an increase in remuneration. Those increases in the basic fee schedule have not kept up to the general increase in wages of other occupational groups. The total income of physicians has actually gone up, as figures quite clearly show. Partially, this is due to the general increase in the utilization of medical services but it is largely due to the increase of services provided by the physicians.

[4:15]

To discuss physicians' incomes meaningfully, it is necessary to compare the incomes that physicians received 10 years prior to the last available figure, and to compare them in turn with the incomes of other workers in the health field and of other professionals, with those of the average industrial worker.

Comparing fee-for service incomes of physicians we find that in 1962 the net income of the physician was over $18,000 and his expenses were 34 per cent of the gross income. In 1972, expenses were still 34 per cent of gross income but the net income was by then over $40,000. Both these figures are after expenses, before taxes.

In the period of 1962 to 1972, the increase in income was 124 per cent. Even if we take the cost of living into account, using the consumer price index, net income for physicians rose by 62 per cent between 1962 and 1972.

Compare this with nurses. Using salaries for nurses in hospitals as set out in the old OHSC guidelines, their salaries rose 93 per cent between 1962 and 1972. Doctors' incomes were five times as high as nurses in both 1962 and in 1972. Even if we assume that doctors' incomes stabilized over 1973 and 1974, the net incomes for physicians are still 3.5 times as high as those for nurses, even given the 1974 portion of the recent wage settlement.

Compare them with other hospital workers. Again even assuming the physicians' income remained stable between 1972 and 1974 and that the wages of hospital workers increased by $60 per week across the board—this was the metro settlement of May 1974—physicians make 4.75 times as much as the average male hospital worker and 5.2 times as much as the average female hospital worker.

Compared with average industrial workers: In 1962 the average wage, using the industrial composite, was $4,350 per year, assuming 52 weeks of work. In 1972, the industrial composite was $8,054 per year; the increase between 1962 and 1972 was 85 per cent. Physicians made 4.2 times as much in 1962 as the average industrial worker and five times as much in 1972.

Compared with other professionals: Here are some figures for all of Canada—lawyers and notaries went up by 81 per cent; engineers and architects, in the same period, by 49 per cent; dentists by 88 per cent and accountants by 67 per cent.

Let me repeat some key figures for incomes. The average industrial worker's wage between 1962 and 1972 increased by 85 per cent. Lawyers' incomes in the same period increased by 81 per cent, nurses' incomes in the same period increased by 93 per cent while doctors' incomes increased by 124 per cent.

The physicians are obviously concerned to keep this income differential but the question needs to be examined in terms of the service provided. The nearest professional category is the lawyers whose incomes are up by 81 per cent in the same time period. The obvious explanation for the increase is that the combination of a restricted field, fee-for service and full coverage by the state for the services rendered has produced optimum results for the physician.

I wonder if the community at large should not now question this income differential. Should not other professions over a period of years be allowed to catch up while the physicians incomes are held steady? The anomalous situation of these large physicians' incomes is further compounded by the fact that the physicians earned 3.5 times as much as a nurse and 5.2 times as much as a female hospital worker. Since many nurses, especially new nurse practitioners, do at least partially coterminous tasks with physicians, should there be such a large discrepancy?

If the educational criterion is used in comparing physicians' incomes with the incomes of roughly comparable occupational groupings, such as social workers with MSW or registered psychologists, the discrepancy of incomes between these occupational categories can only be explained by other than the educational criterion.

Aside from the obvious mystical factor that the physician deals with matters of life and death, as the present Minister of Labour, (Hon. B. Stephenson) used to say in her previous avatar as a strong unionist, there re-

mains the fact that the physician belongs to a super union with the unique power of virtually writing a blank cheque.

The recently passed Health Disciplines Act has of course locked the health profession in a straitjacket of qualified professional law, with clearly differentiated roles establishing the primacy of the medical profession and the total inability within existing law to allow for the introduction of new health professionals like the nurse practitioner—over 100 new McMaster graduates cannot find an appropriate job—or augmenting the function of other professionals such as phychologists or social workers.

On the one hand the ministry has given permission and support for some innovative training programmes for new health professionals, and on the other hand has locked them into a rigid professional law which does not allow them to practise.

Brown points out that "Medicine for profit leads inevitably to conflict over occupational territories, to the distortion of the division of labour for the sake of income rather than service and results either in the exploitation of the workers through low wages or the exploitation of the consumers through high prices."

I would like to deal with occupational health, and will proceed now to the last of my four broad categories of health problems: health and the environment. For brevity's sake, I will zero in on just one aspect of this problem: the work environment.

Every year, several hundred people are killed at their work and many more suffer work-related injuries and develop work-related diseases. Every year, as well, industry introduces many new products and processes, the nature and potentially dangerous or even fatal effects of which are often not known until the product is already in wide use, and health complaints begin to arise among the workers or consumers.

For example, a case in point: PCB—polychloral biphenyl—is an extremely useful chemical which is inert, non-biodegradable, waterproof, and non-inflammable. It is used in manufacturing electric transformers, flourescent lights, polystyrine cups and herbicides, for waterproofing and fireproofing textiles, and in the photocopying business. But even in very small quantities, the chemical has a deleterious effect on human health.

In Japan in 1968 to 1971, the Yusho disease was described, affecting multiparous women, and producing spondylitis, spine deformation, osteomalacia, micro-fractures, the acceleration of the production of liver enzymes, and the accumulation of PCB in the body fat. Because it is so inert and resistent to sewage treatment and incineration, the chemical is ubiquitous. It is even found in cereals which have absorbed it from the cardboard boxes in which they are packaged, and in shellfish. The final extent of its effects has yet to be fully determined.

I have described PCB in detail to illustrate a common problem in our industrial society. Again and again new compounds and processes come on the scene, but some of their most injurious effects are not known until much later. Here, as elsewhere, what is needed is a three-fold approach to prevention.

In the first place, society requires a mechanism by which all such innovations are exhaustively analyzed and tested for health hazards before manufacturing or release on the market is permitted. This is the primary level of prevention. This preventive level has up to now been left in the hands of the federal government, with whom responsibility for examining and testing new products largely lies. But, it should not stop there. The provincial government in general, and the Ministry of Health in particular, must become involved and take a more active role in testing, setting standards, and distributing information about potentially harmful industrial compounds.

At the secondary prevention level, a two-pronged thrust is need to protect exposed individuals before they are affected and to treat affected people after they are exposed. A vigorous clinical system of detection supervision and monitoring of the levels of noxious and dangerous chemicals is one half of this programme. The other half involves treatment of anyone even suspected of a dangerous level of exposure. Concurrently, of course, a strict and fast-moving mechanism is required to halt production of the dangerous chemical or continuation of the malfunctioning process —and to enforce the stoppage until the situation is fully rectified.

At the tertiary level of prevention, we must deal more fully with the after effects: rehabilitate the injured or disabled worker, compensate him or her for loss of earnings, protect the financial security of his or her family and clean up the polluted environment so that the effects of the disaster are eradicated.

We need not look as far afield as Japan, however, for a horrifying example of the effects of environmental disorders on health. The story of Elliot Lake is instructive, not only for this reason but because it illustrates

the Health minister's ineffectuality and irresponsibility in the face of that challenge. There has been evidence in Czechoslovakia since as long ago as 1926 that radiation in mining operations is a cause of lung cancer.

In 1967, correspondence between Dr. Wheeler of the Workmen's Compensation Board and Dr. Sutherland, chief of occupational health in the Ministry of Health, was already dealing with excess lung cancer among Elliot Lake uranium miners. Yet no secondary preventive steps were taken. The miners were not told of the hazards and no attempt was made to control the radiation. Only this year were the radiation levels of 0.3 WL appended to the regulations of the Ministry of Natural Resources.

Why has the occupational health branch of the Ministry of Health asleep for eight years? And why is it still failing to live up to its responsibilities? In March, 1974, the ministry conducted a voluntary health survey of 36 cases of silicosis at Elliot Lake and 53 cases of radiological dust effects. Of these 89 men who showed some lung damage due to silica dust inhalation, 66, or 74 per cent of them, are still working in the conditions of silica dust exposure. Why are they still working? Why have the obvious secondary preventive measures not been taken?

At the tertiary level, can you do no more than encourage the silicotics and pre-silicotics to find other employment? Is it not your responsibility—yours or specifically your government's responsibility and your responsibility in combination with other ministers—to move decisively to develop other jobs, provide funds for relocation and retraining and offer full compensation to miners rendered unemployable through disability? Until you do, the miners will have no option; they will continue to stay in the mines and work until they are full-blown silicotics.

One cannot help but ask why the Elliot Lake problem has been handled in such a criminally inept fashion by this government and this ministry. One need not look far for the answers. At least four provincial ministries are involved in safety and health at work. There is no co-ordination between these ministries. There is a lack of both will and leadership on the part of the government to attack the problem of occupational health from a unified perspective.

The budget of the occupational health branch of the Health ministry, which ought to be spearheading the government's occupational health campaign, is just 0.4 per cent of the ministry's total budget. This reflects, I suggest, not so much a statutory arrangement as a singular lack of interest in the field of occupational health on the part of the ministry and its successive ministers. The need is imperative for an overall, well-funded agency, or the ministry, to co-ordinate those programmes currently scattered through at least four different ministries if Ontario is to solve its occupational health problems.

The minister may reply to this criticism by pointing to the recently appointed Advisory Council on Occupational and Environmental Health. The council is expected, as the minister put it:

> To provide a formal mechanism for industry, labour and other interested parties to advise government on health standards and to recommend new policies and programmes. It will also assist government in defining how health safeguards can be engineered into new plants at the design stage.

But this council will not serve to integrate the fragmented field of occupational health, since the inspection, monitoring and enforcement of health standards will continue to be the responsibilities of the Ministries of Labour, Natural Resources and Environment, while the advisory council will report to the Minister of Health.

A number of just people have been named to this council, but it contains no significant representation from the workers it presumably exists to protect. Furthermore, the council has no real power at all. Its part-time and advisory status reduces it to insignificance. It is more political window dressing. It is hard to believe that the advisory council will offer any real assistance towards mitigating the plight of the many workers affected or threatened by unsafe working conditions right now.

[4:30]

One further aspect of the ministry's occupational health policy needs to be mentioned. In its brief to the royal commission, the ministry recommended that mining companies should hire a fully qualified doctor to provide occupational health services, and that: "Management and union will be encouraged to promote and support an advisory health and safety committee at mining companies."

Has any such action been taken? Does the ministry seriously intend to urge, through the ministries of Natural Resources, Labour and Environment, that the primary responsibility for occupational risk prevention should rest with those who create the risks and partially with those who work with them?

Furthermore, what followup procedures are contemplated to ensure that reliance on the goodwill of the employer is well-founded? How will the standards of employer-retained doctors be monitored? And will there be a statutory insistence that the creation of such on-the-job health and safety committees be mandatory and not just simply voluntary? In the field of health and the environment, as in so many other areas of provincial health services, it is time that the Minister of Health took its life-and-death responsibilities more seriously.

Let me reiterate that although Mr. Miller as the Minister of Health is far from guiltless, the brunt of my criticism of Ontario's health care policies and practices must be borne by the present government. In fact, Mr. Miller's principal shortcoming may well be his inability or unreadiness to stand up to his colleagues in the cabinet—I continue to give you more credit than you deserve—to convince them of the need for a radically different, more progressive approach to health. It may be that he has failed to assert his leadership in this area within the government itself, as well as in the province as a whole.

Until such time as that happens the Treasurer's (Mr. McKeough) statement on the place of health care in provincial financing, delivered to the Ontario Hospital Association on Oct. 28 of this year, must be considered to set out the basic policy guidelines of this government in the health care field. And we must also assume, I am afraid, that the Minister of Health implicitly endorses, or at least does not dissociate himself from these guidelines.

In his statement to the OHA, the Treasurer (Mr. McKeough) tells us that he is worried about the projected 18 per cent increase in hospital spending in Ontario and the 15 per cent increase in medical spending. I am worried, too; though for quite different reasons.

According to the Treasurer, these escalating costs are due to two factors. I quote: "Aside from the obvious effect that wage inflation has in the health field which is so labour intensive—the two factors are," and again I quote, "high and growing utilization rates and a cost-sharing structure that inhibits the development of low-cost alternatives to hospitalization."

High utilization rates are in turn, says the Treasurer, the result of two things: availability of medical care and universal programmes of hospital insurance and Medicare. I have already had a good deal to say about the extent to which availability of medical care may not be as great or as consistent as the Treasurer suggests, and I have also drawn attention to the ministry's failure to foster the kinds of alternatives to hospitalization which Mr. McKeough himself sees as desirable.

Let me concentrate on the question of Medicare. "It is a matter of simple economics," says the Treasurer's statement, "that when a service suddenly becomes cheaper and more accessible, the demand for it goes up sharply." This is not simple—rather it is over-simplified—economics which uses verifiable statistics to reach untenable conclusions. It is correct to say, as Mr. McKeough does, that medical visits per person are 20 per cent higher today than they were four years ago; but it is misguided and incorrect to say that this is because Medicare has made the service more economically accessible.

In Great Britain, where universal Medicare has been in existence for a quarter century, the number of initial demands made on the health service by patients has declined. The obvious difference is that British doctors are paid by a combination of a capitation fee augmented by a bonus; while our doctors are paid on a strict fee-for-service basis, which can become a veritable licence to print money.

I have a friend—a social worker—who is more aware than most people of the potentian abuses and discrepancies in medical practice. Recently he had occasion to consult his family doctor. The doctor examined him, reassured him that the problem was self-limiting, prescribed medication and told my friend to return in a week's time. My friend said: "Do I need further tests?" "No," replied the doctor; "I just want to make sure." "But if I am going to be well, why do I need to come back?" The doctor responded: "Don't you want to be sure?"

Needless to say, the doctor would be paid by OHIP for two visits. This is the phenomenon of the "multiple visit;" which Mr. McKeough identifies, though he attributes it to the wrong factors. Not all Medicare systems increase the utilization rate, but a fee-for-service system does legitimize and encourage a physician's decision to unnecessarily multiply medical services.

It is in the nature of the human organism to require medical care and every civilized society requires a means of providing that care on a universal, affordable, efficient basis; that is by comprehensive health insurance. But it is surely just as much in the nature of

human psychology that if the government institutes that comprehensive health insurance scheme on a fee-for-service basis, and lets the physicians run it as they please, then at least some of the increased cost of providing health services will be due to those same physicians encouraging duplication of service, not out of real need but in response to the glint of gold. Mr. McKeough himself admits the 10 per cent federal wage guideline now regulating professional fees, like the eight per cent fee increase settlement of 1974, "will have only a marginal impact on overall programme costs, since the pressure will be responded to by yet further increases in the number of billings."

Then why, we may ask, is the government not changing the fee-for-service system? Why is the government not moving to work with doctors in an effective, equitable mechanism for controlling and regulating the uses and abuses of the health insurance system? It is so much easier to do as Mr. McKeough does: blame the federal government, even blame the patient for getting sick so often and staying in hospital so long. As a psychiatrist, I have often encountered this particular aberration: one refuses to deal with one's own problems by insisting that they are really somebody else's problems.

Changing the fee-payment structure is obviously only one of many reforms that need to be implemented at once. The kind of sweeping change which the Ontario health care delivery system desperately needs is a major, long-term undertaking. When the Minister of Health says that he will not institute such change, he may well be acting on his perception of how short his own tenure as a minister may be, and how equally short, in fact, this government's tenure as the government may be. Nevertheless, the health care delivery system must be changed and it must be changed fundamentally, not merely superficially.

This government has exhibited a failure of leadership and a failure of nerve in approaching the very real problems of health and illness in this province. The best that can be said of the present minister is that he takes a managerial approach. He sees the health service as a great factory or corporation, and with the help of accountants and efficiency experts he hopes to run it as a tight ship, increasing productivity while limiting costs.

This is an approach which demonstrates a complete lack of understanding of the basic, underlying human and medical issues. Worse still, however, is the government's tendency to sit on its hands and refuse to accept any responsibility at all while fixing the blame on somebody else, anybody else it can think of; on the lazy, self-destructive nature of humanity itself—a theme perhaps more appropriate to an hysterical preacher than a practical politician; or on the patients themselves—if only nobody got sick we wouldn't have all these health care problems; on, in extremis, on that perennial bete noir and whipping boy of the provincial Conservatives: the federal government.

Let me conclude by saying that as a result of this governmental maltreatment, health care in Ontario is a depressed, out-of-shape, sick patient indeed. But what it needs in medical terms is not a change of diet or a bit more exercise or even cosmetic alteration; it needs—it must have, if it is to survive—nothing less than immediate and radical surgery. Is the hon. minister man enough to put on the mask and gloves, pick up the scalpel and go to work? If not, perhaps it is time to call in another specialist.

Mr. S. Smith: Mr. Chairman, I will not try to emulate the very fine address by my friend from the official opposition. He pretty well considered his realm to be the entire health policy of the province. I will try, instead, to highlight certain aspects of health policy and hope that I can be constructive in my criticism of the government and in the way it has treated health up until this point.

I was told before I entered this House that the present Minister of Health is a very decent fellow and a friendly and charming man. I have seen nothing so far to make me change that particular assessment. In fact I feel that anybody who can stand there with two psychiatrists as critics surely deserves the compassion of all human beings.

And this is particularly true in view of the minister's comments to the House in recent days that from time to time he is troubled with random thoughts coming into his head as he stands to answer questions. I even heard him confess something of a fear that he had an ailing mind, I believe, at one point. He may just be terribly fortunate that if he could manage to sort through the undoubtedly conflicting opinions that the two critics could offer him, at least he would have some sustenance in an otherwise hostile environment.

I am a little concerned, however, that as we sit to look at these estimates—and the minister has kindly handed us just now the annual report—that nowhere in the annual report from the Ministry of Health is it indicated whether or not Ontario is becoming more or less healthy.

I bring up this point because any system is fine and looks all right as long as there is plenty of money available. When money is virtually unlimited you can set up any sort of halfway rational system to do anything you like; and then when problems arise you throw money at the problem and you can pretty well get away with that sort of thing. But the time that a system is put on its mettle is the time when money is short. This is the time when you have to really see whether the objectives of the system have ever been clarified, have ever been stated; whether the goals have ever been agreed upon and whether there have ever been criteria by which to judge whether the objectives are being attained; whether these objectives are being approached or whether they are receding further and further into the background.

The problem we face in the Ministry of Health, it strikes me Mr. Chairman, is very similar to that faced by the Ministry of Education and, furthermore, very similar to that faced by the Ministry of Colleges and Universities. There is a long history, far antedating the present minister, of building buildings, trying to supply services of some apparently definable kind and counting one's success strictly in terms of quantity of such buildings, the number of people who pass through them and the number of people hired to work therein. The Ministry of Colleges and Universities, for instance, really has shown no sign whatsoever of having a clearly-defined idea of what universities are about in today's society.

Similarly, I present to you, Mr. Chairman, my point of view that the Ministry of Health really has no clear idea of what constitutes health in Ontario; of what their real task is; and of whether they are approaching success in that task or falling further behind in their efforts.

It seems to me that the real objectives of the Ministry of Health have been—to be kind and to be somewhat charitable—to try to make sure there is a doctor available to every citizen of Ontario when the citizen feels he or she needs such a person; and have been also to try to make sure that there is a hospital bed available to every citizen in Ontario if the doctor suggests they need such a bed.

Roughly speaking, it seems to me, these have been the objectives of the Ministry of Health. The problem is, of course, that the number of doctors or the availability of doctors, and the availability of hospitals, in no way argues that health is being achieved or not being achieved.

An absolutely infinitesimal amount of money is spent each year by the Ministry of Health in what it should be doing; which is surveying the health of this province, developing measures which are applicable and understandable, developing regional measures so as to be able to compare the state of health between different parts of this province, developing cost benefit analyses so that we know whether or not a new programme or a new hospital or a new way of paying for things has or has not been worth the money.

Now as long as money was plentiful they didn't have to do that; but now money is not plentiful and they scurry about looking for ways to cut back. And they don't know what ought to be cut back, because the fat is in no way differentiated from the lean.

[4:15]

What we have is a situation where money will be cut, probably in an across-the-board way. As a result of that, we will probably end up with more inefficiency rather than less. Let me give you an example, taking some of the figures the government already has but won't use. Even back in 1973, for instance, the average length of stay for a patient in the Toronto Western Hospital—in an active treatment bed—was 11.5 days; at St. Joseph's Hospital in Hamilton it was 7.1 days.

Before the argument is made that really they were different kinds of patients, let me assure you these figures are available by diagnostic category and therefore differences among the patients mean very little.

The difference in money expended between those two hospitals alone, if you take about $150 a day as a rough cost for a hospital, is approximately $13 million. Does the ministry have an answer as to why it takes four days longer to treat a patient in one hospital than it does in another hospital? If the ministry has that kind of answer why has it not made these answers public?

If public education is needed, if medical education is needed and if certain types of penalties are required or certain types of incentives, let the ministry use them; we will support that. What we cannot support is the threat the ministry has already issued publicly, that across-the-board cuts in beds will be implemented. We cannot accept that because that means the careful, the thrifty and the efficient will be cut back as well as the careless and the spendthrifts. As a consequence of that, what will happen is that the doctors

who function at efficient hospitals, where they have learned to trim their waste, will end up having to admit their patients all over, at other hospitals, because the efficient hospitals will be full. Perhaps that will cause the inefficient hospitals to improve, but I suggest to you it is a very inequitable way of doing things.

There are other figures the ministry has had for years and refuses to deal with. Take unnecessary surgery. It is an open secret that there are groups of doctors in this province and elsewhere who perform hysterectomies and tonsillectomies when they are not necessary according to modern medical opinion.

These people are identifiable. There is no reason to believe that the incidence of uterine abnormalities, for instance, is any higher in one part of the province than in another. Why, therefore, should there be such discrepancies in the incidence of hysterectomies? But the government refuses to act on these figures.

Similarly, we all know there is a tremendous tendency to the over-prescription of certain drugs. In this regard I would particularly mention tranquilizers and certain antibiotics. The government knows and the ministry is well aware that this happens. What is the ministry going to do about that?

It is not sufficient to send around a leaflet once in a while to the doctor in practice or to occasionally go on the radio and say a few words—admirable as all those things are, I am not knocking them. There has to be a system of audit whereby the ministry can be kept informed of the kinds of prescribing habits of Ontario physicians and can take remedial action. But the ministry has failed to show—I don't want to be inflammatory in any way today—in a sense, the courage to do these things.

The Ministry of Health, it seems to me, would be better termed the ministry of treatment because, in point of fact, they have shown very little concern with health and most of their efforts are expended in terms of treatment.

As my colleague from the official opposition, the member for Parkdale, has already said, the preventive measures that the government has taken have been pitifully few. What, for instance, is the Ministry of Health really doing about the physical fitness of the population? What about seatbelt legislation? How about alcoholism? We know the costs of alcoholism and the use of tobacco on health care, for instance, are enormous; and what happens is the hon. minister's budget ends up cleaning up after all these other private sectors in the population. When the steel makers pollute and cause illness and when the people who smoke tobacco and produce tobacco cause illness, and when the distillers indirectly cause illness, that doesn't show up in the cost of alcohol, tobacco or steel. It shows up in a different part of the accounting, namely in the public sector, in the health budget.

It seems to me that the Minister of Health ought to be—perhaps he already is—struggling with his colleagues to have a little more accurate cost accounting so that in point of fact the health budget is not constantly thrown around as a $3 billion drain on the province. In point of fact, it's really an attempt to clean up after everybody else.

There are some things the government can do. I asked them to implement seatbelt legislation. I asked them to implement the law which forbids smoking in certain public areas, especially in hospitals. I ask them to show a little ingenuity and instead of having smoking lounges in various places, why not have some non-smokers' lounges? Why not make it a point that the non-smoking lounges should be somewhat better appointed than the smoking lounges? It may seem like a facetious and trivial point. Unfortunately, it is this kind of creativity that has been absent in these huge advertising campaigns which have allegedly been designed to curtail drinking and excessive smoking.

What we do find is that there has, unfortunately, grown up a certain mystique in our society that smoking is a terribly fashionable and manly thing to do. This probably explains why so many more women are doing it now than used to, and also so many more youngsters are doing it now than used to. It seems to me the government has failed miserably in its efforts to deal with these matters.

The Addiction Research Foundation has come under heavy criticism and we are still waiting to see what the government is going to do with that institution. I am sure the hon. minister doesn't seriously believe that the incidence of alcoholism in Ontario, or the incidence of heavy smoking in Ontario, has been affected one iota by the millions that have been poured into that particular institution.

What is the ministry going to do about that? If they're looking for something innovative, why don't they look for instance at the antabuse clinics which Stelco and Dofasco have set up in Hamilton? Why has the ministry not in some way encouraged smaller industries to band together to set up jointly-administered antabuse clinics at their own places. That would be one awful lot better

than the sort of advertising campaign which says "you will be your own liquor control board"; or something of this kind, which I'm sure hasn't stopped a single person in Ontario from taking a single ounce of alcohol.

Mr. Nixon: You don't hear much about that since the election.

Mr. Ruston: No, not since the election.

Mr. S. Smith: This is the Greek chorus again.

Mr. Nixon: Well, we just want to help you.

Mr. Ruston: How about the new commercials, the singing commercials on the radio?

Mr. S. Smith: If I may, Mr. Chairman, I'll take your attention for a moment to some of the points made on the question of payment of physicians.

Unfortunately, I cannot agree totally with my friend from Parkdale who suggests that salary is the only way to pay physicians. I believe there are drawbacks to each form of payment. When you put people on salary, there is always the problem that they might find themselves having discussions and coffee breaks more than seeing patients. On the other hand, when you put them on fee-for-service, there's always the—

Mr. Yakabuski: Professional development days.

Mr. S. Smith: —there is always the danger they will be just putting patients through a revolving door as quickly as possible to make as many dollars as they possibly can. Clearly, that is a tough spot. I don't envy the minister that particular decision.

It seems to me, though, that more and more physicians want to go on salary, and the appropriate response of the Ministry of Health ought to be to make possible a number of alternatives so that those physicians who would like to come up with innovative approaches which combine fee-for-service and salary should be able to do so.

More important, it is well known that physicians practise better medicine when they practise within a group setting, and the government has had many reports encouraging this. Yet, the government has done pitifully little—I won't say they've done nothing, because they've done something—but pitifully little considering the amount of money spent, to make it worthwhile for physicians to band together and to collectively hire some non-physicians to carry some of the health care load, part of the load which they could do a lot better, such as handling certain of the psychological and social aspects which physicians are faced with all the time.

Again, it seems to me there's been a certain timid attitude on the part of the Ministry of Health in this regard. Although they deserve full marks for funding certain innovative experiments, I'm afraid I cannot give them full marks. They have done much less than they know has been required for years, and that several reports have already instructed them about.

I also agree with the Minister of Health on the other point. His point about curtailing the number of doctors being probably the only to cut down on utilization of various health services is correct in my opinion.

Here I disagree with the NDP, which has made the point that there should be an unlimited number of doctors. They say doctors' salaries would go down because of the marketplace effect of having a whole lot of doctors around. That would be true, I think the salaries would go down if we had a whole lot of doctors around. But these doctors would use laboratory facilities, x-ray facilities, hospital beds. There I agree with the ministry wholeheartedly.

However, what I am concerned about is that while curtailing the number of doctors, the ministry has done nothing in terms of the distribution of these doctors. The incentive programmes have had some results. I think there has been a movement of doctors to certain rural areas. But several areas of this province are still terribly under-serviced, and I'm sure the minister would have to agree with that. I would like to know exactly how he suggests that's going to be remedied.

I also feel that the place of paramedical personnel has not been recognized. I feel there are many jobs that can be done by less highly paid individuals than physicians, and there is no good evidence that the ministry takes this matter very seriously.

Let me say a few words on the matter of industrial health. I hope industrial health doesn't become a political football, because if there is anything on which we ought to have tripartite agreement it should be in this area.

I would respectfully request that the minister instruct his newly appointed group of people, whom we all wish very well in their deliberation, to think about the following concept. Surely the working man has a right to know what he is breathing just as everyone else has a right to know what he or she is eating at any time. I would suggest exactly

the same kind of mechanism as we presently have in the food and drug directorate; that someone require a licence in order to put into a person's breathing atmosphere certain substances which have not been proven safe to breathe.

Just as you require a licence to put a drug, cosmetic or certain other internally-consumed items on the market, you should also require a licence for things that people have to breathe. This can easily be handled by having industries present their inventories and their processes to an institute for environmental and industrial health and require a licence where the onus is on the industry to prove the safety of what it's going to have its workers breathe.

That is something, I would imagine, which we could get all parties to support and I would hope it does not get bogged down in a game of political football. It's not something on which I wish to score points at all. It's something that is terribly important to every family, every breadwinner, every man, woman and child in Ontario.

In the field of mental health, let me point out one interesting discrepancy the ministry has known about for years and done nothing about. Why it is that the psychiatrists of Ontario are not treating the mentally ill of Ontario? That is a fundamental question. The minister is well aware that the bulk of psychiatrists in this province are seeing people in private practice who are not mentally ill. They may be in some way uncomfortable, they may be somewhat maladjusted, they may be unhappy; but they are not mentally ill. The mentally ill are being cared for by a pitifully small group of psychiatrists and a dedicated group of paramedical personnel. It's not to downgrade the paramedical personnel to lump them together in one group, but rather to save the House from a long list of these other professionals.

It would take courage to set up a system of incentives and disincentives to make sure that psychiatrists, instead of sticking to themselves in their offices on St. Clair in order to see a bunch of basically healthy people, start to actually concern themselves with the mentally ill of this province. But the ministry must do this, and the ministry has shown very little stomach for the job up until now. It is no way intended as a personal slur but as a general report as to what seems to have been happening over the past few years.

[5:00]

The ministry seems to lack alternatives to hospitalization and yet the ministry is well aware that hospitalization has become prohibitively expensive. The explanation given by the Treasurer is very interesting and there's even a bit of truth in it, unfortunately. I hate to say this in a cynical way, but it is true. Let me put it to you this way: what the Treasurer says is that the federal government won't cost-share for these more efficient ways of treating people but it will cost-share for the inefficient ways of treating people.

As a consequence of this, the Treasurer says, we have little choice but to continue treating people inefficiently. After all, that way is still cheaper in the long run to Ontario taxpayers even though it's more wasteful of the taxpayers' money in total.

Let me make this very real. If you could get a patient out of an expensive hospital bed into a less expensive ambulatory facility, and you are only keeping him in the hospital bed because the federal government pays half of that but doesn't pay half of the ambulatory care, then in the first place you are wasting the federal government's money. This is not, in my opinion, the mandate of this particular government. In the second place, may I tell you that most of the federal dollar comes from Ontario anyhow, so you still end up wasting the Ontario taxpayer's money.

Now, the politically courageous thing to do, if the federal government is wrong—and I think they are wrong in not cost-sharing these more ambulatory programmes—the political courageous thing to do is to put the patient in the more efficiently-run place anyhow and then to demand of the population that it take note of the fact that a saving has occurred and that the province demands its share of that saving from the federal government. That would be the correct, the moral and the politically courageous thing to do. To continue to treat people inefficiently, by the Treasurer's own admission, because in the long run the Ontario budget will look better even though it makes the federal budget look worse, is dishonest, distasteful and disreputable.

I don't want to take up the time of this House unnecessarily on general items because there will be opportunities for us to comment on individual matters that come before us in the estimates. If I sit down very shortly, I hope it will be taken as my way of reserving my right to question the hon. minister as each item emerges in the estimates; a right which, unless I misunderstood, has been at least partially waived by my friend from Parkdale who spoke at some length.

I will therefore conclude my remarks, basically by saying that what we need in this

Ministry of Health is a series of objectives that can be clearly defined; goals that can be consensually accepted; criteria that can be measured, even if they now have to be developed; a desire to report to the people on how the dollars are being spent; an interest in cost-benefit analysis; and the courage to use the figures already available to punish those who are inefficient and to reward those who are efficient rather than to simply make across the board cutbacks.

We also need the courage to implement some of the more difficult decisions that I have pointed out, to stand up to various professional groups where necessary and to assist other groups to have their rightful place in the health care system. We need a greater emphasis on prevention, on fitness and a government that basically means business when it talks about health. Thank you very much.

Hon. F. S. Miller: Mr. Chairman, after the last hour and 45 minutes of attention by two psychiatrists, I probably have been diagnosed in my ministry as having paranoia, schizophrenia, mental depression and a few other things. Retardation was a necessary prerequisite for my appointment. However, . . .

Mr. Nixon: On whose behalf?

Mr. R. S. Smith: On the one who made it or—

Hon. F. S. Miller: Yes.

Mr. Ruston: He is the one to blame.

Hon. F. S. Miller: I have tried to make notes as the two speakers went through their list of things. I can't disagree with lots of the things they say.

I have to congratulate the member for Parkdale on his thorough statistical review of facts and figures. I have many of them myself, and I review them often with the same conclusions he arrives at.

I have to admit though, I can't compete with either of the two critics in terms of medical knowledge—maybe that's an advantage. Maybe the fact that I am not committed to a predetermined point of view allows me to be more rational and objective about the things I see.

Mr. Nixon: Maybe.

Mr. Ruston: Possibly.

Mr. Nixon: As long as you don't make a stronger claim than that.

Mr. R. S. Smith: Ignorance is bliss.

Mr. Nixon: You are a blister.

Hon. F. S. Miller: Yes it is.

I suspected I saw in the member for Parkdale's four points something similar to Mr. Lalonde's lumping of the four categories of health care. He went through a whole list of comments—about people demanding free service, the elderly being kept alive by science, public health being more economical than treatment. I think these are all fairly true statements.

Sometimes I wish the television doctor shows that dramatize the very things he talked about—the heart transplant and all the fancy things that have people believing they can ignore their own health, that there will always be somebody to bail them out in the end—I wish some of those programmes would show the patients who don't make it; perhaps it would destroy some of the illusions we have about the ability of the system to make up for our unwillingness to look after our own bodies.

So we really don't have too many major disagreements in those areas.

I think we have begun the programme. In fact if I've done anything in the last year, it's been to continue preaching that we have to educate people—we have to work in the school system, we have to work with the individuals.

Yet I'm not really an optimist when it comes to education's effect upon our willingness to look after our bodies. We as a group, at this point in our history, are probably the best educated people this country has seen, but I don't think we are the healthiest people this country has seen over many years.

The question—that we've spent a lot more money and what has it done in terms of health?—is very valid. I don't think it has done a heck of a lot. The question then, is why?

I am glad to hear that both of you are in favour of seatbelts. I suspect, then, that if legislation was promoted—and let me assure you, I'm doing my best to promote it—

Mr. Nixon: We have it before the House now.

Hon. F. S. Miller: I know that we do from that side, but it's from this side too. I'm sure we will get your support. May I ask you, will we get your support?

Mr. Sweeney: We will carry it over with us when we move over.

Mr. Nixon: The bill is before the House. Will we get your support?

Hon. F. S. Miller: You will get my support. But will I get yours?

Mr. Nixon: But will we get yours?

Mr. Yakabuski: You will welch at the last minute, Mr. Nixon.

Mr. Chairman: Order please. I wonder if we could return to the estimates.

Hon. F. S. Miller: The member for Parkdale implied that the provincial drug plan was not comprehensive; he referred to one in British Columbia. It is interesting to notice that some of the other provinces—such as Saskatchewan—have copied ours because they believe ours is better than a universal drug programme. I think you would accept that.

We have a list of 1,553 drugs in Ontario; they are available free of charge to all people over 65. I'm sure you accept that. They are those drugs acknowledged to have proven therapeutic value at the best possible cost. A number of combination drugs have been included because for some of the elderly there are advantages to combining the component parts of some drugs, allowing them to take only one pill. I think our programme is to be emulated, rather than criticized.

We can always add to it as combination drugs are proven to be of value. But we are following the best medical advice we can get and we are trying to educate doctors, in fact, to prescribe in better ways.

I think you should help us in that programme, rather than assume that we should fall into the trap of allowing easy prescribing where brand name products are selected by memory just because some salesman has made a pitch quite recently or because we are used to them.

You know, we are trying a bit of an education job with our drug formulary; and I think at the end of a year and a quarter we are proving that it's working. I hope you would grant that. We have, for example, the lowest prescription costs in Canada. I think we are about $4.63 per prescription. We have dearer prescription drugs—

Mr. Dukszta: I meant for everybody.

Hon. F. S. Miller: Oh, for everybody? Oh no, I am not going to say everybody. I think we have gone for enough right now when we cover the over 65s. We are spending some $46 million a year on the programme now.

Both of the speakers talked about the distribution of doctors, and if my notes are a bit scattered it will be because I am trying to combine some of the comments they both made. Everybody claims we haven't done anything in Ontario to improve the distribution. We referred to this in June.

I simply say; sure, we have problems with mal-distribution. Look at the Lake Nipigon riding. To pretend we don't have the problem would be foolish. But we have done a pretty good job of trying to come to grips with it. I think the latest moves taken and worked upon through the summer—to tie immigration of physicians to Ontario to their willingness to serve in these areas—is the most powerful thing we have done in several years to make sure that those areas in need get doctors and that we don't add to the surpluses we acknowledge exist in the major cities in Ontario.

Mr. Stokes: Would you agree there was a shortage rather than mal-distribution?

Hon. F. S. Miller: Of doctors? No, just the opposite. If anything we have a slight surplus by world standards; that is assuming the world's standard is fair. But knowing the way they are chosen, I would think the standard errs, perhaps, on the side of having more physicians than are needed rather than fewer. I think the standard is one for every 650 people. We are probably—

Mr. Dukszta: It is one for 1,000 in North America.

Hon. F. S. Miller: Well all right. One of the reasons for that, of course, is because doctors tend to centre around those institutions that have highly specialized facilities.

Mr. Dukszta: You need more health centres.

Hon. F. S. Miller: Let's be honest and say that as time has gone on highly specialized facilities have become more and more common across the northern parts of Ontario.

Mr. Dukszta: They are all here.

Hon. F. S. Miller: No, they are not all here. I can go to towns or cities like Kirkland Lake where the hospital isn't open yet. It was started, I guess, in 1972 or thereabouts. It will be open very shortly—I guess it is open now. Yes, it is open now; I should have stopped to think of that because of the questions that were raised the other day for that area.

Before it was finished enough specialists had moved into the community to put demands upon that hospital for highly specialized services that weren't dreamed of in the design stage. As our surplus of specialists builds up, they tend to move out. Muskoka has ophthamologists now, whereas you used to go to Toronto when I was a kid, and then it was to Barrie and then it was to Orillia. Finally, they come to Bracebridge two days a week. I think we will find this is happening more and more around the province.

Birth control was referred to very briefly, and I am afraid the member for Parkdale misinterpreted what I said. I wasn't implying that he should know. I was implying that the Minister of Energy (Mr. Timbrell) should know because the member was attributing the comments to him and—

Mr. Dukszta: I only got mad because you think I took it so lightheartedly. It was a serious thing I brought forth.

Hon. F. S. Miller: Oh I think that may indicate—

Interjection.

Hon. F. S. Miller: I indicate simply that one can be serious and smile—

Interjection.

Mr. Stokes: What have you got against bachelors?

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: I am used to that.

Hon. F. S. Miller: I am just the devil's advocate for him.

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: More than an advocate. [5:15]

Hon. F. S. Miller: Now listen, your Honour, let's not have a debate in public.

Referring to premiums, you asked why do we keep on collecting premiums. You know, we probably have a fundamental disagreement in this area. Premiums right now are not accounting for one-sixth, or not much more than one-sixth, of the cost of my ministry. It is my opinion that the money has to be raised either in premiums or in tax or both.

We have had constant premiums for some years; I think since 1972 if I am not wrong, or even 1971. People over 65 are free; people without taxable income are free; people with less than $1,000 taxable income have half premium. Therefore, we have in effect taken the load of premiums away from those least able to pay. Also, industry in general pays a share of many employees' premiums.

The fact is, though, that the tax or the premium is a visible means of relating a service to a cost. I would argue that with health costs going up two or three times over the past four or five years—whatever the number is—we should be collecting more premium rather than less. I fundamentally believe the premium is a good way of reminding people of the cost of health care, a fact that should be kept before them. However, the decision will rest with the minister responsible for the Treasury.

I was interested in your comments that there were proven documents to show that community health centres have lower hospitalization rates. I would be very interested in seeing them, and I would appreciate your giving them to me sometime, because that's the kind of information we are looking for. We are looking for documents to help us to find ways and means of evaluating community health clinics or health service organizations. I thought the paper the Ontario Council of Health presented last summer—and which I trust will be printed very shortly—on trying to arrive at measurable indices was very interesting. We did accept it and we will be trying to measure certain factors relating to quality of care, cost of care and so on through the health service organizations that have been set up and that will be set up.

How many will be set up remains to be seen. The Ontario Council of Health said that probably a minimum of 50 need to exist to give them a statistical base. There was some dissension. In fact a minority report said this should not be true, that fewer than 50 could work. I am inclined to listen to the minority point of view, but I am not going to set any arbitrary limit on the number. I am very anxious to continue experimenting with them to see if they in fact work.

I don't have an either/or point of view about the way we should run the health care system. If health service organizations are the best way to deliver health care the gradual creation of them, as we prove they work and as the medical profession accepts them, will, I think, justify and cause them to proliferate.

I listened to your comments on the district health councils and I was intrigued when you said you thought we had accepted basic NDP thinking. I suppose if you cover the waterfront we are bound to accept some of your thinking sometime. We have been

stressing health councils for some time. I visited Ottawa the last few days and had a very interesting visit to our first operating health council. I had the opportunity to see it help me solve a major problem in a very short time frame.

In other words, rather than our ministry getting to work and looking for a solution to the chronic care bed situation in Ottawa, the Ottawa Health Council did, and I want to commend them for it. They got the various deliverers of health care together and from them found the places for us to put the chronic patients. I think that's great. It had a measure of support that was far greater than anything that would have ever been imposed on them by our ministry, even if our answer had been right. I am just delighted to see a health council functioning this well at so early a point in its history. It augurs well, I think, for the future.

They also have done some very interesting work in trying to establish their relationship with the consumers and providers in the community, all those disparate groups that function in the health field. That, I think, is very useful for future health councils. I believe that when they have had another short while functioning we should gather the members of other health councils and let them profit from what is going on there.

We're creating health councils quite quickly. You had the numbers. I'm not sure whether you're right. It's five right now; and 21, did he say, in progress? That's quite a few. We're not pushing them down anybody's throat though, yet; and I say that because I don't believe that something that depends upon co-operative effort in a community can be pushed down their throat. If, in fact, they're going to work, they're not going to be pushed down people's throats. They're going to have the time to be accepted as a proven better way of integrating health care.

As far as elected representation goes, I never rule out what might happen in the future but I have to say that one of the major criticisms of the health councils in the beginning was that they were another layer of government. I don't believe they are another layer of government. They are an advisory body to the minister who is responsible for spending the health care dollars in the province. They contain some governmental people, some consumers and some deliverers. I do not think they should be elected because the moneys they spend are not being collected by them. I think other boards that are elected are usually of that basis.

Secondly, I'm not interested in a person's ability to stand up in public and convince somebody they are worth voting for. I'm interested in their technical expertise at this point.

For these reasons I think the present method of having a steering committee look through the area of a health council to choose geographic and technical expertise, on a balanced basis, is very important. I think it's the best model to stay with; and in fact to some degree is why I find the proposals from Sudbury, that I accept elected representatives, not acceptable to me yet.

Now you got to the teaching hospitals and said that 34 per cent of the beds were getting 57 per cent of the money, if I recall the figures you used. You ask me why. Our teaching hospitals, and I've seen quite a few of them, in the main are some of our oldest hospitals. I think you would agree with that. It's not true in Hamilton, where you've got McMaster University Medical Centre. It's not quite true in London, where you've got University Hospital. But basically, when you look at the major teaching institutions, Toronto General, Western, at some of these hospitals we're dealing with some pretty old plant. They needed upgrading, perhaps worse than some of the other hospitals around the province.

Secondly, my ministry was committed to increasing the ability of the system to produce Canadian-trained doctors. This required an upgrading of the teaching facilities; and the upgrading of the teaching facilities required an upgrading of the clinical and and hospital facilities, which in turn has required us to put a fair amount of money into those areas.

It's a staged programme I think we allocated $300 million in 1973 dollars to the programme and we're still trying to get it underway.

I'm glad to hear you say we should close more active treatment beds. I think you should realize we have closed many. I think Ontario has 4.8 beds per 1,000 right now.

An hon. member: Yes, that's right.

Hon. F. S. Miller: It is 4.8 or 4.9. The number of active treatment beds is one of the arbitrary figures in the health care field as far as I'm concerned. Whatever number we provide will be used, I think you would agree.

We have provided the alternatives, contrary to the comments of the member from Hamilton. We have provided nursing home beds: 25,000 or 26,000 of them in Ontario,

plus another 10,000 or 11,000 in the homes for the aged. We have provided home care. We have provided a lot of out-patient service.

In fact, I was very impressed in going through Ottawa in the last couple of days to see what a tremendous job they have done, in some of the hospitals like the Civic, in dealing with day surgery. I went through a new section of the Ottawa Civic yesterday where patients come in, stay for the day and go out without ever taking a hospital bed up at night. They're serving a lot of people on that basis; things we just didn't dream of years ago.

It is interesting to find that as the number of patients admitted per year to hospitals goes up the average length of stay goes down. That makes me wonder if we weren't in the past allowing people to stay in too long. I think we have done a lot of things in these areas to improve the efficiency of the hospital system.

A sister taking me through her hospital yesterday, perhaps unwittingly stated exactly my philosophy about making the system more efficient. She was taking me through the most hard-pressed Ottawa hospital—the General—and as we went through it she kept stressing there were no empty beds. At the same time I said to her: "Sister, there are no beds in the aisles. When I go to hospitals that want to impress me with their problems, they usually have the patients out in the halls." "Oh," she said, "I solved that problem. At one time we would have at least 20 in the halls all the time; I sold the beds."

I say unwittingly because that was in effect the main reason for the closure of units of beds in some of the hospitals. If the beds were left there, of course they got used whether they needed to be or not. One tends to keep on expanding until all available space is in use.

If you see us doing some of this I hope we will have your support, because I think I will have to be faced with some of these moves in the next while to make the system more efficient so that the moneys can be diverted to the alternative and preventive fields. I have learned one thing. There is no use providing the alternatives unless you tighten up on the high cost ones simultaneously. I hope you would accept that fact.

The member asked a number of questions, some of which I can't answer, about long-term psychiatric care and the drop from 16,000 to about 7,000 patients over the past few years. He asked what happened to them; were they at home; were they at work; and who looks after them?

Some were moved out of the hospitals because they were chronics and they were moved into homes for special care. I don't mean boarding houses when I say that. Homes for special care in the province have all the requirements, physically and staffing, food and all these things, that nursing homes have. They come under the same regulations generally.

Others were moved into residential homes, but a goodly number of them are in less institutional settings. Happily though, we aren't putting as many people, as I am sure you know, into the hospitals for long-term care because of the improved treatment procedures that psychiatrists have come up with, whether it be chemotherapy or whatever other means they are using.

By getting people back into society we know we are taking some risks, but we are also minimizing the number of people who end up as permanently institutionalized patients, something that happened in the past. The old insane asylum unfortunately was a place where society got rid of people who had mental illness and forgot about them.

I think the hospital you worked in was a classic example, wasn't it, of that very philosophy? I wish some of the members around here would take the time to visit some of our institutions. They are welcome to and I will gladly arrange it when they want to see them. Nothing shocks me more than to see patients who have been in an institution for 25 or 30 years and to realize just how we can destroy the flicker of life and desire to live in people when they are in a hopsital for a long time.

I don't think we have been unkind if the physical plant around them isn't all it should be. It is perhaps a measure of society's unwillingness to put them in the homes where we would like to see them. At the same time, physical plant doesn't make a person's life altogether happy. I would rather have some of these people out in society in homes that aren't all they should be, rather than sitting in our institutions safely "protected" from themselves and from society.

To show the openness of our ministry, I think you must admit that we never try to deny you any information you want, do we?

Mr. Dukszta: That's very true.

Hon. F. S. Miller: I have an eight-page commentary on what you had to say the last time you visited us. Would you like me to read it bit by bit?

Mr. Foulds: After these estimates where does it go? Are you keeping a dossier on him?

Hon. F. S. Miller: I am. This is dossier No. X912; and frankly, it indicates he needs some treatment.

Mr. Foulds: Where was he last Thursday night?

Mr. Makarchuk: Are you practising without a licence?

[5:30]

Hon. F. S. Miller: What I found most interesting is that you and your leader don't agree on the four-phase system. However—

Mr. Dukszta: He agrees now.

Mr. Foulds: He is not here to defend himself.

Hon. F. S. Miller: The fact remains we recognize some of the limitations on the children's mental health programme from staffing. At the same time, I have to tell you, it's going to be one of those programmes that we believe needs to be enriched even while others are being curtailed. All the other black books—and their colour is indicative—all the black books tell me how to cut costs but this one I have beside me. This one tells me how to increase the costs of services for children's mental health.

I think we should point out some of the things we've done since 1971. We've doubled our expenditures on children's mental health services. In those four years we've more than tripled our new programmes. Our children's mental health centres have increased from 20 to 40. There are 100 per cent more beds than we had in 1971. Licensed mental health centres have increased their services from 198 children to 539 by 1974. It goes on and on.

The four-phase system, I think, is just entering the period of time when we can appraise it. It took some time to get it off the ground. We believe it's good and we wish to give it the chance to prove that it is.

It invariably involves moving some children from one place to another as their need for care changes. But I think we talked about this at some length in June. We found that the old methods of all the bodies looking at their kids, depending upon the trouble they were in when they got to their agency, just wasn't working. We were treating the children with the same problems in many different ways and we feel this new system has gone a long way toward eliminating that, and there's a lot more co-operation between the ministries than we saw in the past.

I'm going to skip over a few things more there. When we get down to the discussion of physicians' salaries, it made me realize you must be running for the presidency of the OMA. Your figures and mine are exactly the same. I guess we used the same source. Either that or we gave them to you.

Mr. Foulds: No, you took them from him.

Hon. F. S. Miller: The fact remains that doctors' salaries did go up considerably. We have been using these statistics in our arguments in the past three years where we've been trying to maintain the increase in the fee schedule relatively constant. I think you'll admit that we've maintained that fee schedule below the inflationary levels. What was it; 7¾ last year after two years without a change? Four per cent this year, and as yet an unnegotiated amount for next year.

I'm quite aware that utilization has gone up in that time and that individual net incomes have gone up. Doctors hotly contest this with me, because I talk in averages and they claim they're not average. I'm sure the statistics—well I saw a flicker of a smile across your face there; average in terms of income, I mean. I'm satisfied though, that the mechanism for discussing their salaries is working pretty well, even though as yet we haven't got a settlement. That's the Clawson committee.

We got onto environment next and you used polychlorinated biphenyls—I think it was, wasn't it, PCBs?—as an example. You said we should protect men before they are affected.

Well if I'm proud of anything, I'm proud of the influence the Ministry of Health has had in the last year within government in terms of centralizing responsibility and control for occupational and environmental health programmes.

Four ministries are now working together, three of them with the direct operating responsibility, in a sense—Natural Resources for mines; Labour for industrial plants; Environment for emissions. They all relate to health, with Health having the senior authority for the programmes. Out of that new amalgamation came the statements we made in Elliot Lake this year, and that were made by the Minister of Labour, about benefits to be paid to people who evidenced silicosis.

I don't know of any jurisdiction in North America that tries to encourage a worker to change from one occupation at high risk to another occupation at low risk before in fact he is disabled, and encourages him by making three-quarters of the pay differential available to him as a bonus. I think that was one of the major steps. We do pay for retraining if

a person needs to move. We do pay for total loss of salary if there is not a job for them to go to.

If one examines the statements made by the Minister of Labour back in June or July —I'm not sure which month—and the programme as we are planning it and putting it into force, you'll see that it does allow the worker this option. We do, for example, indemnify new employers against the built-in compensation risks of the employees coming to them, so that if International Nickel plans to hire an Elliot Lake miner, they won't refuse to do it because they are taking on a high-risk case that will be charged back against their workmen's compensation rolls. That used to be a problem, but we now indemnify them against that. I think those are major steps we should be commended for.

We went the next step and it's great to criticize—the member for Hamilton West said, "Let's not make environmental and occupational health a political football." Well, I can't blame anybody for making it one. It is such a perfect subject. You can sit there and say, "why didn't you do this? Why didn't you know that? Why didn't you prevent this?" It's very easy. But its not half as easy to deal with when you are charged with the responsibility of solving the problem.

I don't want it to be a political football, and I would charge any one of you over there to say I have ever held back any facts or figures from any of you who asked for them. I don't want it to be a political football, and I don't want you sitting there thinking I am hiding facts and figures from you. We are trying to treat it as openly as we can, even though it is embarrassing at times.

Last week I gave your leader all the data on the Reeves Mine. I think he mentioned that on the weekend. I think that kind of thing would not have been expected a few years ago. Sure, he can come back, as he did, and hit me, saying, "Why didn't you do something?" That's where the political part comes in. I have to work with you if we are going to solve the problem. I am trying to make that point. I'll be very open; I expect and trust that you will be fair in return if I work that way with you.

We are setting up this council that we talked about, the occupational and environmental health advisory committee. You pointed out the worker isn't represented on it. I find that difficult to understand because it's got 13 members, of whom five are from management, five are representing unions and three are there as technical or lay people. If the representatives of the unions aren't representing labour, who are they representing?

The system will only work if it has credibility on both sides and acceptability, which means looking into possible risks and appraising fair and practicable threshold values. There are some products that shouldn't be made at all if they can't be made safely. But to assume that you can take all risk out of all work areas is foolish.

Driving a truck down the highway is a form of risk, as anyone knows. But no one clamours for trucks to be taken off the highways; they clamour for safer rules for the conduct of trucks so that we minimize the number of accidents. So, in the industrial scene, I am trying to minimize the exposure of people to health risks, knowing full well that there will be unexpected ones pop up, such as the coke ovens and vinyl chloride monomer.

To the members who are doctors I should say vinyl chloride monomer is a great example of an unsuspected risk. Not too long ago, weren't you using it as an anaesthetic? Weren't you? Vinyl chloride monomer was an anaesthetic for a while, wasn't it? And yet we find out that it should be limited to 0.1 parts per million or billion—I'm not sure which—or else it causes cancer of the liver.

Hindsight is great. I can't really accept that one must licence products in advance. Unfortunately knowledge isn't gained that way. I wish it were. Vinyl chloride monomer would tend to illustrate the point. People looked at it, tested it, made a whole bunch of evaluations of it, but didn't know, because they didn't find out until it was in general use, that it caused cancer of the liver. Now that we know, we act. We have to act.

So, let me say that in the ideal, I accept what you say. In practice, I don't think we'll ever achieve it. I hope that the occupational environmental health group will start looking for more suspected products so that they won't hit the market. I suspect that many of the things we take for granted today are going to turn out to be dangerous in the future, as our ability to diagnose and track down evidence improves.

That's another part of our plan that I talked about earlier. We are trying to keep records of people who work with chemicals that are known risks, so that we will build up information on a compulsory basis for our Workmen's Compensation records, a compulsory knowledge base. So when people are taken ill, years from now, we'll be able to find out from our information what

common exposures they had. That's the most frustrating thing today. You try to find out but don't have the data on why or where a person worked, You just guess in many instances.

I can only say that great though our problems may be, we in Ontario—because we are the most highly industrialized part of Canada—lead the way. I am not ashamed of that. We lead the way in environmental control and in occupational and environmental health awareness. And I just challenge you to some of the other provinces, including B.C., or Quebec, to see if they care as much about the workers' health as we do in Ontario. I have worked in a few industrial plants in Quebec. Look, for example, at the asbestos mines and their restrictions in Quebec versus ours. See if there are any restrictions in Quebec.

You say we are only spending 0.4 per cent of my budget on occupational and environmental health. That's true, I guess. But that sounds mighty small until I say that each percent is $3 million, and going up fast. In a ministry like mine, where you spend $3 billion, each little per cent is a lot of dollars.

You both talked about capitation fees. I am interested in them. I am interested in all payment mechanisms. Sometimes I wish I had a decaptiation fee.

Mr. Foulds: Would you care to explain that?

Mr. Dukszta: On the critic or the doctors?

Mr. S. Smith: How long have you been feeling that way?

Hon. F. S. Miller: Jim, I didn't think you were listening.

Mr. Foulds: Oh, we have grown used to that.

Hon. F. S. Miller: I'm losing some of my notes, so if I am disjointed, please forgive me. You were talking about the Elliot Lake Mines and the risks of radon gas. I think one has to realize that it was in the mid-Fifties that we improved ventilation—mid-Fifties or mid-Sixties, I'm trying to remember which. Mid-Sixties. As far as we know, we have no evidence since of a person contracting cancer of the lungs through radon gas or radon dotters since the ventilation was improved.

I think if you review all the data we gave last fall, you'll find that was true then. We are the first to tell you we don't know that it has, in fact, worked. But the evidence is encouraging. That was true of silicosis too. So that we feel we have taken a number of steps in that area and have really improved the situation.

[5.45]

I think that concludes my comments on the remarks that the member for Parkdale made. I should point out to the member for Hamilton West that the very things he conjured about as he started his remarks, struck me early in my time as Minister of Health. I wanted to know if Ontario is healthier now than it was. I wanted to know what the major causes of premature death were. I wanted to get a plan of action for long-term health care. I recognized the problem of dealing with day-to-day problems that often put you off your long-term planning.

I can tell you, without revealing anything, that we are a long way down the road towards that. We have done a massive evaluation of the statistical data. I hope to have a report some time not too long from now that will give you some interesting insights into these things. I think I can say that, while we have made some improvements, spending money obviously didn't make people healthy. I think that's why I am not so anxious to spend more until I have learned how to spend wisely what I am spending.

You said something about being obsessed with physical plant, or words to that effect, with hospital plant. I am concerned about this. I made five hospital visits in the past two days in Ottawa, and I think they would be quite similar to those that I make anywhere in the province. I delivered, not a lecture, but I guess it could be called that, to the boards on the problems of health care cost escalation; of the real constraints placed on the province's ability to borrow for deficit financing; of the need then to look at the ways we are spending money and the demands for expansion.

I always get total agreement from the people on the board, and then I get a presentation which says, great, but this hospital needs the following things.

The public is not the least bit receptive to cuts in the health field as far as I can see. It's tremendously receptive to costs in the education field. The average person is complaining bitterly about wasted money in education. I equate that with the fact that is shows very directly on their home tax bill. Would that I had 25 or 30 or 40 per cent of my budget on a local mill rate. Then I think we would see the greatest revolution

since time began, or since the Boston Tea Party, if we did it that way.

Yesterday in Ottawa, I pointed out that the hospitals alone there get $120 million a year from us. That's a pretty big industry.

Mrs. Gigantes: It's a pretty big town.

Hon. F. S. Miller: A pretty big town, yes. I think you must represent a part of it then.

Mr. Swart: What is the unemployment cost?

Hon. F. S. Miller: I don't equate unemployment with a job in a hospital. They are both paid out of tax dollars and there is no use getting into that argument. Unless we transfer tax money to the producers, we have not solved any of the problems. If I create work just to make somebody think they have got a job, I have done no good at all.

Mr. S. Smith: Would the minister permit a comment?

Hon. F. S. Miller: Sure.

Mr. S. Smith: I think your response on this, like a lot of the other things you have said, is appealing and quite acceptable to myself and, I am sure, to my colleague, inasmuch as you as minister have made an effort to get people to think about some of these unpalatable things, about having to close physical plants and not always to be demanding more and to get people over this need to see a hospital nearby as a sign of security and so on. But I do think it's necessary, with respect, that you refer back to some of your predecessors in office. What I am saying is that there has been a long tradition of offering people physical plants and offering people more doctors, when that has turned out in the long run to be an easy solution when money is plentiful but has obscured the fact that a real system with cost benefit analysis has not yet been developed. I hope the minister will understand that nobody is suggesting that he himself is obsessed in this manner, but rather that over the years the ministry has had that particular policy.

Hon. F. S. Miller: I agree with you and I think the previous ministers would agree with you too. One has to look at what the communities felt they wanted. The communities felt they wanted these services with a kind of pride that I have seldom seen equalled. They still feel they want them, and I think you and I and the rest of us in this Legislature have a job of re-directing some of the wants of the communities.

Mr. S. Smith: If I do, I will have to bill you.

Hon. F. S. Miller: When I grew up as a kid, I wasn't spoiled—you can tell that. It was very simple. My parents didn't give me a lot of things because they had nothing to give. Today I find it very hard not to give my kids things because I can. That is really the story of our health field.

But suddenly the end has come as I see it. The ability to give finally has been tested. This is what is going to make us face some of these real problems and change some of the wants of society—tailoring them to our ability to meet the costs of those services.

I am glad that we don't have too great a difference of opinion because I am going to be striving mightily in the next short while, having had 18 or 20 months to study the problems, to effect some of the things that I think all three of us would tend to agree with. Perhaps we don't agree in total, but perhaps enough in principle that you won't throw me out when I try to do them.

Mr. Foulds: Just throw your government out.

Hon. F. S. Miller: I will have to change parties I guess if I want to stay Minister of Health then.

Mr. Foulds: I think the Premier (Mr. Davis) is going to come in before 6.

Mr. Chairman: Order, please. Would the minister complete his remarks?

Hon. F. S. Miller: I am trying to, sir, but they keep provoking me.

The availability of service, I have to agree, is not directly related to health. You just said that and I agree completely. The cost benefit analysis is something that appeals to me very greatly as an engineer. I think you were right, when I was talking about the Ontario Council of Health's attempt to do something like that along the HSO route. I don't know whether you have got the paper or not but it is an interesting paper. I'd be glad to try and get one for both of you before they are printed, because I read it with some real interest. Whether the methodology is good or not, I don't know but it is an interesting attempt to put figures on some of the things that are subjective in the main. It contains some measuring sticks for us to look at.

I am not going to be making across-the-board cuts. I tend to agree with you. Last year we made them, interestingly enough not because we thought they were the best thing

but because after some patient negotiation with the hospitals of Ontario, it appeared to be the only workable solution. This year our restrictions on budget, with some luck, will be more selective. We'll be looking at those places that can afford to take cuts and perhaps even giving more money to those places that, as you say, have done a very efficient job in the past of keeping down their hours per patient day.

So I agree completely. It makes for a lot tougher decision making. The great beauty of an across-the-board rule is that everybody is treated fairly in their eyes, or equally anyway. Therefore, the administrative problems of talking to those who want exceptions is minimized. The other route obviously is going to have almost every board who is penalized saying they are unfairly penalized. "Prove why it was us" type of thing. Then they will come back and say "but we are an exception because . . . "

Mr. S. Smith: Could I please suggest, Mr. Chairman—the minister also used the length of stay by diagnosis by hospital figures which are in his possession. I think they could prove helpful.

Hon. F. S. Miller: Yes. I would agree there. In fact, when we analyze hospitals we use some of those figures. We are going to allow you to have 6.1 days if you had a gall bladder out, and things of that nature. I think some of the attempts to bring individual physicians into line in hospitals is being done that way right now, by good planning and discharge groups or whatever group it is in the hospital charged with that duty.

You mentioned a number of things that intrigued me. I guess one of the studies I am going to be doing, or the Council on Women has asked us to do, is to look at those treatments given to women excessively by physicians. You chose hysterectomies and you also talked about tranquilizers. I guess when we hit those two we hit two of the women's diseases. Certainly hysterectomy isn't a man's disease, at least—have I got two minutes?

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: This is getting dirty.

Mr. Foulds: You are displaying some of your biases.

Hon. F. S. Miller: But I have to say to those who criticize, that a good part of this is not the Ministry of Health—it's the medical profession that has to accept the responsibility for the operations it performs and for the tranquillizers it doses out, I cannot legislate those things.

Mr. Dukszta: Mr. Chairman, the responsibility may be the physicians' but it has been given to them by the state—by the government to which you are responsible. So you mustn't deny it.

Hon. F. S. Miller: I know, but dear sir, I think you, as bright, well-trained people, cannot have the state leaning over your shoulder every time you make a diagnosis. A good deal of the responsibility rests with you and your peer groups who review what you do.

Mr. Dukszta: As an engineer you know that quality control is essential and that is what is lacking at the moment. Maybe you should introduce it.

Hon. F. S. Miller: Engineers manage to do it.

Mr. Foulds: At the moment he is peerless.

Mr. S. Smith: Mr. Chairman, may I make a constructive suggestion in this regard. I know that the doctors are very jealous of their autonomy in these things and they are basically medical decisions, but I'm sure the minister is aware that he has a number of tools at his disposal. If I may try to be helpful—

Hon. F. S. Miller: Is that fools or tools?

Mr. S. Smith: Tools at his disposal. I did not refer to the cabinet as being at your disposal.

Mr. Foulds: Not bad. Not bad.

Mr. S. Smith: The suggestions I'd like to make fundamentally are these: that if you know that in a certain region or a certain hospital, there's an extensive incidence of hysterectomy—just to use that example, and there are tonsillectomies and so on—you do have at your disposal the ability to make that knowledge public. You have at your disposal the ability to draw the attention of the hospital administrators to these discrepancies. You can draw them to the attention of the Ontario College, and ask for some explanation. These are things at your disposal, and I would hope that you would utilize them.

Hon. F. S. Miller: Yes, though I'm not sure about going public on some of them until I've tried the other routes. I think it's quite important for you and me to maintain a certain degree of confidence between the patient and the doctor without publicly say-

ing you should ask your doctor if this operation is necessary. That can happen.

I don't think it's a bad question, but I'm saying that when you're very ill and you do need an operation, you need to have confidence in the person looking after you. Believe me you do, I've had a few of them, and I would hate to have thought they were pulling out the wrong things. As it turns out, they did.

We've got onto payment mechanisms with you, I think, too and I've talked about that earlier.

You talked about the Addiction Research Foundation—what will I do? The Krever report was requested by the Addiction Research Foundation. It was received and I suspect, from what I've seen, it has generated a more self-searching review of that organization than I've seen done before. The executive director is on a sabbatical. Just this weekend you may have noticed in the press that ARF got together with all their staff and had, in a sense, a large group therapy session.

Mr. S. Smith: You don't believe in that, do you?

Hon. F. S. Miller: And I think many steps have been taken that are of very therapeutic value in that area. I'm watching it with real interest for encouraging change. I'll continue to watch it. I'm very anxious to see what they define their function as being.

I'm interested to see that they decided they shouldn't be providing remedial care but rather advice. I think that's encouraging because we have hospitals and other organizations set up to do these things. I believe the steps that were necessary are in motion and I will continue to watch with very real interest.

We spend, I don't know—about $13 or $14 million dollars a year there. What we do is highly respected in the rest of the world. Ontario does a lot of research there for other people that's useful to all of Canada. I don't think we begrudge that but we want to make sure we get our dollar's value for it.

I talked about the distribution of physicians to the member for Parkdale. Paramedics; one of the reasons that perhaps we don't seem to be creating paramedics, or giving them the roles that they are justifiably entitled to, isn't because the ministry doesn't believe in them. In fact, we pioneered some programmes for nurse practitioners. We have a basic problem that we have too many doctors now. There is no use bringing in people who can add to the doctor's productivity until you've trimmed your supply of doctors because they are a straight add-on cost.

I think the steps we've taken in immigration control will stabilize, or perhaps even improve, the present physician population ratio. We will be able to get into the use of the paramedics—over a little longer time frame, perhaps, than we had hoped. But we will. It is our long term objective. We quite accept the need to use these people.

You talked about the low-cost alternatives and you said that we were perpetuating the high cost ones because Ottawa shares in the cost. Ontario really was the only province to come in wholeheartedly with low cost un-shared alternatives in an attempt to lower the cost of health care.

Looking back, I can see some of the problems we had, just like the doctor situation. When you've already got too many active treatment beds, you are kidding yourself when you say that you remove a chronic patient from that hospital, build a new one across the road and put them in it or put them in a nursing home because it costs $18.50 instead of $122 a day. It only costs $122 on average. It's an overall global budget that isn't paid on a per diem basis. You know that.

If, in fact, the incremental cost of keeping a patient in a hospital is only $9.50 a day—that's pretty close to what it is I guess—why pay $18.50 across the road, if the beds are there. This is one of the arguments I would use. As the population grows in those high-growth areas it is quite easy to rectify this problem. In the low growth areas, it is not. So we'll have some problem, I would say, stabilizing or using the alternative care facilities in a cost-effective way in rural Ontario.

Mr. Godfrey: Reduce the length of stay then.

Hon. F. S. Miller: What we've done as an alternative, of course, in some cases, is closed blocks of beds so that we at least have some cost savings and put pressure on the system to admit only people who should be in hospital.

Mr. Godfrey: It is cheaper to keep them in hospital.

Hon. F. S. Miller: It is not cheaper to keep a person in the hospital longer than they should be there. I want to practise good medicine. Why keep them there 12 days if they only need to be there eight-and-a-half.

Under any circumstances, I just don't think it is necessary.

I am now through with my rebuttals to the opening remarks. We have 18 hours and 33 minutes left.

An hon. member: 21 minutes.

Mr. Chairman: Before we proceed to item 3, I want to remind the committee that we are now down to 18 hours and 21 minutes. When we resume at 8, we'll be dealing specifically with item 3, health services.

The committee recessed at 6 p.m.

CONTENTS

Wednesday, November 12, 1975

Distribution of GAINS cheques, statement by Mr. Meen 413

Taped telephone hate messages, statement by Mr. McMurtry 413

Air pollution study, questions of Mr. F. S. Miller: Mr. Deans, Mr. Nixon, Mr. Martel, Mr. Cunningham 413

Falconbridge smelter emissions, questions of Mr. Kerr: Mr. Deans, Mr. Laughren, Mr. Martel 415

Health of Stelco coke oven workers, questions of Mr. F. S Miller: Mr. Deans, Mr. Mackenzie 416

Flood damage, questions of Mr. Davis: Mr. Deans, Mr. Haggerty 417

Payment for cattle purchases, questions of Mr. Bennett: Mr. Deans, Mr. Nixon 417

Toronto teachers' negotiations, questions of Mr. Wells: Mr. Nixon, Mr. Foulds, Mr. Singer, Mr. S. Smith 418

Paperworkers' strike, question of B. Stephenson: Mr. Nixon 420

Hydro rights of way, questions of Mr. Timbrell: Mr. Williams, Mr. Philip 421

French-language broadcasting, question of Mr. Welch: Mr. Samis 422

Mississauga inquiry, question of Mr. McMurtry: Mr. Singer 422

Bear damage compensation, question of Mr. W. Newman: Mr. Wiseman 423

Anti-inflation programme, question of Mr. McKeough: Mr. Swart 423

Violence on Indian reserves, question of Mr. MacBeth: Mr. Roy 424

Winter trails programme, questions of Mr. Bernier: Mr. Yakabuski, Mr. Moffatt 424

Ontario Northland Railway staffing, question of Mr. Snow: Mr. Bain 425

Report, select committee reviewing proposed Hydro rates, Mr. MacDonald 425

Report, Ministry of Health, Mr. F. S. Miller 427

Tabled order in council re Expropriations Act, Mr. McMurtry 427

Report, Task Force on Legal Aid, Mr. McMurtry 427

Professional Fund-Raising Corporations Control Act, Mr. B. Newman, first reading 428

Estimates, Ministry of Health, Mr. F. S. Miller 428

Recess 460

SPEAKERS IN THIS ISSUE

Bain, R. (Timiskaming NDP)
Bennett, Hon. C. Industry and Tourism (Ottawa South PC)
Bernier, Hon. L. Natural Resources (Kenora PC)
Breithaupt, J. R. (Kitchener L)
Campbell, M. (St. George L)
Cassidy, M. (Ottawa Centre NDP)
Cunningham, E. (Wentworth North L)
Davis, Hon. W. G. Premier (Brampton PC)
Deans, I. (Wentworth NDP)
Dukszta, J. (Parkdale NDP)
Foulds, J. F. (Port Arthur NDP)
Gaunt, M. (Huron-Bruce L)
Gigantes, E. (Carleton East NDP)
Godfrey, C. (Durham West NDP)
Good, E. R. (Waterloo North L)
Haggerty, R. (Erie L)
Kerr, Hon. G. A. Environment (Burlington South PC)
Laughren, F. (Nickel Belt NDP)
MacBeth, Hon. J. P. Provincial Secretary for Justice and Solicitor General (Humber PC)
MacDonald, D. C. (York South NDP)
Mackenzie, R. (Hamilton East NDP)
Makarchuk, M. (Brantford NDP)
Martel, E. W. (Sudbury East NDP)
McKeough, Hon. W. D. Treasurer, Minister of Economics and Intergovernmental Affairs (Chatham-Kent PC)
McMurtry, Hon. R. Attorney General (Eglinton PC)
Meen, Hon. A. K. Revenue (York East PC)
Miller, Hon. F. S. Health (Muskoka PC)
Moffatt, D. (Durham East NDP)
Newman, B. (Windsor-Walkerville L)
Newman, Hon. W. Agriculture and Food (Durham North PC)
Nixon, R. F. (Brant-Oxford-Norfolk L)
Philip, E. (Etobicoke NDP)
Reid, T. P. (Rainy River L)
Roy, A. J. (Ottawa East L)
Ruston, R. F. (Essex North L)
Samis, G. (Cornwall NDP)
Singer, V. M. (Wilson Heights L)
Smith, R. S. (Nipissing L)
Smith, S. (Hamilton West L)
Snow, Hon. J. W. Transportation and Communications (Oakville PC)
Stephenson, Hon. B. Labour (York Mills PC)
Stokes, J. E. (Lake Nipigon NDP)
Swart, M. (Welland NDP)
Sweeney, J. (Kitchener-Wilmot L)
Timbrell, Hon. D. R. Energy (Don Mills PC)
Welch, Hon. R. Culture and Recreation (Brock PC)
Wells, Hon. T. L. Education (Scarborough North PC)
Williams, J. (Oriole PC)
Wiseman, D. J. (Lanark PC)
Yakabuski, P. J. (Renfrew South PC)

No. 12



Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT — DAILY EDITION

First Session of the Thirtieth Legislature

Wednesday, November 12, 1975

Evening Session

Speaker: Honourable Russell Daniel Rowe
Clerk: Roderick Lewis, QC

THE QUEEN'S PRINTER
PARLIAMENT BUILDINGS, TORONTO
1975



CONTENTS

A list of the speakers taking part in the debates in this issue of Hansard appears, in alphabetical order, at the back of this issue.

Daily contents of proceedings also appears at the back of this issue. Reference to a cumulative index of previous issues can be obtained by calling the Hansard Reporting Service indexing staff. Phone 965-2159.

Hansard subscription price is $15.00 per session, from: Sessional Subscription Service, MGS, 9th Floor, Ferguson Block, Parliament Bldgs., Toronto, M7A 1N3. Phone 965-2238.

LEGISLATURE OF ONTARIO

The House resumed at 8 p.m.

ESTIMATES, MINISTRY OF HEALTH
(continued)

On vote 2901:

Mr. Chairman: When we rose at 6 o'clock we were dealing with vote 2901, item 3, health services. The hon. member for Wentworth.

Mr. Deans: Thank you. That just affords me the opportunity to raise a matter that has been bugging me no end. Let me tell you, in the plain language of the people that I represent.

Mr. Nixon: We can hardly wait to find out what it is.

Mr. Deans: Well I am going to tell the member. As is my normal way, he won't have to wait long.

Mr. Moffatt: Be patient.

Mr. Nixon: Right. It may take an hour, but share it with us.

Mr. Deans: But I want the member for Brant-Oxford-Norfolk to know if he can stick around it will be a pleasant change.

Mr. Chairman: Order please. On item 3, vote 2901, health services.

Mr. Eakins: Are you going to tell us what is bugging you?

Mr. Deans: Now I know the minister will recall that on Oct. 31, 1974—

Mr. Nixon: Oh that's what it was.

Hon. Mr. Welch: That was Hallowe'en.

Mr. Deans: As is found, starting on page 4747 of Hansard.

Mr. Nixon: The plot thickens.

Mr. Deans: It was an evening session. The minister will remember that I raised with him the whole matter of the hospital in the east end of the city of Hamilton. At that time, while I was in the midst of discussing it with him, pointing out the difficulties that people in the eastern portion of the Hamilton-Wentworth region were having with getting adequate health services, the minister interjected and said: "Can I answer that one specific thing?" He got up and said:

> I think this is probably news at this point in time, but I think I reached a fairly important conclusion and decision for Hamilton about 3 o'clock today. Because I have conveyed my decision to the Hamilton Health Planning Council, I am very pleased to make you aware of it. As you may know—

The member for Lake Nipigon (Mr. Stokes) interjected—and I won't read his interjection; it was irrelevant. The minister then went on to say:

> On Monday or Tuesday, the Hamilton Health Planning Council came and made a presentation to me. They were deeply concerned that the lack of a decision on the rebuilding of the Hamilton General was throttling all the other problems in planning for health care services in the city.

As I mentioned, they have done perhaps the finest job of any group of people in Ontario.

He went on to say:

> I today notified them that I was prepared to have the hospital rebuilt on that site provided these considerations are included: (a) That they come up with a plan for the optimum use of the master site; (b) They reduce the total number of beds to 1,999,

[Right? I don't know what that means.]

> which was our 1979 planning standard; (c) They review the role of the new hospital in view of its other purposes in the community apart from being a specialized hospital;

[And this is the part I want to deal with.]

> (d) They find a solution to the east end needs in the city, a health clinic or whatever it may be.

I want to reiterate, it says, "a health clinic or whatever it may be." He then said:

> Those are the riders we put to them in our letter today. We are asking them to work out the solution within these parameters.

And then this exchange followed:

> **Mr. Deans:** That is interesting. If I had known that you were considering such a thing I would have been delighted to have made a submission on it because—
>
> **Hon. F. S. Miller:** It can be done now.
>
> **Mr. Deans:** —I happen, for funny reasons, I suppose, not attributable to any effort on your behalf, to represent much of the east end of the city. I am concerned, and I recognize that many people might tend toward the centre. Everything seems to want to go in the core. Did you give them any timetable for their answer?

The minister went on to say "no," and the conversation carried on between he and I. But it was evident from that discussion that the health council was to find a way of providing for the needs of the people in the east end. The minister said, "a health clinic or whatever it may be."

Now I took it to mean, quite frankly, that he had recognized that the eastern portion of the core city of Hamilton, from Victoria Ave., which is west of centre, geographically, all the way to the very far end of Winona, was not very well served in terms of adequate health care facilities. There were doctors with clinics, but there was nothing for the majority of the people by way of emergency care service. For that matter, there was nothing there in the event they needed overnight care, or perhaps to be confined to a health facility for a day or two for observation or immediate treatment.

So I waited. That was Oct. 31, 1974; over a year ago now. I waited for awhile. I was pleased with the result.

I think the minister can probably remember that it's been a particular concern of a number of people in Hamilton. My good friend and former colleague, Reg Gisborn who represented Hamilton East, raised the matter for at least 10 years consecutively in this House. He continually pointed out there was a desperate need for some kind of emergency care facility in the east end of the city. There were a great number of people who simply could not be expected to be transported to the core of the city; that all of the hospital facilities in Hamilton were centre and centre west in their location. It was extremely difficult during rush hours to transport people from the eastern parts of the city and the western parts of the county and the east end to Joseph Brant Hospital, because they had to go over a much travelled and very congested route. They had been deprived of ambulance service for some considerable period of time.

There once was a time when there was an ambulance located in the town of Stoney Creek, but for reasons that I don't understand and no one there understands that ambulance service was taken out and put in the east end of the city of Hamilton. The people of Stoney Creek don't have such a facility available to them now.

Anyhow, there's a lot more to be said about it. But I, at that point, felt that for the first time in 10 or 15 years the government really did understand the problem and that we could expect to see some results. I noted that on Nov. 7, 1974, which wasn't long after the debate between the minister and myself, the minister put out a press statement over the name of Douglas Enright, but with his authority, and it said, and I quote from one portion of it:

> In addition, the council is to review the health care needs of the east Hamilton community and the role of the new facility in light of changes occurring in the provincial health care delivery system.

From that point to now, little if anything has been said or done by either the health council or by the ministry to reassure the people in the east end. They have been desperately needing this facility, and the minister was telling them it would occur, and that they could at some point look forward to seeing this materialize.

I have written a number of times, but I wrote this particular letter on Oct. 15 to Mr. Ray Auld, the executive secretary of the Hamilton and District Health Council. I wrote to him because I was concerned. I think the minister knows I was, because not a week ago I asked him personally about the progress on the matter. I quote:

> I'm writing in relation to the progress of the promised east end health care facility.
>
> In Oct., 1974, the Minister of Health advised me: Prior to the approval of any payment for the redevelopment of the Hamilton General Hospital, the health council would have to present plans and an implementation date for facilities to meet the needs of the east end residents.

I've had no reply to that, but I can appreciate that it's the mails, they're pretty slow to say the least. Nevertheless what worries me is that the approval, as I understand it, has been given; the money has been approved for the redevelopment of the general hospital. It is now under way, as I understand it. They are currently in the process of the redevelopment that they asked for, and far be it for me to deny them that, because it's probably needed. I don't know, I'm not sure, but I'm prepared to give them the benefit of the doubt. It's probably needed.

I now want to know from the minister in clear unequivocal terms—

Hon. F. S. Miller: Do I ever use any other kind? I talk right out.

Mr. Deans: No, you don't.

An hon. member: Oh, yes you do.

Mr. Deans: Let me tell you, you're very disarming. You're queer and—that's clear and unequivocal.

Mr. Chairman: Order, please.

Mr. Deans: Thank you very much.

Hon. F. S. Miller: Strike that out.

Mr. Deans: Let me correct that; that's not queer, he's clear.

Mr. Samis: He's seductive.

Mr. Deans: I don't know about anything else. You are clear and unequivocal, but unfortunately the things you say don't seem to materialize. Maybe today you are going to say, "Just yesterday I wrote a letter to the health council," just as you did in 1974. Maybe you are going to get up and tell me that just yesterday or the day before you dictated a long letter and you asked the health council to provide you with the details. Maybe you are even going to tell me what they are going to build. It's just lucky I happened to ask tonight.

Hon. F. S. Miller: Just lucky.

Mr. Samis: Must be another election coming.

Mr. Deans: Just lucky. In 1974 I couldn't believe my good fortune that I should ask you on the day of the letter having been signed.

Are you going to provide a health care facility in the east end of the city of Hamilton? If you are, what is it going to contain? When is it going to be built? Is the commitment real? Can the people look forward to some kind of service? Can I tell them tomorrow morning that the Minister of Health is keeping his word; that there is going to be such a facility of the kind they have long been waiting for and desperately needing?

Hon. F. S. Miller: Mr. Chairman, the hon. member did speak to me last week. I appreciated him doing that. He happened to talk to me within two or three days of a visit I had from Mr. Green, who is chairman or has been acting as chairman of the Hamilton Health Planning Council.

I am in a game in which keeping your word isn't always the easiest thing in the world, but one of the few things I have tried very hard to do with those of you to whom I have given my word is to keep it. I don't give it loosely and when I give it, I keep it; even sometimes when it isn't very nice, as some people know in some areas.

The fact remains, I must have better mail service than you do because I have a copy of Mr. Auld's letter to you.

Mr. Deans: When?

Hon. F. S. Miller: Dated Nov. 4. I don't know how or why, I'm just saying I have it.

Mr. Deans: Why would—

Hon. F. S. Miller: Sure. I happened to take the time, once you asked me, to find out exactly what the status was and that uncovered the copy of the letter. Whether it came through our internal system, by hand—

Mr. Deans: Yes, he ran over with it, no doubt.

Hon. F. S. Miller: Perhaps after I called—all I know is I got a copy of a letter which is in the mail to both of us, once we inquired. That's all I can say. In any case, we picked it up so we got it. Do you want the whole letter?

Mr. Deans: Why not? Is it any good?

Hon. F. S. Miller: I only got to grade 3 in reading.

Mr. Deans: Does it tell me whether there is going to be a health care facility?

Hon. F. S. Miller: It says:

Thank you for your letter of Oct. 16 in relation to health care facilities for this district.

You recall from your earlier inquiry and our subsequent reply of Feb. 22, 1974, I explained in brief the development of a 10-year health sciences plan for this district and the terms of reference we have been given by the Minister of Colleges and Universities and the Minister of Health; namely a 10-year allocation was to be spent for the upgrading and improvement of teaching facilities affiliated with the McMaster University health sciences complex.

As you can well appreciate this is a tremendous task and we are experiencing the same kinds of problems that are being encountered in other health sciences complexes located in Toronto, London, Kingston and Ottawa. [A lot of those have to do with financing I would point out to you.]

This health council, in full collaboration with McMaster University and all of the

affiliated facilities, are continuing to work out this long-term plan within the guidelines of the financial constraints that have been placed upon the whole health care delivery system. In our efforts to resolve these matters, council has been constantly working with both ministries plus the planning department of the regional government of Hamilton-Wentworth in correlating all of the data which is required to determine such a plan. But at the same time, council has recognized that it must take into consideration all of the elements within the total health care delivery system.

In respect of the 10-year plan, council has received approval from the Minister of Health to proceed to develop finite plans on the following broad proposals.

1. Hamilton General Hospital to be rebuilt to a maximum of 400 acute care beds with the precise programme allocations as yet to be determined.

[8:15]

I think I mentioned to you the other day that the very reason we put the provision in our overall permission to Hamilton for them to go ahead with the relocation of the hospital on this site was because both the regional and city governments and the health planning council had recommended that. It's pretty difficult not to accept those three recommendations. Yet we felt we had to protect your part of the city and therefore we put that claim in.

2. Pediatrics to be consolidated in order that there shall be only, at a maximum, two units containing a total of 100 acute care beds for the whole district.

3. Obstetrics to be consolidated in order that there shall be only, at a maximum, two units containing 150 acute care beds for the whole district.

4. Tertiary care programme distribution to be adjusted in order to meet not only the requirements of those consolidated pediatric and obstetric programmes, but also to meet the needs of the total community while ensuring elimination of unnecessary duplication.

5. In keeping with the principle of consolidation, approval be given to the Hamilton District Hospital to proceed immediately with the redevelopment planning process within the 400 acute care beds concerned. Reconstruction to be carried out on a phased basis, in order that as beds are taken out of service, the surplus beds, which are presently available in the district, will ensure that there is little disruption in the availability of services and the high quality of service will be maintained. This process will allow the consolidation and redistribution of programmes to take place in concert. It will allow bringing into service on a phased basis the total complement of beds at the McMaster University Medical Centre and provide St. Joseph's the opportunity to proceed to develop its master plan that will be complementary to the total district needs.

6. This overall plan allows for the provision of 1,999 acute care beds by 1979, which is the target the ministry set and to which we are committed.

Now, in arriving at the foregoing, and as stated recognizing the need to develop other health care programmes, council has made a commitment to the Minister of Health that there will be established an ambulatory care centre in the east end of the district.

This will have to be done in close co-operation with the Ministry of Health to ensure the exact site is geographically correct and large enough to accommodate the construction of an in-patient facility when there is more precise information available on population growth and distribution.

In making this commitment, council recognized that present facilities can, and do, serve acute-care patient needs until the government is in a position to provide data and funds that will support the construction of a comprehensive facility that will have a catchment area that reaches into other jurisdictions. We're expecting updating of population projections and spread, particularly at it applies to the east end district in which we understand there are some revisions.

In addition, the Ministry of Health is determining plans from the appropriate ministries—future long-range plans—as to highways and traffic flow. This will have to be correlated to similar information which we're obtaining.

And so on. There are a couple more paragraphs that I think I can leave. But in any case, the answer is there specifically. It's not just the provision of services from some point remote, it's the provision of services from within; and the long-range plan would be for some larger facility with beds to eventually be built.

Mr. Deans: I don't want to shock you, but there have been commitments made in

this House—I'm sorry, in a way, that my former colleague from Hamilton East is no longer here in the House, because he is better able to recall exactly how often, but I would not doubt for a moment that the truth would be maybe 10 years in a row—that there would be some health care facility provided in the east end of the city. What I understood you to read in the letter, which is addressed to me but which I have not yet received, is that they're really still studying it. They may build something in the future. It depends to a great extent on the Ministry of Health and its involvement, and the Ontario government's involvement in the provision of any facility that might be built in the future.

There is no definite plan developed at this point with regard to meeting the needs. I've got to tell you that I took an entirely different meaning. Maybe I'm a bit gullible, I don't know. I didn't think so, but it's entirely possible. The hon. minister has a nice manner and it kind of draws you in a bit. But let me read the paragraph that applies directly to this, from a letter dated Oct. 31, 1974, sent to Mr. Green over the signature of the hon. minister. It says, and I just want to read the lead-in paragraph, it says: "However, I would like your council to address the following problems." That was prior to the approval of the moneys to be spent for the rebuilding of the Hamilton General, and the thing that concerns me most is the following: "Review the health care needs of the east Hamilton community and ensure that these needs are met in the planning of both in-patient and out-patient services."

I really did think that the hon. minister was saying to them that we will approve the expenditures but you've got to prove to us that you have, in fact, conducted a sufficient study and that you do have a plan to meet these needs.

I don't know, it's hard to describe to you what Hamilton is like in terms of hospital facilities for people. McMaster University is inaccessible, virtually inaccessible during certain hours of the day, to people who live in the east end of the city. But unfortunately the Joseph Brant Hospital, which is in Burlington, is equally inaccessible at the same times because of the rush hour periods. So for persons to get to the closest hospital, which would be in another jurisdiction altogether and which would be in Burlington, requires them to make their way through the rush hour traffic. Though it's closer, geographically, it is as inaccessible as McMaster University Hospital.

St. Joseph's Hospital, in the centre of the city, faces the same problems. The General Hospital is in the centre of the city and faces basically the same problems.

Perhaps you can correct me if I'm wrong, but the action of the health council leads me to believe that this is some distance in the future. Maybe the minister could tell me. It's a year; it's more than a year, since I last asked him about this problem, and since he gave me the answer that I relied upon.

Okay, 12 months have passed. Surely to heavens they're in a position now to tell us what they propose to do. Do they have any plan of any kind? Where; what; when? I suppose that's what I want to know. I don't want the hon. minister to tell me when they're going to build a major hospital. I understand that might be some time off in the future. But when can we in the east end of the city and in the Stoney Creek area reasonably expect to see the facility in place, open and treating patients?

Hon. F. S. Miller: I can't answer that, Mr. Chairman, because I don't know how soon.

I want to point out one thing, that in the time of a year, which is a long time to you and me, that council has done a lot of work. It's not a question of my ministry having done that. They have done a lot and I feel they've come a long way towards resolving the overall problems there.

The creation of the facility they talk about in that letter shouldn't require all that time. But I'll be glad to get a more specific answer for the hon. member. I can't give it to him out of my head.

Mr. Deans: I just want to close it off for you then. Item six of the letter which is addressed to me—interestingly enough it's a strange looking letter, it has no address.

Mr. Bain: They don't know where you live, Ian.

Mr. Deans: It has no signature. It's obviously typed for the purpose of satisfying an inquiry, but that's beside the point.

Hon. F. S. Miller: I don't think so, Ian.

Mr. Deans: Well, it sure looks like it. But anyway, it's not even on letterhead.

Hon. F. S. Miller: It's a copy of a draft that was prepared.

Mr. Deans: Ah, I see. The draft is still in the typist's typewriter, no doubt.

Hon. F. S. Miller: There's a date on it.

Mr. Deans: I notice the date typed in the top left hand corner; but that's fine, although that's not usually where they type dates. But that's all right; I'll accept that.

Let me say to you that when I read this thing, it says under item six: "This overall plan allows for the provision of 1,999 acute-care beds by 1979, which is the target the ministry has set and to which we are committed."

Now 1979 is four years from now, that's to begin with. "In arriving at the foregoing," and I assume the part I have read is part of the foregoing because it's ahead of it, and as stated: "Recognizing the need to develop other health care programmes, council has made a commitment to the Minister of Health that there will be established an ambulatory care centre in the east end of the district.'

If they really recognize the problem, if they understood both the history of it and the emergency need, I'm sure they could offer, in a very short period of time, some kind of programme that will show the people that they mean what they say. I'm going to ask you, quite frankly, and I'm going to ask you next week in the question period so you know it's coming: I would like to know within the next week or 10 days what do they really intend to do? When can we expect it? Do they consider it a necessity or is it a sop? Are they just complying because you made it a condition? Are you, at some point once the General's rebuilt and $40 million is spent, going to be prepared, perhaps, to forego that condition? That's what worries me.

I would like to have seen in black and white exactly what they intended to do before you agreed to the expenditure of the funds for the things they particularly wanted, recognizing that the need is both acute and immediate.

The development in the city of Hamilton is taking place to a great extent in the east end and there has to be something for those people. I ask you, please, when these estimates are over or even, if you can find the time, before they are over, get hold of Mr. Auld or Mr. Green; tell them I thank them for the letter I haven't yet received; and ask them if they would be good enough to set out in more precise terms when, where and how they intend to meet that commitment.

Hon. F. S. Miller: May I point out that a goodly number of the people working are volunteers—I believe Mr. Green is—and I think one must appreciate the hard work they do. I have to point out also that they have no other community to serve but Hamilton in their planning. I would hope that in their planning they are taking the needs of your area into account without concern about the rest of the province, because that is their specific charge.

I don't think I ever implied to you that you are getting a hospital in the near future.

Mr. Deans: No, I didn't say that.

Hon. F. S. Miller: No; I just want to make sure that you and I agree that wasn't one of the misunderstandings which could have crept in. The very fact that they insisted on the Hamilton Civic being rebuilt downtown was, to me, an indication that for the immediate future you wouldn't be getting a hospital in the east end.

Mr. Deans: Let me save you a lot of aggravation. I don't want you to be agitated by it. Let me read to you what you said: "To review the health care needs of the east Hamilton community and to ensure these needs are met in the planning of both in-patient and out-patient services." Whatever that requires we'll settle for. In-patient and out-patient services—I don't want you to build another general hospital. I don't want you to build anything which isn't necessary, but I do want you to build or have built what I believe and I think you honestly believe was a commitment.

Hon. F. S. Miller: That's right.

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Chairman, may I talk, in this estimate, on hospital needs in Owen Sound?

Mr. Deans: No, that comes under vote 1703.

Mr. Chairman: Yes, you can proceed on that.

Mr. Sargent: Thank you. May I ask the minister how much of the $18 million in this vote is federal money? How much of the $18 million under health services is federal money?

Hon. F. S. Miller: That may take a moment to answer because we will probably have to look for details if, in fact, we have that breakdown.

Mr. Sargent: All right we'll leave that.

Hon. F. S. Miller: I can tell you. Of this, the answer is none.

Mr. Sargent: My information is that you received—

Hon. F. S. Miller: May I explain for a second, since I have looked at the detail of the thing? The items we are talking about here—psychiatric hospitals, ambulance services, clinic services—were all non-sharable items. The items, as I understand it, in which the federal government shares are hospital operations costs and medical benefits indirectly for doctors' fees.

Those are the two major items. There are of course some other minor items that are shared. In other words, the money you are looking for isn't in this vote, but in any case talk about it.

[8:30]

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Minister, you will recall that a few weeks ago the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Lewis) came to Owen Sound and stated publicly after visiting the hospital:

> The hospital situation is ludicrous, with surgical and medical equipment in the hallway, overcrowding and inadequacies in the levels of patient care. I don't understand the political ramifications. What kind of twisted social priorities exist when the government frittered away $200 million in North Pickering . . . when we have patients going to different levels of the hospital who must travel with supplies, visitors, soiled linens, sterile items, garbage and food all on the same elevator?

In other words, he was shocked to see that this thing could happen and he planned to go to the mat with you and I and the leader of the Liberal Party on these estimates.

I don't think it is becoming to the minister or to the House to talk about the dirty linen we have, insofar as political ramifications are concerned. But the facts are, Mr. Minister, that we have here a report by Woods, Gordon and Co., 88 pages in length. The fact that you are receiving in total about $700 million a year from Ottawa towards your estimates for reallocation in Ontario is a damning piece of evidence. Yet you refuse to acknowledge the fact that there should be equity in Owen Sound, that we pay the same hospital rates as the rest of Ontario. In fact we are talking, Mr. Minister, of putting signs on our highways saying: "Please drive carefully around this area because Mr. Davis has closed off all hospital beds."

What do we do, Mr. Minister? You know the situation, and during the estimates I would like you to qualify what you said on the air three days ago, that you would change your policy now to be in excess of five years. It might be after 1980 or so before we could get a new hospital. Yet you are spending $1.5 million to put portable hospitalization on the lawn of our hospital. You are putting 30 beds or 34 beds two miles away for our chronic people.

In other words, I think you should be ashamed of the way you treat my people like second class citizens. In fact in the House last session, Mr. Minister, you said the reason they should be treated like second class citizens is because they have a second class member.

An hon. member: Oh, no.

An hon. member: Oh, no; that's wrong.

Mr. Sargent: I take that, but that didn't get your candidate any votes this last election up there. By and large I think that—

Mr. R. S. Smith: That came from a second class minister.

Mr. Sargent: You should tell the House, Mr. Chairman, that the—

Hon. F. S. Miller: On a point of privilege, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman: Point of privilege.

Hon. F. S. Miller: The gentleman is quite correct when he says that. He also knows I had a smile on my face because we were trading jokes at the time and he full well knows it. I didn't mean that in any personal way at all. There are lots of times you say things in this House which taken out of context would be pretty damning.

Mr. Sargent: I have never yet talked personalities in this House. I talk about the office that you hold.

Interjections.

Hon. F. S. Miller: I hope the lightning doesn't strike you right down.

Mr. Sargent: So if that is your point of privilege, it is pretty weak. Why can't we get in our area—at least closer than London, Ontario—a kidney dialysis machine?

Mr. Givens: You got it right.

Mr. Sargent: Why don't we rate one of those in our area? Any closer than to serve

about 200,000 people, we can't have one of those machines? I would like to ask why.

Hon. F. S. Miller: Mr. Chairman, I don't know whether the Leader of the Opposition is willing to go to the mat and bring the government down on this issue or not—let them do it, I'm quite willing to have it done—because I can't treat you any differently than other people. I am treating you fairly whether you want to accept it or not.

The interesting thing is I'm seeing the chairman of your board shortly—I think it's a week tomorrow—

Mr. Sargent:. You refused to see him last week.

Hon. F. S. Miller: Pardon?

Mr. Sargent: He called me last week and said you refused to see him.

Hon. F. S. Miller: I haven't refused to see him.

Mr. Sargent: He couldn't get through to see you. Your aide said you would not see him.

Hon. F. S. Miller: That is not so. I have not, at any time, refused to see Mr. Hindman. He's got an appointment with me right now, whether you know it or not. I thought it was this week; it's next week.

The last time I saw your board was almost a year ago—October, November or December. They came down to discuss short-term measures to help your hospital survive through the agreed-upon overcrowding.

Mr. Sargent: Because you wouldn't give us a new hospital, that's why.

Hon. F. S. Miller: That's correct, I wouldn't give you a new hospital—there are lots of places I haven't given new hospitals. But some of the places I have given new hospitals are Liberal, just as some of them are NDP. I think you should check with some of your members to verify that. Ask Pat Reid.

Mr. Johnston: Who is he?

Hon. F. S. Miller: The fact remains that your board came down and said that if they couldn't have a hospital for five years or more—and I said, incidentally, it would be no less than five years, my guesstimate was seven or eight—they did not want to spend the million-odd dollars we were willing to share with them to add a permanent extension to the present building. They said they would rather put temporary service buildings up at lower cost that would be salvageable at the end of that time. They were willing to have us pay the cost of the renovations to the Mackinnon Phillips Hospital so 34 patients could be transferred there, giving you 34 more active beds in the hospital in the city.

Those things were agreed upon, and as far as I know the portable buildings are up, are they not?

Mr. Sargent: Yes, sir.

Hon. F. S. Miller: As far as I know too, allowing for the time it takes for the normal routine of government services—planning, calling tenders and getting a job done—the work at Mackinnon Phillips has been coming along. Not as fast as I would have liked, but I believe February or thereabouts we'll be able to put the 34 patients in where they will be serviced by your hospital staff, rather than by the Mackinnon Phillips staff.

It is our long-term objective to give you a hospital there, but the current buildings do have a lot of value. They're worth at least $25 million or $30 million to replace. We simply couldn't justify stopping the use of those buildings while they were still usable, realizing how scarce assets for capital building are.

This year in Ontario I had capital of somewhere between $80 million and $100 million. It sounds like a lot, but of that some $65 million was under way when the year began, so discretion was very limited on the balance of the package. We simply are having to make a number of locations go forward for a longer period of time, and yours was one of them.

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Minister, the report recommends that we must have 355 beds. We have 237; we're 118 beds short. You won't let us put our beds in the hall. We've had our halls full for the past five years; you've blocked that off. You cut our budget by $200,000; we had to fire 28 people. You compound the programme, but 35 miles away you've given Mr. Winkler a $4 million hospital. They call it the Hanover-Hilton; the rugs are up to your knees, and half the facilities are empty. Just 35 miles away you have a $4 million hospital.

We are the area hospital with the best medical and surgical teams in the Province of Ontario and it is the biggest disgrace in the Province of Ontario. You tell me about beds in the Province of Ontario. We have 150 or 200 beds on University Ave. empty.

How can you tell us that we don't rate the same treatment for our hospital care as the rest of Ontario?

Geographically in this province everybody should have the same rights. You shouldn't suffer for education or jobs or help because of geography; but it is a fact in our city, in our area, no matter how you try to bend it. Federal moneys are coming in to you and you're not pushing them or allocating them equally, yet the basis of democracy is a fair allocation of our assets across the province on an equal basis.

That is not the case when you give Mr. Winkler, who had charge of the Treasury, a blank cheque and he wrote himself a $4 million hospital which is half empty while we can't serve our people. If you came up there next week and had a heart attack, you couldn't get into our hospital and that's a fact. My mother couldn't even get a bed in the hall the night she died. And you tell me you're giving fair treatment to people in this province.

I know you have problems with finances but those are self-inflicted wounds and we should not have to suffer for it. We're talking about a long-term deal in this province and we've gone for one generation now without a decent hospital, and by God it's not going to continue.

Hon. F. S. Miller: I don't think anything I say will change the member's mind. I think there's been a pretty fair allocation of hospital funds around this province and we're pretty well serviced. I would point out to you I collect $951 million from the federal government per year. I spend $3 billion. The federal government, in turn, collects about $1.4 billion from us, to give us back our $951 million by the way. I think one has to realize—

Mr. Nixon: That is half the cost of post-secondary education, plus half the cost of welfare.

Hon. F. S. Miller: I'm just talking health dollars right now.

Mr. Nixon: You are not talking about health dollars when you are talking—

Interjections.

Mr. Roy: Don't you think we're Canadians here?

Mr. Nixon: Don't you think paying taxes is Canadian?

Hon. F. S. Miller: You're a farmer; I doubt it.

Interjections.

Mr. Sargent: In the last session of the House, I said you received—

Mr. R. S. Smith: You are a used car dealer, what about that?

Mr. Nixon: That is another one of your facetious remarks that will return to haunt you.

Hon. F. S. Miller: That's right.

Mr. Sargent: You do admit that you received $951 million from Ottawa for allocation in this province? In the last session, you accused me of bending the truth when I accused you of getting $750 million from Ottawa but today you admit you get $951 million from Ottawa. All we ask is that we have one day's loss. You're losing $8 million a day now in debt. The $6 million you've lost a day since a year ago today and the $2 million debt load is $8 million a day you're losing. All we ask is one day's losses for our area, for our hospital, to service about 200,000 people.

Mr. Nixon: What could be more reasonable than that?

Hon. F. S. Miller: I can't talk logic with the member. I suppose your hotel is totally paid for?

Mr. Sargent: My hotel?

Hon. F. S. Miller: Yes. Is it?

Mr. Sargent: No. I have a pretty healthy mortgage against it. I'm paying 13 per cent on my mortgage because I can't get an ODC loan from old satchel-ass over there.

Hon. Mr. Bennett: You'll have to resign your seat.

Hon. F. S. Miller: If it makes you feel any better, neither can I, and I've tried.

Mr. Sargent: You know the business; you know all about it.

Hon. F. S. Miller: I do that. The difference is you succeeded.

[8:45]

Mrs. Gigantes: I would like to address myself to the part which concerns district health councils. One reason is because we have one of the four in the province in the Ottawa-Carleton area. I think our experience there

and some of the questions which have come to my mind from what I understand to have been the experience of that council, raise some problems on which I would like your comments. When I look at the operations of our council, which has been in existence for two years and which only this May got its directors and finally started getting itself together, I ask myself, who does it represent, how is it supposed to have a relationship to the regional medical office of health and the board of health and the ministry under its present constitution, how can it exercise any real influence on provincial programmes in the Ottawa-Carleton area when it has no control over budget and no claim to an elected mandate, which might be a substitute to some control over a budget, particularly in terms of trying to deal with the ministry? I am not going to ask you for a hospital, you will be glad to know, but I will take you back over a chronic problem in the Ottawa area, which is the acute-care bed shortage problem.

We now have 2,314 acute-care beds in the provincially-chartered hospitals in Ottawa and there are 60 beds in the national defence medical centre; the total is 2,374. The provincial allowance, or the kind of quota that we are allowed, is 2,109; and that is based, I am told by people on the district health council, on statistics which are two years old. We are also allotted by the province the right to 255 beds, because we service patients from the Quebec side, from the Hull area. So our allotment under the provincial quota would be 2,364. Given that we have 2,374 beds, it looks like a surplus of 10 beds; but that is not what it feels like, and that is not what it is really like.

The basic provincial quota allowance for our area is 2,109 and that is too low because we are in a high growth area and we never seem to catch up on two-year-old statistics. About 300 of the acute beds that are included in our quota are now being used by chronic-care patients and the actual number of Quebec patients is not 255, but closer to 350. The upshot of all this is that we have a shortfall of approximately 400 acute-care beds; as you are well aware because you just visited the area and I am sure the minister knew it before.

The response we had from the ministry, and from you in your visit, was that we are going to have the release of 200 beds for chronic patients that will be provided in existing institutions, but the need right now is immediate, and the 200 beds that you have been talking about, by my understanding, will be phased in—and I have read conflicting news reports on this—over the period from January to June.

It is still only 50 per cent of what we need immediately in a critical kind of way. These beds that will be released will meet two-thirds of our chronic care need and it will meet none of the existing need created by the influx of Quebec patients from the Hull area. I know you refer to development at Sacre Coeur Hospital in Hull designed to help us on the Ottawa side deal with our bed shortage problem, but these developments too are many months away, and we have also in the Ottawa area come to be quite leery of promises by the Quebec government to look after the hospital situation on the Hull side.

So we have a critical problem which is not going to be met in time for us to feel the effect through this winter. The district health council has expressed, over the last long period of time, a great deal of concern on the subject. Even when all the points you outlined become real, we still have a need for 200 acute-care beds, for which there are no plans announced let alone beds.

I look at this problem in the light of the work the regional district health council has attempted to do in the Ottawa-Carleton area; we have had a report of the task force on hospital accommodation in Ottawa-Carleton, which was endorsed by the regional health council this summer and it was given to the minister. The report recognized that the immediate need for beds in the Ottawa-Carleton area is inter-related with deficiencies in other programme areas.

I think you should take note of the fact that this regional health council is doing the best job it can under difficult circumstances, and I will come again to its difficulties with its mandate. They have asked you to relieve deficiencies in other programme areas so that the bed shortage problem would be alleviated. They are not asking you to create a new hospital, and they are not asking you to build new facilities to put new beds into. Basically, they are asking you to release resources that exist and to give supportive action for existing programmes they think are going to help the bed shortage problem.

The first point in the task force report was an underline of the need for a placement assessment programme in the Ottawa-Carleton area. Then each facility, each hospital and the doctors, would know which place to be putting patients and how long they should be staying; releasing patients to facilities with lower levels of care as soon as that was possible. That is not happening now.

The council was told by the ministry that in order to get such an assessment programme going we have to wait for an evaluation of a similar programme in Hamilton, but it seems to me that's too late. It is a programme that should be started now. The district health council has asked for it, and I think you should give more serious consideration to it for our area.

There is another problem associated with the placement assessment programme which has to do with the mandate of the regional district council, the health council. Even if it gets an assessment placement programme going it doesn't have the power to make the institutions conform to the recommendations of that programme. That could be a very serious flaw; I think it is recognized by the Ottawa-Carleton District Health Council that it may be necessary for such an assessment programme to work properly that the council or the administrators of that programme have the power to make sure that institutions, hospitals and doctors conform to the recommendations.

The second point that was touched on by the task force on hospital accommodation was the shortage of support beds and it recognized a lack of at least 100 support beds. There has been consideration by the district health council, in a very serious way, to try and scrape up the extra beds in existing institutions. But they are going to need help and support in other programme areas to be able to do that.

Their third recommendation was that the social and nursing support programmes that are in existence should be integrated into senior citizen housing programmes. They feel that would tend to alleviate geriatric chronic care use of beds and the taking up of hospital beds by senior citizens who, given a kind of low level preventive treatment in their own housing area, would not end up having to spend time in hospital.

Mr. Chairman: I must remind the hon. member that item 3, health services, does cover district health councils, but you seem to be dealing with things that may be more appropriately brought up under item 2 of vote 2903, general hospitals and related activities.

Mrs. Gigantes: Mr. Chairman, I feel the recommendations of this task force report, which were submitted by the regional district health council to the ministry, and the fact that the ministry has not dealt with them, reflect directly on the mandate of the councils. This is why I wish to bring them up under this item.

Mr. Chairman: If you want to stick strictly with the activities of the district health councils that's fine, you are quite within the vote.

Mrs. Gigantes: These are.

Mr. Chairman: When you start talking about active treatment beds and such like, it should come up under vote 2903, item 2.

Mrs. Gigantes: Mr. Chairman, with your permission, I would like to talk about the programme that has been proposed by our own regional district health council and the fact that the ministry is not responding adequately and why that means that the way the district health councils are working and their relationship with the ministry is not adequate at this time.

Mr. Chairman: You can continue, keeping in mind that this vote deals specifically with the activities of the district health councils as opposed to the operations of hospitals.

Mrs. Gigantes: Thank you.

Mr. Samis: A wise decision, Mr. Chairman.

Mrs. Gigantes: I will cut my points short.

The fourth point in the task force report calls for an extension of rehabilitation programmes at St. Vincent de Paul; and the fifth the creation of an open-ended home care programme. The limit for home care programme to one individual right now is 80 hours. The estimate of the task force was that an open-ended home care programme would permit 110 patients to stay at home.

All these are points which I feel have been the creation of a very earnest study by the district health council in the Ottawa-Carleton region. I think it's a shame they haven't all been taken with the same degree of seriousness by the ministry.

They are not major expense programmes. They are programmes which would help to relieve a bed shortage problem without building new facilities. I ask myself why the district health council is having this problem? The problem of creating and releasing and reassigning beds in the Ottawa-Carleton area, for both chronic and active treatment, relates directly to the questions I asked first about the role and the power and the mandate of the Ottawa-Carleton District Health Council. And I think it's important to examine that experience before we get into the creation of

other district health councils under the same set of guidelines.

The province has the money and makes the final decision on programmes. The district health council has no electoral constituency to reinforce its recommendations. School boards at least have that, though we know school boards can't exercise a great deal of discretion in terms of the allocation of their budget. At least when they come to the Ministry of Education, they come with the power that comes from having been elected and chosen by the people of their area.

The Ottawa-Carleton District Health Council has so far shied away from tackling the primary care field in the Ottawa-Carleton regional area, and this relates to my second question. I don't think they can be blamed for shying away from it, because there seems to me to be a confusion of mandate between the district health council, the medical office of health and the regional health board.

Probably many members in this House are aware that our medical officer of health is Dr. L. H. Douglas who is quite an extraordinary character, and who for many years in the Ottawa-Carleton area has provided leadership of an imaginative and dedicated and very determined nature. He is a veritable guardian of public health and he's developed an excellent birth control clinic in the Ottawa-Carleton area and he's taken some very brave stands in closing Ottawa area beaches.

Mr. Foulds: And he's a good Liberal.

Mrs. Gigantes: But if I were on the regional district health council—

Mr. Foulds: He can't be perfect.

Mrs. Gigantes: —I wouldn't try to put my foot on Dr. Douglas' territory because he's a man who constantly reminds people who ask any questions about his decisions that he is responsible only to the ministry. That's what he tells people. I understand he is paid, appointed, hired by the ministry.

Hon. F. S. Miller: No.

Mrs. Gigantes: Who hires him?

Hon. F. S. Miller: You better check your facts.

Mrs. Gigantes: He is lying then.

Hon. F. S. Miller: He is approved by me.

Mrs. Gigantes: And for all my concern about preventive health and all my respect for Dr. Douglas, I wouldn't be willing to sit on a non-elected district health council and try and convince Dr. Douglas he should modify any of his programmes in the primary health programme he runs. You'd have to be begging for punishment to attempt to guide Dr. Douglas from a base of so little authority.

[9:00]

In the long run, it seems to me, as the Mustard report said and as the experience of the Ottawa-Carleton District Health Council is demonstrating, district health councils will need a sufficient information base and sufficient authority to decide on what mix of medical professionals and paramedical professionals are needed within each particular district health area.

The ministry's response to this, in terms of giving district health councils this kind of mandate, is presented in the booklet called "Report, Reaction and Response: The Health Care System in Ontario." It's a reaction that's defensive and timid. It suggests that the control of the distribution of health manpower in Ontario is not an appropriate job for district health councils, and that the Mustard recommendation is, "a particularly strong one and gives rise to a number of complex concerns."

The ministry shores up its defensive stand on this issue by alluding to consumer-group concern for the human rights of doctors. If I could humbly suggest to the minister, the consumer groups are not mesmerized by the human rights of teachers who must move to areas where the school boards have identified local needs for educational manpower; and this reaction on the part of the ministry and on the part of the public, is just one more indication of the success the medical profession has achieved in convincing government and public of the God-like discretion it must have about how and where and to whom medical service is provided.

I feel the right and the power to decide what mix of medical professionals and paraprofessionals are needed within a district health area must be given to the district health council. It's meaningless to talk about planning unless they have those powers.

Following up this point, it's not sufficient to say, as the ministry does in this booklet, that the under-serviced area programme is working. Communities are still without services in this province and large urban communities are over-serviced in some professional areas. That's certainly true in the Ottawa-Carleton area. We have more specialists than we need.

Mr. Chairman: Order, please. May I point out to the hon. member that under-serviced areas do not come under this vote.

Mr. Foulds: It is covered by a health council.

Mrs. Gigantes: I am questioning the mandate which the ministry is giving and the experience we are having with the Ottawa-Carleton Regional District Health Council, and the areas where it needs new power in my view.

Mr. Chairman: As long as you relate it to the health councils you may continue then.

Mr. Foulds: This is simply detailed supportive material.

An hon. member: Picky, picky.

Mr. Samis: The Chairman is being liberal again.

Mr. Nixon: It's a conspiracy.

Mrs. Gigantes: In order to indicate that I feel the ministry is being inconsistent on this very point, I'd like to remind the minister that the Treasurer (Mr. McKeough) spoke to the Ontario Hospital Association on Oct. 28 and made a direct relationship between the number of doctors in an area or in a province or in a country and the cost of OHIP. I think he's right and I think that as long as we're not letting district health councils decide how many medical professionals and paramedical professionals they need for their area, then we're going to run into this problem again and again. It's a social waste and if you're going to have any meaningful planning by district health councils that has to be an item that's included in their mandate.

Another area that's examined by Mustard when he looks at the health care system and the role that can be played by the district health council is the need for and the recommendation for an area health services management board in each area, to be responsible for what is called a logical grouping of facilities and administrative resources. Again, the response of the ministry, in "Report, Reaction and Response," is very defensive. It's a response that almost suggests the Mustard report is being perverse in its recommendations, and it shores up its negativism again by referring to public opposition.

I think this is a totally inadequate response. I think the identification by the Mustard report of the need for this area health services management board to be attached to the district health council indicates the reality that a district health council of volunteer people is not going to be able to build up the information base and the planning that really is needed if district health councils are going to have any real meaning in planning local health services.

I have been called to order again and again, but the reason I have raised these points is that I think the district health councils cannot operate satisfactorily within the mandate the ministry is currently giving them. I would like to see them operate satisfactorily. I think the people who sit on the district health council in the Ottawa-Carleton area have a serious approach to the problem and are very dedicated to working out solutions. I think they are being hamstrung, as I fear other district health councils will be, by the ministry's interpretation of how these health councils should work.

Hon. F. S. Miller: Mr. Chairman, I commend the speaker for taking the time to read as much as she did. She has talked about my inconsistencies and I listened to hers—and I am just surprised. I am accused of being autocratic if I make a decision, and I am democratic if I don't. First of all just before supper hour your critic told me I had stolen a plank from the NDP platform—

Mr. Warner: Do you know how to use it?

Mrs. Gigantes: We just wanted to thank you.

Hon. F. S. Miller: —in creating these, and now you are telling me they don't work. I am not sure I can follow that kind of reasoning. I would say that your health planning council in Ottawa thinks things are going pretty well. I would say that when they submit a series of recommendations on a Wednesday and have them accepted the following Monday, that we haven't taken too much time in delays.

I would say that when they can provide a response to immediate chronic care needs in a two-month time frame, they have done very well with a complex job.

I would say that when they have to deal with Dr. Douglas and other people like him, who take tremendous pride in their autonomy —and don't forget he's just one person you are familiar with; he is repeated many times in the community by heads of medical staffs and hospitals, by chairmen of boards, by groups of people who provide a health service; and every one of them prize their own autonomy.

Mrs. Gigantes: None like Dr. Douglas.

Hon. F. S. Miller: Perhaps not. By the way, as I understand it, subject to correction, he is hired by his board, who send his name to me for approval. I understand this is virtually automatic, and once appointed he can only be removed for cause. I haven't found out what that cause is yet, in his case or anybody else's.

In other words, they are virtually the authority you talk about. Once they are appointed, they are virtually insulated from the people they serve—with good reason. Some times they do very unpopular things, and that is why they need to be protected from the vacillations, perhaps, of a board which has a great deal of local pressure put upon it to prevent the MOH from doing what he considers necessary. So I have never argued with the system; I am just explaining. That's the system by which an MOH is virtually a law unto himself.

Mrs. Gigantes: The only one; that is the problem.

Hon. F. S. Miller: Interestingly enough, my lawyers say I cannot remove an MOH without very specific circumstances. This was brought up, incidentally, by one health board not too long ago. It did want to remove the MOH, and did feel that it had reasons, such as incompetence.

Mr. Shore: That is not reason enough.

Hon. F. S. Miller: That is not reason enough? It should be, but it isn't. Apparently there has to be a much more specific reason under the law, for an MOH to lose his job. They are pretty well protected.

You talk about electing the health council. I told your critic I don't believe in electing the health council, because they are an advisory body. They are advising me on your needs. They are not administering a budget. They are not collecting taxes from the people in Ottawa. The person who is elected sits in this Legislature. You are their representative in that sense. You and I are discussing those dollar matters here in the proper forum.

They are giving me advice like many other bodies created to give government advice, but giving it to me on a local priority basis. They are chosen for their knowledge of the community. Some of them are obviously elected councillors, some of them are obviously consumers and some of them are obviously professionals. The sum total of their experience, hopefully, will sort out some of the local wars that go on between bodies that compete in almost every community for health dollars.

You and I know we will never have enough dollars for all the people who want to provide services, we never will. You can take over this government tomorrow, but let me assure you you won't have either.

Mr. Foulds: We will.

Hon. Mr. Kerr: Don't give in.

Hon. F. S. Miller: I am not giving in; I said you "could."

Mr. Foulds: You are right.

Mr. R. S. Smith: No they couldn't, Frank.

Hon. F. S. Miller: So in other words, at the best we can ask them to priorize things so that if they have an endless list, the list tells me the order in which they want things done. Then when we run out of money, we stop at that point on the list.

I think that is a very good system, but I have been tremendously impressed at some of the obvious changes of heart that took place in Ottawa between September and November trying to find these 200 chronic beds we talked about.

The fact that Queensway-Carleton gave up obstetrics to put chronics in; that the Queensway-Carleton offered to me another 40 beds whilst I was there, providing they knew they could get them back some time in the future for active care; that the Perley Hospital showed me rooms on their property that were at one time nurses' quarters and which they said they would be pleased to make available on a temporary basis; and so on and on.

People were looking to solve problems through that council and I don't think in the past it would have happened. I think that council needs to be commended for that approach.

On the other hand, I think the solutions are more immediate than you implied. The fact that the 200 beds that are already in existence at Sacré Coeur, but are not in use will be in use should drain off a goodly part of the 120-odd surplus people from Quebec who are using your beds.

Admissions to hospitals are not arranged by this ministry. We are not going to draw a line—because the Ottawa and Hull districts are the same, they are one community—we are not going to draw a line and prevent people from going back and forth, but all things being equal, Ontario people with the same degree of illness should have some

preferences. I think that is a fair statement. And all things being equal, the 200 beds built on the Quebec side should be fully utilized so that we aren't bearing all of the pressures.

They had certain staff problems that prevented that in the last few months and the Quebec minister assures me he thinks they are over now. His assurances of the building campaign will take a little longer; the 85 beds won't be built for a while, but at least I see him moving in that direction. So I think we will pull the plug—on the 300-odd chronic beds—and we will start to move out of the active beds and make room for your people.

Pressures have been great on the Ottawa system but I have to point out to you that the fact that all beds are full, whether it be in Ottawa or whether it be in Owen Sound, is not an indication that they are properly full. I will never get medical agreement on that. The fact remains that if we create beds they are filled. It is as simple as that.

Mr. Godfrey: What does that mean?

Hon. F. S. Miller: It means that admissions go on until the beds are full. I have suggested that the control on the system is the absolute number of beds and that one forces utilization of the beds for the uses for which they are properly designed. We can double the number and we will double the number of people in hospital and we won't make us any healthier. That's all I am saying.

Mr. Bain: Are you saying that if there are no beds people aren't liable to get sick?

Hon. F. S. Miller: Oh come on now. Listen, 25 years ago we had nowhere near the number of beds we have today. What were we doing then?

Mr. Wildman: We didn't have the population then.

Hon. F. S. Miller: No, but I mean per person. Be realistic, look back and see what we did get along with.

Mr. Godfrey: People weren't getting the care then.

Hon. F. S. Miller: Oh come on.

Mr. Chairman: Order.

[9:15]

Hon. F. S. Miller: I am accused, if I listen to the public, of being defensive. Surely you are the one party that says I must listen to the public. Where have we done such a thorough job of listening to the public as in the Mustard report? There are some things that we listened to that I didn't personally agree with but it happened to be the response of the people who were involved in the process, and they tell me that is the democratic process.

Mrs. Gigantes: The ministry accepts the reasoning behind the recommendations, yet fails to recognize the reasons why they have good recommendations.

Hon. F. S. Miller: I don't say the recommendations weren't good. I am just saying that right now, in this day, they are not acceptable to a large number of people. Talk to the Catholic hospitals in your city before you are so quick to talk about area service management boards. Please do that.

Mrs. Gigantes: I don't care about the management boards, but you have to give the powers to somebody. District health councils will have to have the information base, or somebody else does.

Hon. F. S. Miller: I have talked to many members about the problem in Ottawa. The member for Ottawa West (Mr. Morrow) brought up the issue a number of times in previous discussions and I have taken it seriously. I think we moved with more speed and dispatch and kept our word in that area, and I think you will find the press think we kept our word in that area fairly well over the last few months.

I trust the council, given a chance, is going to do very well. It is searching for the ways of relating to places like the board of health. It is trying to get these groups to give up their previous methods of dealing directly with this ministry and insisting on running to the minister every time they didn't get their way by dealing through them.

I don't want to see power groups. I want to listen to an opinion that reflects the needs of the community rather than the relative strength of the people making the plea. That, I hope, is what your local health council does. They may well mature in five, 10 or 15 years to the point where certain budgetary authorities go their way. I don't know. I am only saying they may well, and I think we welcome that. But as the first 17 members of that board have discovered, learning about, analysing, and co-ordinating health care is a far more complex job than those of us who are looking at it from the outside think it is. Once we get involved, the very real emotions of the issue—

Mr. McClellan: You sound like a colonial administrator in Africa.

Hon. F. S. Miller: Well, perhaps I am. I can only suggest you try it for a while; deal with all the people who are involved in the health process and I will wish you luck.

Mr. McClellan: How can you know, with such certainty and confidence, that the people—

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman: Order.

Hon. F. S. Miller: You have to be recognized.

Mr. Chairman: Is the hon. member for Carleton East finished on this point?

Mrs. Gigantes: I would like to say to the minister that it is precisely because we are in agreement on the potential of the Ottawa-Carleton District Health Council that I beg him to take seriously his own recommendation that it be given a chance to work. I think to be able to work it has to be given certain kinds of support by the ministry. It has to be given support for its reasonable requests.

To say that the situation with the hospital beds is assured a happy solution now, well it will be a happy solution when we see it.

I also suggest to you that there has not been a positive response to the five recommendations of the task force on hospital accommodation; and that, incidentally, is a serious, well-considered request endorsed by the Ottawa-Carleton Health Council.

I also suggest to you that if you want to give that council a chance, and other councils like it, you are going to have to take very seriously the Mustard report recommendation which says that a voluntary district health council, such as the one we have in Ottawa-Carleton, must have the ability to gather together a good information base and a good basis of planning, which is what the proposal for the management board really means to respond to. If you leave that gap, that board is going to flounder because volunteers cannot spend the time on a problem which is, as you describe, incredibly complex and demanding. I think unless they have the support services of a management type staff, either directly under it or associated with it and working in correlation with it, there is no way the council can succeed. There is no way it can convince the community of its credibility and beat down all the parochial demands of which you speak.

Mr. Chairman: Does the minister want to respond to that? The hon. member for Renfrew North.

Mr. Conway: One question to the minister with respect to the area ambulance services: Some weeks ago I brought to the minister's attention a problem and a concern that we have in our area. It's one that relates to the hon. minister's and the ministry's approach to ambulance service.

How does the hon. minister feel the future of ambulance services is going to go; in particular this area of ambulances being tied to hospitals versus ambulances which are operated independently of hospitals? And in further particular, a question to the minister that I raised with him some weeks ago, and that is the question of the ambulance service in the Deep River area.

As the hon. minister is aware, there was a very attractive new hospital opened in that area a short time ago. The board of the hospital, when they were planning construction, consulted with the hon. minister and the officials of the ministry. They were led to believe that an ambulance bay ought to have been constructed, and it was subsequently constructed as part of the hospital complex. As they believed, it was the ministry's firm intention that there should be, in response to an obvious gap in that particular area, an ambulance attached either to the community or to the hospital itself. I would simply ask what, if anything, the hon. minister has to tell me about the answers to the question that I posed some days ago. It falls, I think, very nicely under item 3.

More generally, what does the hon. minister see in terms of the future for ambulance services with respect to the connection of ambulances to hospitals?

Hon. F. S. Miller: First, I apologize for not giving an answer on that. I wrote the question down but I don't appear to have got the answer yet. In fact, if you will just give me a second, maybe I will.

I am told that Atomic Energy of Canada has withdrawn the service that has been there for some time and that we are currently trying to negotiate between Pembroke and Petawawa to have coverage in the area, possibly with an ambulance on that site and possibly not. What is the distance? I used to travel around that way a bit from Pembroke and Petawawa to Deep River.

Mr. Conway: Well the distance between Pembroke and Petawawa is eight miles, between Petawawa—

Hon. F. S. Miller: It is pretty hard to justify satellites that short distance apart. It may well be, without prejudging the decision that our staff comes up with, that the response time over eight miles is often less than it is in the city at about two miles.

Mr. Conway: I think the interesting point here, Mr. Minister, is that the hospital was constructed and the area officials were told, as they tell me now, that there was concern in the ministry for a gap in the service in Deep River. As the hon. minister knows from his travels there is a very large area between Petawawa and the area towards Mattawa which is covered by one ambulance.

The ministry requested an examination of the service in that area. It was at the ministry's urging, so I'm told, that an ambulance bay be constructed at this particular hospital. According to the information placed before me in recent weeks, it was the ministry's initiative that led that hospital board to do what it has subsequently done. So they sit today, very anxious about what it is they are going to do with the ambulance bay they have and what it is the ministry has in its mind with respect to bringing performance in line with the promise of what they were led to believe some weeks ago.

It is a very urgent matter in that particular area. We've had some deaths that ambulance people feel were attributable to that particular situation. The regional director in Ottawa, with whom I was speaking on this topic some weeks ago, in his plans for the reorganization of the ambulance services for that whole area, led me to believe that the ministry definitely wants a reorganization.

So my question is, essentially: Does the hon. minister plan to attach an ambulance to the Deep River hospital? I know the people in Deep River are very seriously concerned. They feel that this, together with the extended care problem, which is another matter I suppose, is a very grave and immediate concern to them. I would hope the hon. minister would look into the matter seriously and consider following the proposals that were established by the ministry some months ago.

Hon. F. S. Miller: Well in fact years ago would, I think, be the answer; because it predates either my time or that of the director of the ambulance services. There is no question that four or five or six years ago—maybe less time than that, but certainly three or four years ago—it was postulated that ambulances should be attached to hospitals. As time went on we had trouble with a number of the hospital-based ambulance systems, where the hospitals asked us to take the service back. Now I'm not saying we had trouble with the quality of service, I'm saying there were often internal problems such as ambulance operators who were also orderlies in the hospital.

Mr. Sargent: Such as budget.

Hon. F. S. Miller: Then they would not be available for orderly duties when an ambulance call came along, or vice versa. Ambulance drivers refused, through negotiation, to do anything, therefore orderlies resented the presence of ambulance operators doing nothing. I think this kind of irritation often drove administrators of hospitals to the point where they didn't really want an ambulance service attached to them. Some opted out for one reason or another.

We haven't got an "either or" situation now. In other words, if a hospital is anxious to provide the service, we're willing to talk to them. At the same time, we're quite prepared to talk with the so-called private operator and/or the municipal operator, depending upon the type of service we have in a community. I think, all in all, we have four types of services—hospital, private, municipal and ambulance service branch, which is our own, and volunteer, that's five.

Mr. Conway: Am I to construe from that, Mr. Minister, that the ministry plans to continue in the future with this mixed ambulance service approach?

Hon. F. S. Miller: Yes, it does. We are currently negotiating some terms with the Ontario Ambulance Operators Association for those who are private operators where in fact we're paying them a global budget, in a sense.

The only thing I can say to you is this: we must provide you with adequate ambulance service. That doesn't mean ambulances based in Deep River; it means adequate ambulance services. Until we've completed this review of Pembroke, Petawawa and so on, I don't want to promise you that you will have an ambulance stationed there. It may well be possible to have a satellite vehicle functioning out of that area, dispatched somewhere else or something of that nature.

Mr. Conway: Is it the ministry's intention to consider, as part of the reorganization, a redistribution of existing ambulances?

Hon. F. S. Miller: Yes; that's it.

Mr. Conway: That is part of the consideration?

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman: The hon. member for Beaches-Woodbine is next.

Mrs. Bryden: Mr. Chairman, I also want to raise an ambulance question with the minister, although it's not related to my constituency.

I have heard that in the Port Hope-Cobourg area there is a problem. In Port Hope they used to have 24-hour ambulance service, before the ministry took over the service. But it seems to be that as soon as the ministry takes over the service, people find they get less service and don't seem to have any means of getting the ministry to discuss with them how the service can be improved. The two areas are now serviced, I understand, by one ambulance from Cobourg, which gives Cobourg 24-hour service but does not give Port Hope 24-hour service.

The municipal council has had a committee looking into this and they feel that not only could the service be given to both communities on a 24-hour basis, but at considerably less cost if tenders were put out for another operator. They apparently have another operator they think might be willing to do it.

I'd like to ask the minister when the franchise, or whatever it is, will be opened up for bids and whether the town council has been consulted about improving this service. I think they went to the government before the election and John White, who was considered special trouble-shooter on election problems, said, "Leave it to me, it's all under control." But they've heard nothing since. They are still waiting to hear from John White or his successors. That's one question. [9:30]

The other question I wanted to raise is what are the ministry's responsibilities in connection with the three-ministry programme which was announced in Kenora to do something for the Indians of the Grassy Narrows and the Whitedog reserves where the mercury poisoning has destroyed their livelihood and has put them under a threat? I hope it doesn't really mean that their health is in danger, but there is at least the suspicion that they may be in danger from the reports of what has happened in Japan.

I'd like to know what the minister's responsibility is going to be in this programme. Is he planning, for instance, to monitor the health of all the residents in the affected areas? Is he planning to do more educational work to alert the residents to the dangers so that they will respond to monitoring and respond to the suggestions that they should not eat the mercury-polluted fish? What are the plans of the three ministries to provide alternative food sources and alternative forms of employment? How much in the way of funds is being provided for this alternative form of employment programme?

Hon. F. S. Miller: That is out of my ministry now.

Mrs. Bryden: Maybe the programme is, but not the monitoring of their health, surely?

Hon. F. S. Miller: The health part is okay.

Mrs. Bryden: Perhaps he has some information from the Treasurer (Mr. McKeough) as to how much funds are available for this programme in the employment field too.

Finally, what are the ministry's plans to provide treatment and compensation for any that are found to be unfortunate enough to have symptoms of Minamata disease, if there are any? I would hope there aren't, that maybe we've heard about it in time and can prevent the tragedy that happened in Japan. I think it is a very serious situation and the ministry should tell the House what the plans are. This statement on which I have the press clipping was made in Kenora, not in the House, and we really haven't had any detailed information on it.

Hon. F. S. Miller: Thanks for your questions. I'd say the ambulance service in Port Hope-Cobourg is not a ministry service. I guess who ever has given you these facts has not checked a few things out.

I'd like to point out what we have. It's a private service covering both towns. There's a vehicle in both towns. It's not a question of it being in one town or the other. I don't know if they told you that or not.

Mrs. Bryden: It is not paid for by the ministry?

Hon. F. S. Miller: All ambulance services are paid for by the ministry. You heard me mention the five types a minute ago.

Mrs. Bryden: Yes.

Hon. F. S. Miller: Those that we consider our own are the ambulance service branch

vehicles that are staffed by civil servants who work for the Ministry of Health. Some are run by municipalities like the city of Toronto and within Metro Toronto; we have these in this area. Some are run by employees of private operators who don't work for government.

Be that as it may, there is a vehicle in each town. One is on duty 24-hours-a-day and one is on duty during the day. They rotate towns on a shift basis; in other words, five days in one town and five days in the next town for the 24-hour vehicle.

The coverage is good. I can tell you one thing, based on the statistics the ambulance branch has, we are very able to predict the normal call levels and response times, so we feel we can give adequate coverage when this type of situation is carried out. The rationalization of two services into one was done partly as a cost-saving device and partly to get control over the situation.

We've been down a number of times to see the people in that area and discussed it with them, contrary again to the messages you may have. I quite agree that anytime there is a change in service there is some disruption. We had to start, literally, with hundreds of tiny ambulance services run by private operators around the province. We started out by trying to fund the mall with as little disruption as possible.

Over the years, as operators have gone out of business or as competition such as we've had in Belleville looms up, we've tried to bring the systems into one or more organized packages instead of two or three competing groups. They only used to get paid if they got to a call. We're trying to get rid of that kind of competition by centralized dispatch. We think we've done a very good job. Let me say it can always be better. I only ask you to listen to some of the people outside of Ontario who see it from their point of view and think we've got a pretty good one to start with. You can go west to ask for some of those opinions, incidentally.

Mrs. Bryden: Could I ask the hon. minister a question? How often do you give the opportunity for another operator to make a bid on the service? How long are the contracts with the present operators?

Hon. F. S. Miller: I don't know that we have a stated period of time for tender calling, if you can call it that, because I don't think we do it. We do it on a proposal basis rather than a tender basis. I would say that as long as we're relatively satisfied with the operations, we wouldn't have cause to go looking for another operator.

Mrs. Bryden: So I take it it's not done on a tender basis?

Hon. F. S. Miller: As my director points out, there's an annual licence. In other words, they could lose a licence any time on an annual basis if we felt they were unsatisfactory.

Another thing, we just brought the ambulance regulations out. In those regulations, for the first time, will be a number of causes for cancellation; things that didn't exist before. We were really on pretty shaky ground because if you know the system the holder of a licence, for say a nursing home or an ambulance service, who for one reason or another loses that if our ministry cancels it, has the right of appeal. The right of appeal is to the Health Service Facilities Appeal Board. This group has to look at the reasons we, as a ministry, gave for taking away that man or woman's livelihood. Therefore, we've had to have documentable, if that's the word, reasons for doing this.

In the ambulance branch those were very tenuous things in the past because the regulations weren't in place. Now they are. For example, they require them to be staffed with trained people and we set out what those levels of training are—record keeping, and so forth—and any of these could be considered to be reasons for cancellation of a licence in the future. Now can I go on to the other question?

Mrs. Bryden: The hon. minister hasn't quite answered at what stage a potential new operator, who thinks he can operate it cheaper and perhaps more efficiently, can apply to take over the licence?

Hon. F. S. Miller: Any time. In other words, we're open to talk to people. I've toyed with the idea of having actual public tenders—that was when I was Dr. Potter's assistant—for services on a routine basis. No one else had any enthusiasm for that but me.

Mr. S. Smith: And none in your cabinet, Frank.

Hon. F. S. Miller: They're thinking about it now, he says. That's because I'm minister. Let me get on to the next issue, the mercury issue.

This is one of the ones which is so hard to talk about without the political implications coming in. I try to be unbiased. Be-

tween closing at 6 p.m. tonight and reopening at 8 p.m. I spent time visiting the eight or 19 people who are going to Japan on our behalf this Saturday: the neurologist, the ophthalmologist; fisheries biologist and so forth; people with some fairly high skills who are going over with the Japanese government's assistance to learn more about the problem.

The pledges made in Kenora were that we would provide alternate protein sources as long as the need existed. We set no time limit on it. For the last six or eight months, approximately 400 pounds of fish a day, give or take, have been available for the Indians on the two reserves from normal sources. All fish contain some mercury that we know of but all of these are below the 0.5 parts per million guideline that we have. We said that the epidemiological and clinical studies would go on with whatever intensity was needed on the reserves; using, if possible, some of the natives themselves to help us, because we recognize communications as an essential part of the programme we're trying to effect. We are conscious of the great distrust that really does exist between the white man and the Indian, or vice versa. I guess the case is that they have had a lack of confidence in what we have said. We hoped it would be overcome partly by having some trained people from the reserves working with us. I can't tell you how intensive that needs to be until some of these people return from Japan and give us the benefit of what they learned there—and in Iraq by the way, they are going to Iraq for two weeks too.

The question of compensation and a number of other matters have been left, because they are well beyond my responsibility or knowledge. We have, in Ontario, held to the belief that a polluter is responsible for damage caused through pollution.

With mercury poisoning, we haven't as yet diagnosed a case. I know it's said that the Japanese doctor did. I haven't seen the final translation of his papers yet, but I understand even that has been watered down in his papers.

Mr. Sargent: That wouldn't matter. You'd still have Dow Chemical to deal with.

Hon. F. S. Miller: One of the things that has been suggested, and I talked to the neurologist about it tonight, was that we should try to get the co-operation of the people in that area to permit autopsies on any of the Indians in the area who die, naturally or through accidental death; we should examine their brains to allow us to assess whether there is any damage to the brains of people who have been eating fish in that area. That, to the best of our knowledge, is the only way we can predetermine whether these people are starting to show internal symptoms of mercury poisoning.

I have never at any time tried to say I don't expect to see trouble. I hope I don't, but I certainly am not going in prepared to try to prove there isn't a problem, nor do I need the proof that there is a problem to take the actions we think necessary to protect the people from a potential hazard. That's why the food sources are being established and that's why the testing programme will go on as intensively as necessary.

We do need to educate people. We think that the chiefs are doing a pretty good job on our behalf and on their behalf now. As you know, the federal government financed, partially anyway, their trips to Japan, and I think that most certainly opened the eyes of the chiefs and a few people who went with them as to the real potential of the dangers their people face.

Mr. S. Smith: Just a question, through you, Mr. Chairman, to the minister, regarding this particular vote, which in my understanding is item 3, health services, just to remind the House at this point. Under supplies and equipment, I notice in comparing the estimates with those of the previous year that the amount seems to have been increased quite markedly, by approximately $1.8 million. I am certain there is a good explanation but I would be grateful to the minister for the explanation.

Hon. F. S. Miller: Can we have a moment while we check?

Mr. S. Smith: Thank you.

Hon. F. S. Miller: Supplies and services, is that the one you mean?

Mr. S. Smith: Supplies and equipment, under health services. You are presently requesting $2.9 million and last year it was $1.041 million. Would I be of assistance to bring this over?

Hon. F. S. Miller: It wouldn't do any harm. I have the answer, even though I can't find the figure. Somebody else knows more about these figures than I do. It says we moved the ambulance purchase costs from transfer payments to direct operating expenses; an accounting move, in other words. [9:45]

Mr. S. Smith: Sorry about that, but I'm afraid I am no more enlightened because transfer payments last year amounted to only $550,000 and were entirely under district health councils, unless you are speaking of a different vote. This time, as I said, there is a rather large increase. Why don't I send the figures over to you?

Hon. F. S. Miller: There are transfer payments in other votes which are reflected in this item but are not under this vote. We have combined a number of our bookkeeping functions on a different basis this year, partly because the ministry reorganized.

Mr. Chairman: Does the hon. member have any more comments on this item?

Hon. F. S. Miller: Incidentally, if we haven't satisfied you, I can turn you over at any time to our audit people to search the matter in detail.

Mr. S. Smith: No, I appreciate it. It is just that one doesn't want to let a large item pass without some comment. In general, I am sure all the opposition members would feel the way I do—that when there are large changes from year to year in the estimates an explanatory note of accounting changes would probably save the time of the House and a lot of research time.

Mr. Godfrey: A supplementary, Mr. Chairman: Further to that, I note under general hospitals and related activities, it states payments for ambulances and related emergency services $31 million, which represents a very sizable increase from the previous year. I do not wish to confuse your mathematics but just to tie down the change in the ambulances. This is under the general hospitals and related activities situation, where it mentions transfer payments; payments for ambulances and related emergencies services $31 million, which shows a 66 per cent increase from the previous year.

Hon. F. S. Miller: I was looking at something else when you started to talk, so just—

Mr. Chairman: Does the hon. member for Hamilton West have further remarks on this while they are looking up the information he seeks?

Mr. S. Smith: No, although I must say I join with the hon. member for Durham West because he did find the other item and that did increase vastly as well. I'm still mystified by this accounting increase and what it's about. It's probably nothing important. I'll gladly yield the floor to other members.

Mr. Chairman: Will the hon. minister commit himself to getting that information?

Hon. F. S. Miller: I have to get the right page. You were on S65, if I'm not wrong, when you were asking that question? Part of it is inflation; part of it was the transfer of some provincial operations to private operators during the course of the year. In other words, it wasn't a total increase in spending. It was a total increase in the payments which were transferred.

Mr. Godfrey: I am sure that is satisfactory, sir. I didn't understand it, but thank you.

Mr. Burr: Mr. Chairman, the member for Wentworth has asked some questions about a hospital and the member for Grey-Bruce was asking questions about a hospital. Am I out of order if I ask a similar question?

Mr. Chairman: Yes, I would prefer that you raise it under 2903, item 2.

Mr. Burr: Do you mean you are really on item 3 here now?

Mr. Chairman: We are on item 3, vote 2901, health services.

Mr. Burr: I will pick a different category, drugs and therapeutics. I would like to ask the minister about one item, it won't take very long: that is the Aspirin tablet. Shouldn't there be labels on Aspirin tablets? You can push this off to the federal government, of course, but if you agree with me, perhaps you could give some assistance. For example, as far as pregnant women are concerned, there are several hazards in consumption of Aspirin. For example, Aspirin consumption during early human pregnancy has been associated with malformation of the central nervous system in babies. Aspirin is a powerful inhibitor of the synthetics of prostaglandins, substances vital to the body in reproduction. Pregnant women using Aspirin run the risk of anemia; pregnant women using Aspirin run the risk of haemorrhaging; they run the risk of prolonged gestation; and they run the risk of complicated deliveries. Taken during the last two weeks of pregnancy, Aspirin has caused blood disturbances in infants. All of these and other side effects can be found in the New England Journal of Medicine, July 4, 1974.

My question to the minister is: Why isn't Aspirin labelled with a warning for pregnant

women and why isn't it treated as a prescription drug because of its many side effects?

The minister will recall that recently we had some discussions about the idea that vitamins should be sold in pharmacies because the druggist would be available for consultation. It seems to me it would make far better sense for a pharmacist to be present for consultation when selling Aspirin to people, especially pregnant women, than it would be to try to consult with people when one wanted to buy some harmless vitamins. I would just appreciate the minister's comments on Aspirin.

Hon. F. S. Miller: I have learned to appreciate this member's comments, too; because if I have learned anything in the short time I have been Minister of Health, it is that no knowledge is total. Things we consider safe today are found to have risks tomorrow, and vice versa. I know that you have taken perhaps more time than any other member of this House to look into some of the health wonder drugs—like fluorides and things of that nature—that are currently in vogue.

I also think back to a few years ago when I read the medical journal called Reader's Digest that said that the safest drug in the world was Aspirin and that almost any amount of Aspirin could be taken without any known harmful effect upon the human being. That's not too many years ago—it may be 15 years ago—but it just shows us how our appreciation of a given material changes with time and experience.

I would be the first to agree that Aspirin has evidenced these risks. If you haven't seen the pamphlet that our ministry produced describing the risks of Aspirin—because one has been produced on that basis—then perhaps you would like a copy.

You are quite right when you said the question of labelling or restricting the sale of Aspirin is not provincial, it is federal. I would see no harm in endorsing the comment that perhaps risks be mentioned. I don't think you would find it would qualify as a prescription drug, because we have just got opposite positions, almost, on this and the other issue you referred to, the megavitamins or high potency vitamins. We suspect some risks there, therefore we were trying to protect the public from something they didn't wish to think about as a potential risk.

Mr. Burr: But we know them here.

Hon. F. S. Miller: That is what I say. I say the positions are almost reversed. We think we know some of the ones in the other field; at least some people feel they do. Some people put papers out that don't just say: "We think." Their attitude is: "We know." I don't think in either case that the risks justify the total freezing of the sale by the prescription process, but I do believe in both cases they justify some kind of a warning.

Mr. Burr: Would the minister get in touch with Ottawa and talk about it?

Hon. F. S. Miller: We do that fairly regularly, so I will make a point of it.

Mr. Sargent: Continuing the saga of the closing of hospitals in my area—

Mr. Chairman: I wish the hon. member would bring that up under item 2 of vote 2903.

Mr. Sargent: Okay, I'll just speak about ambulances for a second. You'll find this hard to believe of this minister, who purports to look after the needs of our people. We have an area of 4,000 square miles in my riding where, as of two weeks ago, we did not have any ambulance service between midnight and 8 o'clock in the morning. The most dangerous hours are between midnight and 8 o'clock, yet there is no ambulance service in that 4,000-square-mile area because of budget cutbacks. Now what do you plan to do about that one?

Hon. F. S. Miller: The answer I've been given by my staff—I was just checking, because I can't tell you whether your ambulance staff are on 24 hours a day—

Mr. Sargent: I can't hear you. Say it again.

Hon. F. S. Miller: I have the same trouble. Your ambulance staff are on what they call immediate call-back at night. In other words, they're available to come in on the basis of a call, but they're not sitting in the ambulance station.

Mr. Sargent: If a man lives 10 miles out of town, by the time—

Hon. F. S. Miller: I hardly think that would be called immediate call-back; in fact, I'd like to know if such a problem exists. Surely, you're not suggesting that we wait for somebody to drive 10 miles to town?

Mr. Sargent: It's a fact that one of them lives nine miles out of town; he lives in the beach area. If there's a snowstorm, he has to get dug out to drive into town and get the ambulance to go to the call, no matter where it is.

Hon. F. S. Miller: My director says under those conditions, if a person lives out of town, normally he makes arrangements to be in town at night when he's on duty.

Mr. Sargent: But what kind of a system is it? We pay the same hospital rates as the rest of Ontario, yet we have an area of 4,000 square miles where there's no ambulance from midnight to 8 o'clock in the morning? What kind of democracy or equality is that?

Hon. F. S. Miller: That's not quite fair. There is an ambulance service during those hours of the night, but the drivers aren't sitting waiting by the vehicle.

Mr. Sargent: But they're on call.

Hon. F. S. Miller: They're on call.

Mr. Sargent: Volunteers.

Hon. F. S. Miller: Lots of towns, like mine, have a volunteer fire department at night for the same reason. If the number of calls being placed during the hours between midnight and 8 in the morning fall below a certain number, you can't justify people sitting there night after night. I can probably get you the exact number of calls made between those hours if you want them, and I'd be glad to give them to you. Would you like that information?

Mr. Sargent: Come on. You can doctor anything you want to; I'm talking about intelligence. Consider the amount of money we pay you, and you ask questions like that: Do I want the figures? What the hell good are the figures? If a man is lying dying on the highway and you've got to phone in for a guy to get out of bed and get into an ambulance to come down and find out where the call is—what kind of nonsense is that?

Hon. F. S. Miller: What you're saying is figures won't influence you.

Mr. Warner: Don't confuse him with the facts.

Mr. Ziemba: Don't confuse him with the facts.

Mr. Sargent: What the hell—

Hon. F. S. Miller: I'll get the information for you anyway.

Mr. Sargent: Who needs it? We want an ambulance service around the clock. That's what we want. We don't want your figures.

Mr. Bain: Mr. Chairman, I was a little mystified when the minister responded to a comment by the member for Carleton East (Mrs. Gigantes) by saying that he attempted to always listen to what the community wanted. I am afraid that in my riding he has failed to listen to the community.

In the south end of my riding, in the Tritown area, the community would like nothing better than to express its wishes on the site of a new hospital, and indeed whether a new hospital is wanted by the community. I would appreciate the minister's comments as to whether he feels that the people in the local community are entitled—I believe they are entitled, but does he believe they are entitled—to voice their opinion as to whether they wish one new hospital or whether they wish to upgrade the existing facilities?

[10:00]

Mr. Chairman: I would prefer if the hon. member would bring this up under vote 2903, item 2. You were distributed a supplementary sheet showing health services, item 3; which covers drugs and therapeutics, inspection branch, direct services division, psychiatric hospital branch administration only, ambulance services and clinic services branch. So I'd prefer that you keep your remarks to those areas, otherwise we're going to be bogged on this vote all night.

Mr. Bain: I was prefacing my remarks to general item No. 3.

Mr. Chairman: But if you want to get into the specifics there's no money here for general hospitals per se, it's under vote 2903, item 2.

Mr. Bain: We will try another one and see where this one fits. The other question I would like to raise with the minister has to do with chronic and extended care.

As I'm sure he is aware, in all parts of this province there's a great lack of chronic and extended care facilities. In my riding in particular, in the north end of the riding, in the Kirkland Lake area, in the Teck Pioneer Residence for senior citizens, fully 50 to 60 per cent—

Mr. Chairman: Again, the specific item that you speak of is covered under vote 2903, item 2, general hospitals and related activities. Item 3, if you'll notice, deals with extended care and rehabilitation services.

Mr. Bain: We will try and make ourselves available when that's raised.

Mr. Chairman: The hon. member for Nipissing.

Mr. R. S. Smith: Mr. Chairman, I have three questions on regional health councils, and perhaps the minister could clear up in my mind just what's happened over the past year and a half or so. As I recall, I think I and other members of the Legislature received maps some time ago indicating what areas of the province were covered by the regional health councils. Of course there were gaps here and there where they hadn't been set up. Then I hear there are really only five in operation, while somebody else says well there are 21 on the go. Just what is the situation? Could I preface my remarks by asking that question?

Hon. F. S. Miller: When we talk about the ones that are formed, I was just trying to find out what state Nipissing was in right now.

Mr. R. S. Smith: Not a very good state as far as that is concerned.

Hon. F. S. Miller: May I explain the process of the formation of one in general, rather than specifically for your riding or the area that you're representing?

Mr. R. S. Smith: No, no. I am not yet asking specifically about my riding. What I'm asking is how many are in actual operation across this province and how many are in the process of being formed? I mean actually being formed, I don't mean where they're just talking about it.

Hon. F. S. Miller: The formation rate is going along quite quickly. I'm told 21 are in the steering committee stages, which is in the formation stage. The other stage is the discussion stage. I can't tell you how quickly these are coming on stream, but I can tell you that for a while we've been strained to go through the recommendations of the groups that have been giving us lists of names. From our staff point of view, we've been handling them as fast as we could and not quite keeping up with the inflow of requests.

Mr. R. S. Smith: How many are anticipated to cover the whole province?

Hon. F. S. Miller: I'm guessing 35 or 36, somewhere in that range.

Mr. R. S. Smith: So you're talking about perhaps two-thirds of the areas where they're either in place or they're moving toward—

Hon. F. S. Miller: Yes, right.

Mr. R. S. Smith: There is the steering committee and then there is the actual formation of the council itself.

Hon. F. S. Miller: Yes.

Mr. R. S. Smith: Okay. Some time ago a map was sent around to the members showing where they were in place. I suppose the map must have included those 21 that had entered or were approaching the steering committee position. I looked at that map and I said: "God bless us. Are we going to be left with what's left between Parry Sound and Sudbury, or between Muskoka and Sudbury? That's can't be possible. Nobody could do that."

Sure enough that's what happened. There's been a request now from the ministry, I suppose through the branch that's looking after this, that a district health council be established that would include the district of Nipissing basically, and most of the district of Parry Sound down to the northern boundaries of your riding, or perhaps a little above that.

I can accept the fact that the district of Nipissing, and the northern part of the district of Parry Sound, as well as the corridor down Highway 11, would naturally come under the same health council. But for the life of me, I can't understand what input the town of Parry Sound and that area down there would have to any health council, or would have in any connection, geographically or otherwise. By otherwise I mean in the provision of health services to the rest of the area that's outlying.

I've expressed my views on this matter publicly to the group that is trying to formulate the council in the area. It's not yet to the steering committee stage. I think it's prior to that stage; they are moving towards the steering committee stage with some difficulties.

One of the difficulties, I believe, is the areas that have been outlined by the ministry without consultation. I would like the hon. minister to explain how the people in the town of Parry Sound are going to be served by a health council that also includes the northern part of Parry Sound and the district of Nipissing, rather than be in the Sudbury minister to explain how the people in the district where they go for the services that are rendered to them outside of what can be rendered to them at the hospital situated in Parry Sound itself.

Hon. F. S. Miller: Mr. Chairman, I don't know that the hon. member should jump to the conclusion that they are heading in this

direction. The boundaries that were shown on any of the maps that were circulated, and I think at one point Gordon Walker probably sent the hon. member the one he has because he was letting members know some proposed boundaries, were sent out as discussion pieces. He got quite a few reactions back from hon. members saying they disagreed, on the kind of basis the hon. member is talking about, with the boundary drawn.

Parry Sound has been actively trying to get a health planning council going. At one point they wanted to form, in a sense the nucleus of one there, even if they didn't have anybody to which they could attach for the time being. Frankly, Parry Sound does have problems relating to even the balance of the district of Parry Sound, as you know.

Mr. R. S. Smith: Right, that is what I am saying.

Hon. F. S. Miller: It is because of the two corridors, east and west, in that particular area. They even ran two Conservative candidates at one time, which indicates a problem.

Mr. R. S. Smith: That seems to be the biggest problem.

Mr. B. Newman: You asked for it.

Hon. F. S. Miller: We would think there could be a good argument for Parry Sound being included, as it is in the health unit, with Muskoka.

Mr. R. S. Smith: Well okay.

Hon. F. S. Miller: Muskoka as yet hasn't reached any definitive stages. It is talking about Simcoe. One of the problems we are going to run into is the fact that I think there's an economic region boundary going across between the district of Parry Sound and the district of Muskoka, set by Treasury, Economics and Intergovernmental Affairs. Generally speaking, the economic boundary limits in the province have been considered inviolable. You just couldn't lump parts on either side of them into one plan for any of the community and social services; it didn't matter what.

We argued in Muskoka, and I'm sure you'd argue in your area, that these boundaries, as drawn, aren't necessarily in the best place for certain services.

All I can tell you is that our ministry right now has a relatively open mind on where boundaries would go in the Muskoka, Parry Sound, Nipissing and Simcoe regions. We haven't negotiated any. Steering committees usually look at that as their first problem; what boundaries should we draw, and then how do we organize to serve them.

Mr. R. S. Smith: I beg to disagree with the minister on this, because that's not the impression your ministry is leaving with those people who are trying to tackle the problem. They are given to understand that these are the boundaries that they are to work with and that's it. Part of the problem in setting up the regional units is the fact that the people feel as a result of these maps that were circulated that they're having boundaries put onto them. It hasn't been explained that after they come to the steering committee stage they will then choose their own boundaries. If that is what the minister is trying to say, I wish he would make it very clear, because I think this makes all the difference in the world to many areas.

I'm not saying that Parry Sound should be left out in the cold, or anything else; they have to fit in somewhere, but logically. They certainly don't fit into an area where they don't go for their services. I feel there is an impediment being placed in the formation of a regional health council in Nipissing by this artificial setting of boundaries. I know your government always has a problem in setting boundaries because they have no type of regional planning across the province that's really in place. Everyone of your ministries has a different regional boundary.

Hon. F. S. Miller: No it doesn't.

Mr. R. S. Smith: A few of them have the same, that's a haphazard mistake. They're bound to come up on the same boundaries twice the odd time. But I would ask you, are you going to make it clear to these steering committees that they have the right to set their own boundaries?

Hon. F. S. Miller: Not quite. In speaking to steering committees myself a few times and to groups contemplating the formation of a steering committee, I made it perfectly clear that it was one of their first duties. I'm told by my staff that they understand we are dealing through the area planning coordinators with potential steering committees, saying the structuring of boundaries is flexible. One must admit, though, that as more and more boundaries are defined the choices for those who are beginning become more and more restricted, don't they? So the first few people virtually had an open field. Now we're getting to the point where Sudbury on your west, being the district of Sudbury

plus Manitoulin Island, obviously gives you an absolute western limit.

Mr. Martel: Is that where you want the council?

Hon. F. S. Miller: That's right.

Mr. Martel: Is that where you want to have the council?

Hon. F. S. Miller: Just a second. You'll have your time in a minute.

Mr. Martel: We will talk about that in a few minutes.

Mr. Chairman: Order, please.

Hon. F. S. Miller: I was afraid we would. In any case, that's one boundary now chosen. Obviously, on the other side you've got the boundary between Ontario and Quebec. What the northern boundary is going to be, I'm not so sure; and what the southern boundary is going to be, I'm not so sure. Those are part of the negotiable areas right now.

Mr. R. S. Smith: I should think that you would have some input into what the southern boundary is going to be since it is your northern boundary.

Hon. F. S. Miller: We were going to include you.

Mr. R. S. Smith: Thank God you changed that one. But obviously if you want to get that one off the ground you'll have to tell them that they do have the right to make that decision, because they don't know.

Mr. Chairman: The hon. member for Algoma.

[10:15]

Mr. Wildman: Mr. Chairman, I have a question regarding area planning co-ordination. What is the ministry doing to co-ordinate the development of area health centres to ensure they are adequately funded? Some areas of the province have very few facilities of this type, while others seem to be beginning to proliferate. A part of the problem in the north, in trying to attract professionals, has been the development of area and community health centres. The ministry seems to be wanting to attract professionals by encouraging the development of these centres. But unfortunately many small communities cannot afford to build them. I would like to know what direction the ministry is giving these small communities to prevent the uncontrolled proliferation of centres in small areas where they may not be able really, to afford the facilities. If small centres are encouraged to build centres by the ministry, they surely should be given the financial aid which is necessary to build them. At this particular point, as the minister knows, and as he has stated a number of times, the ministry does not give grants for this sort of thing.

In other words, it seems to me you are encouraging a development of centres but you are not willing to finance them. The Bruce Mine situation is a situation like that. I would like to know what role the area planning co-ordinators have in the direction of local communities and local officials in the development of such centres? What input do they have in the development stage of these centres? I would hope that the minister could clarify that situation.

Hon. F. S. Miller: Mr. Chairman, that was 2901-1, but the hon. member wasn't here when that vote passed so if you don't mind I will answer him. The funding of health service organizations, at least of community clinics, the kind of thing you are talking about in Bruce Mines—

Mr. Wildman: The thrust of my question really wasn't on funding but on the role of co-ordinators in the development; and I believe that is under this vote, Mr. Chairman.

Hon. F. S. Miller: The co-ordinator, in a sense, wasn't the man you dealt with. The person you dealt with is in charge of our underserviced area programme, Dr. Copeman.

Mr. Wildman: Right. I understand that.

Hon. F. S. Miller: He is not an area planning co-ordinator. Now if, in fact, we had an area health council in place, I think we wouldn't have had the kind of problem you have in your area where three communities within not too many miles of each other, on what is a very understandable local competitive basis, all did the same thing at the same time and made it difficult for any of them to survive properly. I think you understand that problem.

It is very difficult, as you will discover, to discourage any community that makes up its mind to build something that the neighbours have. That is exactly what I think happened in Bruce Mines, in Richard's Landing, wasn't it? It hasn't built one yet and it has the doctors there in Thessalon.

In the beginning, when Dr. Copeman started talking about them, one place was to be built. We do not control the building of them any more than we control the building of a doctor's office by a private individual. Once they are built by a community, they are faced, as your communities have been, with trying to pay off the debt; and this, then, requires occupancy by practising people. There is where we get in trouble.

We are, as I explained in the House a couple of times, only able to finance the numbers needed or available. Now we have both problems in Bruce Mines. We need a dentist and they aren't available; and we can't afford another doctor. It may well be that the practice changes in your town one of these days, let's say the fee-for-service doctor leaves, and we are immediately able to justify a second doctor in the community. I think that is the only thing.

It is one of the risks a community takes in trying to bring to it people it feels it needs. It is a risk, I think, they took in the beginning, knowingly; but the facts of trying to pay off the debt have been tougher than they really hoped they would be.

Mr. Wildman: Mr. Chairman, am I to understand from the hon. minister that without an area health council there isn't this kind of co-ordination among communities in the development of such facilities at all? There is no direction from the ministry?

Hon. F. S. Miller: No, there is none.

Mr. Wildman: None at all?

Hon. F. S. Miller: One thing we could have done, and I guess maybe should have done—hindsight being better than foresight—would be to have refused funding to one of those communities, and said, look, we will not designate your town as an underserviced area. I suspect we would have done that, though, after the building was built, looking back at the scene, and that would have compounded the trouble. Unfortunately we went ahead and did support them once they built the community.

Mr. Cunningham: Unlike the member for Grey-Bruce I can't complain about the improvements we need to make in hospitals in my riding inasmuch as we don't have a hospital in my riding. It is a similar situation to that of the member for Grey-Bruce in that it is a large riding and that makes a very good ambulance service integral to the safety of the citizens of my community.

The question I would raise with you—and I have before—relates to the ambulance service we do have which, in my view, is a good ambulance service but is run on a private basis. As I have mentioned to you in the past, the lady who happens to be running this service is experiencing a great deal of difficulty and I am told in recent days that her difficulties have been increased somewhat.

She is in the position where she has to run her service to provide a nightly service in an area where I understand there are a great number of accidents. She subsidizes that cost and the people who operate this service more or less on a voluntary basis are paid the sum of $1 per hour which certainly contravenes our labour standards.

The question I would raise with you is what can we do to help keep this woman in business so that we do not lose the only ambulance service we have in this rather large riding? I would like to say at this time I would be very concerned if this service went down the drain and we were forced to rely on the services of ambulances from either Burlington or Hamilton. They tend to get lost in the regional areas, on the Treasurer's regional roads, and they have a great deal of difficulty finding locations within the area. Specifically, I would like to know what can be done to assist this woman and others like her who are carrying on in good faith on a private enterprise basis. Possibly, you might indicate to me the attitude of your government at this present time to other people who are involved in health services on a private enterprise basis.

Hon. F. S. Miller: I have had the opportunity to meet both your operator and your township councils — the township of Flamborough, if I am not wrong—and the reeve, at least twice and perhaps more often, on this issue over the post few years and we have discussed the matter quite a bit. We've had a number of problems, I guess, in dealing with the operator. They are probably mutual; I am not placing blame. I am just saying there have been disagreements.

To begin with, I think we had trouble getting the staff trained through the ambulance training course at Borden. Then we had troubles with her accepting the central dispatch. We feel that is essential because we don't want ambulances tearing off in all directions duplicating calls and taking direct calls. I believe she still does this, though we have ordered her not to.

We have central dispatch in that area and it is there specifically to make the best use of

the ambulances on duty. She is supposed to be on a call-back basis at night but at her election, keeps staff on duty. This is one of the other areas of argument.

She is an individualist and I admire her for it. I can only say that some of the troubles in that area are not of our making. We have done our best to meet her requirements and our requirements for a reasonable cost operation when they are well trained. We continue to discuss these with her and I think we will solve most of them.

Mr. Cunningham: The point I would make is that there is general consensus—I think tremendous consensus—within my constituency that she is providing an excellent service notwithstanding, I think, disagreements from a few people whose motivations I won't question at this particular time.

If there is a reason or basis for her concern, as it relates to a central dispatching system, it is that once she opts into this system it would appear she is not going to get the calls she has had heretofore. The habit has been for Hamilton ambulances and Burlington ambulances to be dispatched to the Flamboroughs particularly and they have a tendency to get lost. Of course, I don't have to elaborate on this point as it relates to public safety.

I would say that my own view, having met with this woman at considerable length, is that in fact she is doing a good job and she is quite sincere in her efforts. She tells me that her remuneration in the last year has been somewhere in the area of $5,000 to $6,000, which I don't think is particularly appropriate for somebody who puts herself at the disposal of the community 24 hours a day.

Again, I wonder if I could get from the minister, so that I could convey his views to her, some form of encouragement as it would relate to the future of her operation and the future of the service in my particular constituency.

Hon. F. S. Miller: I have assured your council the service will be there. It does require co-operation with central dispatch. We won't get well-integrated ambulance services until central dispatches are properly used. She is not on a fee-for-service basis. In other words, it is not a question of her earning extra money because we are directing calls her way. It's a question of utilizing her properly and effectively.

We code all our calls; we know whether they are urgent or not urgent. I would like you to take the time, if you would, to look at the organizational end of that. Some day when you have got some time I would be delighted to have you do just that. I am quite willing to accept advice from you if you think it's unfair. At the same time, I would like you to know the reasons behind some of our operating decisions.

This is a spill-off from the old days when ambulance operators were almost like the old lawyers, literally chasing business. We can't afford that kind of ambulance service any more. It has to be tied together. In Toronto, when we had two or three different services competing with each other and two dispatch systems, we had cases from time to time of somebody dying because an ambulance that was 20 minutes away was called although there was one three or four minutes away. We can't afford that kind of overlap when people try to provide the service without reference to the availability of vehicles in the area.

Mr. Germa: Mr. Chairman, I note the hour. I only have about 2½ minutes, so I am going to save any berating I have of the minister's incompetence for a later date—

Hon. F. S. Miller: You can get all that into 30 seconds.

Mr. Germa: No, I could berate you for half an hour and I would still have lots left, because I think you run a terrible ministry as far as occupational health is concerned. I refer to the Elliot Lake disaster, and sinter plant disaster and the present cover-up. But I am going to ask you three specific questions.

I think you have received a plea from the hospital administrators in Sudbury regarding some co-ordinating services in the integration of the new hospital which is coming on stream. Even as late as 5 o'clock this evening I was talking to an administrator of a hospital in Sudbury, who told me that when Laurentian Hospital was phased in to take paediatrics, let's say on Oct. 15, they were supposed to come on stream with a certain number of beds. Lo and behold, the Sudbury Memorial Hospital phased out its paediatrics and we find now that only 75 beds are available because of restrictions by this ministry in allowing only 140 beds to come on stream at Laurentian.

Mr. Chairman: I have to call the hon. member to order. That's not under this vote.

Mr. Germa: I am talking about area planning co-ordinators. I am trying to get some co-ordination in the city of Sudbury as far as hospital services are concerned.

Mr. Martel: We might even get a health council if we are lucky—if the minister will let us.

Mr. Chairman: If you want to confine your remarks to area health co-ordinators, you are in order. If you want to talk about hospitals, that's under vote 2903.

Mr. Germa: I had a request at 5 o'clock this afternoon for the minister to send a co-ordinator to the city of Sudbury; it was an earnest plea for this ministry to intervene and to try to co-ordinate the phasing-in of the new Laurentian Hospital.

Hon. F. S. Miller: In the short time remaining, would you tell me who called you, because to the best of my knowledge I haven't been called?

Mr. Germa: The administrator at the Sudbury Memorial Hospital told me he is thinking of reopening the paediatric section. but he hasn't got the specialized staff because they have all been transferred or laid off as of Oct. 15th. They are about 35 beds short in the city in terms of paediatrics alone. I can say the same thing about the phasing-in and phasing-out of the chronic wards; there is no co-ordination there at all. It's probably because you refuse to appoint an area health council board. Why don't you appoint it? The names were submitted to you months and months ago.

Hon. F. S. Miller: They have never been submitted.

Mr. Martel: They have been; on Aug. 15.

Mr. Germa: On Aug. 15 names were submitted to you from a vote of the symposium on health care and social services. The symposium didn't go along with the minister's request that they only submit a multitude of names so you could pick the area health council. Your statement of 15 or 20 minutes ago flies in the face of when you said you wanted to get input from the community.

These were people elected from a symposium of probably 500 people, and chosen to represent the city of Sudbury. They detailed who they wanted on the area health council, and you refused to appoint them because you wanted about 50 names to pick out your Tory hacks in order to appoint them to the health council.

Mr. Chairman: Order, please.

Mr. Germa: And that's precisely what you are doing.

Hon. F. S. Miller: I don't do that, and you know it.

Mr. Martel: All right; take the 17 names that have been submitted to you.

Mr. Germa: Yes, why don't you appoint the 17 names that were submitted?

Mr. Chairman: Order, please.

Mr. Martel: The names have been submitted to you and you know it. Now you are asking for something else.

Mr. Chairman: Order, please. The time for adjournment has arrived.

Hon. Mr. Welch moved that the committee rise and report.

Motion agreed to.

The House resumed; Mr. Speaker in the chair.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Speaker, the committee of supply begs to report progress and asks for leave to sit again.

Report agreed to.

Hon. Mr. Welch: Mr. Speaker, before moving the adjournment of the House, may I indicate that tomorrow we will deal with legislation. We will carry on with the consideration of Bill 8. There will be order Nos. 6, 4, 5, 7, 8, 9 and 10. Then, if we have time, we will then go into committee of the whole and consider the bills that are in committee of the whole House. Friday, we will resume the debate on the Throne speech.

Hon. Mr. Welch moved the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to.

The House adjourned at 10:30 p.m.

CONTENTS

Wednesday, November 12, 1975

Estimates, Ministry of Health, Mr. F. S. Miller, continued 465

Adjournment 493

SPEAKERS IN THIS ISSUE

Bain, R. (Timiskaming NDP)
Bennett, Hon. C. Industry and Tourism (Ottawa South PC)
Burr, F. A. (Windsor-Riverside NDP)
Bryden, M. (Beaches-Woodbine NDP)
Conway, S. (Renfrew North L)
Cunningham, E. (Wentworth North L)
Deans, I. (Wentworth NDP)
Eakins, J. (Victoria-Haliburton L)
Foulds, J. F. (Port Arthur NDP)
Germa, M. C. (Sudbury NDP)
Gigantes, E. (Carleton East NDP)
Givens, P. G. (Armourdale L)
Godfrey, C. (Durham West NDP)
Johnston, R. M. (St. Catharines PC)
Kerr, Hon. G. A. Environment (Burlington South PC)
Martel, E. W. (Sudbury East NDP)
McClellan, R. (Bellwoods NDP)
Miller, Hon. F. S. Health (Muskoka PC)
Moffatt, D. (Durham East NDP)
Nixon, R. F. (Brant-Oxford-Norfolk L)
Roy, A. J. (Ottawa East L)
Samis, G. (Cornwall NDP)
Sargent, E. (Grey-Bruce L)
Shore, M. (London North L)
Smith, R. S. (Nipissing L)
Smith, S. (Hamilton West L)
Warner, D. (Scarborough-Ellesmere NDP)
Welch, Hon. R. Culture and Recreation (Brock PC)
Wildman, B. (Algoma NDP)
Ziemba, E. (High Park-Swansea NDP)

No. 13



Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT — DAILY EDITION

First Session of the Thirtieth Legislature

Thursday, November 13, 1975

Afternoon Session

Speaker: Honourable Russell Daniel Rowe
Clerk: Roderick Lewis, QC

THE QUEEN'S PRINTER
PARLIAMENT BUILDINGS, TORONTO
1975



CONTENTS

A list of the speakers taking part in the debates in this issue of Hansard appears, in alphabetical order, at the back of this issue.

Daily contents of proceedings also appears at the back of this issue. Reference to a cumulative index of previous issues can be obtained by calling the Hansard Reporting Service indexing staff. Phone 965-2159.

Hansard subscription price is $15.00 per session, from: Sessional Subscription Service, MGS, 9th Floor, Ferguson Block, Parliament Bldgs., Toronto, M7A 1N3. Phone 965-2238.

LEGISLATURE OF ONTARIO

THURSDAY, NOVEMBER 13, 1975

The House met at 2 p.m.

Prayers.

Hon. Mr. Taylor: Mr. Speaker, before statements by the ministry I would like to introduce to the House 65 grade 7 students from the Bath Public School who are in the west gallery. These are students from that wonderful Bath area in the great riding of Prince Edward-Lennox. I wish you would extend them a welcome to the House.

Mr. Laughren: Mr. Speaker, I would like to introduce to the Legislature this afternoon 26 members of the Inco Pensioners Club who are in the east gallery and I hope you will join me in welcoming them.

Mr. Johnson: Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to introduce to you and to the hon. members of this house, 50 grade 10 students from the Erin District High School under the supervision of Chris Ledger and three parents. They are seated in the west gallery. Would you please welcome them to the Legislature this afternoon?

Mr. Makarchuk: Mr. Speaker, I would like at this time to introduce to the members of the Legislature 20 students from St. John's College in booming Brantford under the supervision of Mr. Ted Charnish. I'm sure the members of the House will be pleased to welcome them.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to introduce to you, and through you to the members of the Legislature, 13 senior students from grades 12 and 13 of the Sault Ste. Marie Collegiate under the guidance of Mr. Doug McChesney. They are in the west gallery.

Hon. Mr. Wells: Mr. Speaker, I would like to introduce to you and the House some special guests that we have in your gallery today. We have with us the Hon. G. C. MacKinnon, the Minister of Education, Cultural Affairs and Recreation, from the state of Western Australia, who is accompanied by Mrs. MacKinnon; and Dr. David Mossinson, the latter the assistant director general of education for West Australia.

Mr. Speaker: Mr. Speaker is also pleased to introduce a group of some 30 students and their teachers and some parents from the Dale Road Public School in the great county of Northumberland. I hope the assembly will welcome them.

Statements by the ministry.

Oral questions.

FALCONBRIDGE LAYOFFS

Mr. Deans: Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the hon. Minister of Labour. For the purposes of my question, I hope I can assume the Minister of Labour knows there is a bargaining-in-good faith section within the Labour Relations Act.

Does the minister think, given the length of time negotiations took place and the fact a settlement was reached only a matter of days ago, that it was bargaining in good faith on the part of Falconbridge to have come to the negotiating table knowing full well they intended to lay off between 500 and 1,000 workers, and never to make this known to those employees or their representatives during the course of the negotiations?

Hon. B. Stephenson: Mr. Speaker, I would have to tell my hon. colleague that I am not fully acquainted with the details of the negotiating programme at Falconbridge, but I can promise him that I will investigate this and if there is a matter of bargaining in bad faith, I will report it to the member.

Mr. Deans: May I ask a supplementary? Would the minister agree, given that the circumstances are as I outlined them, that it would be cause for action under the bargaining-in-good-faith clause of the Labour Relations Act?

Hon. B. Stephenson: Mr. Speaker, if in fact the situation is exactly as my hon. colleague has outlined, it might indeed be considered something which should be investigated under that aspect of the legislation.

Mr. Laughren: Supplementary, Mr. Speaker: Has the minister been informed by

Falconbridge Nickel Mines of the impending layoff and the number of people to be laid off?

Hon. B. Stephenson: Mr. Speaker, I have no knowledge of that information at this time.

Mr. Speaker: Final supplementary.

Mr. Martel: In view of the fact that the number that is being bandied around exceeds the minimum cited in the legislation that presently exists, would the minister find out if in fact Falconbridge has made application to the ministry, and if in fact there is going to be an orderly layoff or not in the little game that is going on, with Falconbridge attempting to say they might be laying off 500, 600, 700 or some magical figure? Will the legislation take effect to force a more orderly layoff?

Hon. B. Stephenson: Mr. Speaker, the legislation which is in effect should enforce an orderly layoff. I shall investigate to find out whether in fact we have had any such intimation from Falconbridge.

OIL AND GAS PRICES

Mr. Deans: I would like to ask a question of the Premier. Given it is generally agreed the costs of fuel oil and gasoline vary considerably between northern and southern Ontario, would the Premier consider extending the freeze on gasoline and home oil prices in northern Ontario until such time as there is an opportunity for this Legislature to consider ways and means of implementing an equalization across the province?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I think that question should be properly directed to the Minister of Energy (Mr. Timbrell), although I do recall some discussion of this last spring, not as it relates to the particular freeze but to the problem as a whole. If memory serves me correctly part of Mr. Isbister's responsibility, and I think this was conveyed to the member for—what is the member's new riding?

Mr. Stokes: Lake Nipigon.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Lake Nipigon.

Mr. Foulds: Same riding.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Yes, same riding but with a new name.

I indicated, or somebody did, to the member for Lake Nipigon, that part of Mr. Isbister's responsibility was to see if there were some constructive suggestions about the question of equalization of price as between southern and northern Ontario. I believe the Minister of Energy indicated this; and this would be part of Mr. Isbister's report in February

Mr. Deans: If I may, by way of supplementary question: Recognizing that it all ends on Sunday, and recognizing that the cost to northern Ontario residents are considerably higher due to the winter period being much longer than in the south, doesn't the Premier feel that it might be suitable and acceptable at this time to take that step and freeze the prices at the current level in the north until we can have the benefit of Mr. Isbister's report?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I think it sounds like a simplistic solution to what may be a somewhat complex problem.

Mr. Deans: That's right. Maybe we don't make things complicated.

Hon. Mr. Davis: The government is not unsympathetic. We asked Mr. Isbister to give specific attention to this and it's a matter that has given this government concern for the last two or three years as it relates not just to fuel oil, but the price of gasoline. It is not as simple as some would think to find a logical solution to it. As I said, the Minister of Energy—I think I'm right in this—indicated to the House that this was a matter for Mr. Isbister and hopefully he may have some recommendations for us.

Mr. Nixon: Since the Premier has mentioned the cost of gasoline as well, would it not be possible for a consideration to be given to reducing the provincial sales tax, or gasoline tax, in the northern part of the province? We've discussed this before, but surely under these circumstances further consideration would be warranted?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I know the leader of the Liberal Party—I won't refer to them as the third group in the House today.

Mr. Nixon: Suit yourself, we are the third group.

Mr. Reid: What do you think you stand to gain?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Well, I can refer to them as the third party if they like.

Mr. Ruston: We were only two per cent behind.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please, order.

Mr. Roy: We will be kind with you.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Yes, but don't forget you are behind.

Mr. Nixon: Not much.

Mr. Reid: First time in 32 years that we have had a minority government.

Hon. Mr. Davis: And what's more, I've got news for you. You're going to stay behind too. You're going to stay behind—

Mr. Reid: We went up six per cent. What did you do?

Hon. Mr. Davis: —in spite of all of those of you who are going to be contesting it in January. When is the member for Ottawa (Mr. Roy) going to announce? Any day now?

Mr. Reid: When is the Premier going to announce a Tory leadership convention?

Mr. Nixon: When is he going to announce one?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please, we'll get on with the question period. Is there a further answer, Mr. Premier?

Interjections.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Before it is construed that I am personally supporting the member for Ottawa East, I will withdraw that question. I would only say to the leader of the Liberal Party that the government is reluctant to get into tax differentials as a solution to the problem. It has been considered. I think that's been stated in the House before and it is not a suggestion that is without some merit. I'm not going to argue that, but we have been very reluctant, and I think this is true in most jurisdictions, to get into tax differentials based on geographic areas.

Mr. Foulds: Supplementary, Mr. Speaker: In view of the fact that gasoline in northern Ontario is not a luxury, due to the lack of public transportation and because many workers have to commute by car as many as 50 or 60 miles—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. This is far removed from the original question asked—

Mr. Foulds: —each way daily, is the Premier willing to commit his government, as a matter of policy, to the equalization of—

Mr. Bullbrook: Stick to your guns, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. This is the same question, in my opinion, right over again. Did the member for Nipissing (Mr. R. S. Smith) have a—

Mr. Foulds: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. What is your point of order?

Mr. Foulds: The original question was about gasoline prices in northern Ontario and I asked a supplementary on that matter.

Interjections.

Mr. Speaker: You're spreading this thing and asking practically the same question over again, which is wasting the time of the question period.

Mr. Bullbrook: Right.

Mr. Cassidy: The Premier is wasting our time; he wouldn't give a clear answer.

Interjections.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Nipissing, for the final supplementary on this question.

Interjections.

Mr. R. S. Smith: Mr. Speaker, in spite of the Premier's indication that Mr. Isbister is considering this as part of his study, would the Premier in the interim between now and the time of his final report, which I understand will be in January or February, name a committee of this Legislature to establish the actual cost differential between northern and southern Ontario once and for all in both the areas of gasoline and oil?

Mr. Speaker: I think the question has been asked. Is there an answer now?

Mr. R. S. Smith: And secondly, will the Premier give to that committee the right to look at the books of the oil and gas companies to see what the actual costs are—differential costs are—in transportation of the product between north and south?

Mr. Martel: Good question.

[2:15]

Hon. Mr. Davis: Did the hon. member say we would give permis ion to whom to do what? I mean to do what to whom?

Mr. Sargent: The Premier knows what the hon. member asked him.

Mr. R. S. Smith: It is you who make people—

Hon. Mr. Davis: No, no, I didn't hear the first part.

Mr. R. S. Smith: You do things to people. We ask you to look into things. Did you hear the first question?

Hon. Mr. Davis: I didn't hear the first part of the first question.

Mr. R. S. Smith: The first part of the first question is this: While we're waiting for the Isbister report, which I understand will come in January or February, will the Premier establish a committee of the Legislature to look once and for all into the differential in costs of oil and gas between the northern and the southern parts of the province? Secondly, will he give that committee the legal right to look at the books of the oil companies concerned—distributors as well as oil companies—to establish the differential in transportation costs for the two products from the south to the north?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I think it would be premature to say yes to the first part of the question, because we haven't seen Mr. Isbister's report. It may or may not be necessary to have it go further than that; and, of course, if we haven't got a yes or no to the first part of the question then the second question becomes academic. However, I would like to redirect this for any further detailed observation to the Minister of Energy (Mr. Timbrell) who is today celebrating his 29th birthday. I certainly wouldn't want him not to have that occasion noted here in the House and the opportunity to have a more fulsome answer to that very important question.

Mr. Reid: It is the 13th.

Mr. Cassidy: It may be his last birthday in the House.

Mr. R. S. Smith: Mr. Speaker, the Premier has redirected it to the Minister of Energy.

Mr. Speaker: At a later opportunity. We are away from the original question. We started talking about the pricing, or inspecting—

Mr. R. S. Smith: That is what I'm talking about.

Mr. Speaker: It has been suggested that the question be redirected on two or three occasions. I think it hasn't been. I think we should get on with the question period. There may be the opportunity, if we don't waste too much time, to ask that related question.

H.O.M.E. PROGRAMME

Mr. Deans: I have a question for the Minister of Housing. Does the minister think it appropriate and proper that homes offered for resale under the Home Ownership Made Easy programme should have the land rental costs raised from the initial cost of $65 per month to a projected cost of between $200 and $250 a month—for the lot the house is located on? Does he feel that in some way meets the needs of the low- or middle-income groups who are supposed to be able to take advantage of the HOME programme?

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: Mr. Speaker, I am not aware that that has occurred, as the hon. member suggests it has. I would like to have an opportunity to look into it and find out exactly what the details are, to find out if such increases are taking place.

ASBESTOS EMISSIONS AT JOHNS-MANVILLE OPERATION

Mr. Deans: One final question to the Minister of Labour: Will the Minister of Labour investigate the claims today with regard to the asbestosis sufferers of Johns-Manville who are being forced because of economic reasons to continue to work in the areas from which they derived the asbestosis in the first place; and that the Workmen's Compensation Board has not yet moved to provide adequate pension levels in order that they can move to jobs where there's less hazard?

Hon. B. Stephenson: Mr. Speaker, the workers at Johns-Manville who are presently working within the plant are those who are judged to be medically at a level of disability well below 100 per cent.

Mr. Deans: The minister is going to wait until they are dead?

Hon. B. Stephenson: The examinations of the plant which have been carried out within the last two months by my ministry and the Ministry of Health have proven that all of the asbestos levels are well below the strictly enforced level which was set by the Industrial Safety Branch. There is a problem regarding those workers. It probably would be better for them to be out of the plant completely. Unfortunately, the Workmen's Compensation Board does not have the power to move the workers out bodily. It can only encourage them and help them to find other employment. At the moment this whole problem of asbestosis, pneumoconiosis, silicosis, mesothelioma, and the related chest diseases are under intensive study by both the Ministry of Labour and the Workmen's Compensation Board. I'm sure that you will be hearing more about this subject.

Mr. Deans: One supplementary question: Recognizing that we cannot afford to wait until the workers are at the level of 100 per cent disability, what does the minister propose to do to ensure that they don't reach the level of 100 per cent disability? How can she claim that the Workmen's Compensation Board is helping people to relocate, when everybody in this House knows that the rehabilitation and relocation programmes are just—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. We're debating the issue now.

Hon. B. Stephenson: Mr. Speaker, within the past year the Workmen's Compensation Board in this province has, in fact, helped more than 1,000 workers to relocate. It does have an active programme of rehabilitation and job investigation and support during that period when the workers are between the illness and the new job. This is a problem, as I have suggested. It is not a problem which is being ignored by either the Ministry of Labour or the Workmen's Compensation Board. It is a complex problem and will require very complex solutions as well.

Mr. Deans: Don't delay too long.

Mr. Martel: People will be dead before your ministry gets around to supporting it.

U.N. ZIONISM RESOLUTION

Mr. Nixon: I would like to ask the Premier if he will give consideration to introducing a resolution into this House condemning the stand taken by the United Nations in equating Zionism with racism? In this way we could support the resolution of the Parliament of Canada that was introduced by Hon. John Diefenbaker, and supported on all sides, in a matter of such grave concern. I'm sure if he would undertake to do this it would gain support on all sides, and I think would be a reasonable and useful thing to do.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I think my thoughts on this are indirectly well known. I have no reluctance of doing it by way of a resolution although the House has not, on too many occasions that I can recall, became involved in a matter that very directly falls within the jurisdiction of the federal government of Canada.

Mr. Bullbrook: It has precedents.

Mr. Singer: Hate literature.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Yes, I'm not saying there aren't some precedents—I am a little reluctant to have this occur on too many occasions. I think at the time I made certain observations on another issue that I don't want to reopen here on this occasion. My views on a subject that is related to this I hope were rather well established. The possibility of a resolution by this House which we might do tomorrow morning, Mr. Speaker, or a letter —perhaps from the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Lewis), the leader of the Liberal Party and myself—to the first minister of Canada supporting the position taken by the federal Parliament might also be as effective. But I would be quite prepared to consider this.

Mr. Nixon: A supplementary: I appreciate the Premier's answer but I might just suggest that a resolution that would involve all the members of the House would be preferable and I think it would be extremely worthwhile.

LIGHT RAIL TRANSIT STUDY

Mr. Nixon: I would like to direct a question, Mr. Speaker, to the Premier in the absence of the Minister of Transportation and Communications (Mr. Snow). This is the birthday of the Minister of Energy (Mr. Timbrell). It is also the first birthday of the government's decision to reject the Krauss-Maffei approach to urban transportation. Remember? It was just a year ago today, I am told.

Since we have made such a commitment to the Urban Transit Development Corp. utilizing the members of the transportation staff in the development of light rail transportation and other urban alternatives designed for specific use in Ontario and similar jurisdictions, doesn't it concern the Premier that Mr. Godfrey, the chairman of Metropolitan Toronto, has just led a widely representative delegation of urban officials to Europe with the express purpose of looking at the light rail alternatives in those countries so they might buy those vehicles for use here?

Should it not be a statement of policy that if we are going to do this work and research and development specifically for the jurisdiction of Ontario, that we should expect the municipalities here—if we are going to assist them with 75 per cent grants—at least to avail themselves of our research and our capability?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I am delighted that the leader of the Liberal Party

is now in support of research and development in the field of urban transit. That, to me, is a very encouraging and enlightened sign.

Mr. Nixon: Now that the Premier is out of that Krauss-Maffei mess he is even a better politician than I thought he was. The Krauss-Maffei was all his. He can't even make it go with wheels.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I understand that the leader of the Liberal Party, who attempted to make this into something of an issue during the last campaign, still hasn't been able to get over the results. I would only say to him I'm prepared to debate the matter now .

Mr. Nixon: I have got over them. Have you?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Yes, I have, and I would think a lot sooner than you did.

Mr. Nixon: I was reading that you were reassessing your position. Some Tories are reassessing your position.

Hon. Mr. Davis: I got over it a lot sooner than you did, like about 10 o'clock that night.

Mr. Nixon: The hon. Treasurer (Mr. McKeough) has a lean and hungry look.

Mr. Bullbrook: And he is looking at the member for Ottawa East (Mr. Roy).

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I would only say that on this side of the House we all have lean and hungry looks in that sense of the word. I bet the member wishes he had more people over there who had that same lean and hungry look. That's right. That's been one of his problems for years.

Mr. Nixon: Yes, we could use it a little more.

Mr. Reid: There are a lot of heavyweights on those benches.

Hon. Mr. Davis: However, to get back to the question. If the head of Metropolitan Toronto wishes to go elsewhere researching into the areas of urban transit, I'm delighted. I think more people come to recognize the importance of urban transit and mass transit in today's society. This to me is extremely encouraging. I don't find it at all contradictory with the policy of the government or the activities of the Urban Transit Development Corp. I think it's quite complementary and I will not comment on whether or not municipal people should be travelling outside the country. That's not my purview. But certainly I don't find it inconsistent with the policy of this government at all.

Mr. Nixon: Or politicians in general.

As a supplementary, Mr. Speaker, I'd like to ask the Premier if he would approve a grant of 75 per cent which would be required under our grant structure for the purchase of these vehicles from outside Canada, when we have made commitments of hundreds of thousands of dollars, probably several million, for the development right here. We've done this to foster not only the solution to our urban transportation needs, but also to improve our industrial base.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I am not aware of the fact that the TTC is contemplating purchasing from some company outside Canada. That is not my understanding.

Mr. Nixon: They are just over there to look at it.

Hon. Mr. Davis: My impression would be that if there were to be construction of a new form of vehicle, that construction quite obviously would take place somewhere within Canada, hopefully within the Province of Ontario. That is not at all inconsistent with the approach that we've been attempting to take.

As I say, I'm delighted that the leader of the Liberal Party now recognizes that there is great potential in the field of urban transit and intermediate capacity systems. I'm delighted that he has now seen the light.

Mr. Nixon: Is your research any good or not?

Mr. Cassidy: On a supplementary, will the Premier acknowledge now, Mr. Speaker, that it was the failure of the government to be aware of light rail technology development in Europe, and its failure to draw on the North American expertise of the TTC which is renowned in the field, that led it into the goose chase of going after Krauss-Maffei when there were viable and much cheaper alternatives?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I recognize that the member for Ottawa Centre is one of the most eminent people in the field of urban transit, particularly in the intermediate capacity systems. But I really don't want to get into a debate with him, except to make one or two brief observations.

There is no question the TTC is one of the most knowledgeable agencies in North Ameri-

ca in terms of transit. It is also true that there were members of the TTC, including one or two of their very senior people, who recognized the potential of some other form of intermediate capacity carriers.

I would also say to the hon. member for Ottawa Centre that at some point in time, somebody somewhere will develop an intermediate capacity system that is not necessarily the traditional light rail vehicle. I just earnestly hope that it is done here, because the potential in terms of market, in terms of development of technology, are tremendous. There are hundreds of millions of dollars—and he can shake his head. He may not be a member of this House—even I may not be a member of this House when this is done.

Mr. Cassidy: I will be here, I don't know about you.

Hon. Mr. Davis: But I tell the member at some point in time it will, and the experimentation and research in this field was never confined to the Province of Ontario and KM. It is being done in other jurisdictions and I think the member will find it is being pursued. There is nothing inconsistent in that and what the government attempted to do.

But I have to say this, Mr. Speaker, by way of finalizing it. It is fine for the members opposite to suggest that the government of Ontario should not become involved in a research project of this kind—

Mr. Cassidy: You shouldn't have ignored the technology that was available.

Hon. Mr. Davis: I just don't intend to apologize for it at all. I think it was a significant decision in terms of trying to develop something that would serve the transit needs and the potential in terms—

Mr. Nixon: Krauss-Maffei was a fiasco and you know it.

[2:30]

Hon. Mr. Davis: With great respect—

Hon. Mr. McKeough: That is what you said about Pickering and the whole nuclear programme and you are still eating crow about that.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Mr. Nixon: Are you talking about the airport?

Hon. Mr. Davis: No, we are talking about Hydro. I know the member has difficulty in distinguishing the difference but I find it rather amusing and something amazing that other members in the opposition would not put aside their partisan political feelings and recognize—

Mr. Nixon: And recognize Krauss-Maffei as a great breakthrough. It was a fiasco, a waste of money.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. We must get on with the question period.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I can only say that if the leader of the Liberal Party would look at the figures he would find out it was not a waste of money—

Mr. Reid: Just of time.

Hon. Mr. Davis: —that the public of this province was protected under a contract, the likes of which even the member for Sarnia (Mr. Bullbrook) would have difficulty in questioning, and that it didn't cost the public of this province anything. There is the potential of the technology available to us.

Mr. Cassidy: Sure it did. Three lost years is what it cost.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Certainly three years—

Mr. Cassidy: Lost.

Hon. Mr. Davis: If the hon. member for Ottawa Centre is saying it is lost, then he acknowledges that—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The interjections are creating a very long answer and we should get on with further questions.

Mr. Bullbrook: Why do you permit the Premier to abuse me in that way?

Mr. Speaker: Does the member for Niagara Falls (Mr. Kerrio) have an urgent supplementary to this? Are there any more questions by the member for Brant-Oxford-Norfolk? Then the member for Renfrew South has a question.

Mr. Cassidy: That is twice in two days.

Mr. Singer: That fellow from Oriole (Mr. Williams) isn't going to get ahead of him, is he?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I can't hear the question.

ST. JOSEPH'S HOSPITAL STAFF REDUCTION

Mr. Yakabuski: I have a question of the Minister of Health. Is the Minister of Health aware that St. Joseph's Hospital here in this city is putting some 200 of its staff on a two-day week from now until the end of the year so that it can meet the debts that it foresees for the end of the year? We are also informed—

Mr. Roy: Question!

Mr. Singer: Question!

Mr. Bullbrook: Does the Premier see what he did when he appointed the member for Lambton (Mr. Henderson) to the cabinet?

Mr. Yakabuski: —that that reduction in staff will not impair services.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I heard a question. Is it finished?

Mr. Yakabuski: I am wondering if this confirms what many people fear, that some of our hospitals are grossly overstaffed?

Mr. Singer: That is certainly urgent.

Mr. Reid: Yes or no?

Mr. Singer: Is the minister aware?

Mr. Nixon: The sisters of St. Joseph will get the member for Renfrew South.

Hon. F. S. Miller: I really thought I had visited all the towns in the member's riding.

Mr. Reid: That is why he is trying to get even.

Mr. Nixon: He figures if the member for Lambton can get into the cabinet, anybody can.

Hon. F. S. Miller: Mr. Speaker, there was an error in the report in the Toronto papers on that particular hospital that hopefully will put the member at ease. It read that they were laying everybody off for two days a week between now and the end of the year. In fact, they were laying everybody off for two days in total between now and the end of the year, to recover their budgetary deficits. That was based upon a $200,000-overrun in their budget and they could recover it by the two-day layoff.

The indication of overstaffing isn't in my opinion gross or necessarily uniform. I can assure the member that one of the things I have been looking at is the relative staffing levels in the hospitals of Ontario so that we can determine if any of them are paid for too many people.

Mr. Godfrey: Can the minister assure us there will be no deterioration of patient care with this loss of staff at St. Joseph's Hospital?

Mr. Martel: That's the real question.

Hon. F. S. Miller: Mr. Speaker, I am relatively sure that if one allows for everybody to have only two days off between now and the end of the year, they should be able to phase it in a way that does not affect patient care. I think if the member checks back at St. Joseph's, they had predicted a summer slump. They didn't have it. Thus the moneys they expected to save in the summer were not saved. Therefore, they are economizing through these measures now. Incidentally I understand it was discussed with their staff and was acceptable to most of them.

AERIAL SPRAYING CONTRACT

Mr. Burr: A question of the Minister of the Environment regarding the aerial spraying in Windsor on Sept. 27, to kill mosquitoes carrying the encephalitis virus: Why was an out-of-province company brought in, despite an additional cost of at least $10,000 for stand-by time and travel time from British Columbia?

Hon. Mr. Kerr: Mr. Speaker, I understand there were about four bids on this particular project and one of the main considerations by the city of Windsor was the time it would take to complete the particular job. There was some urgency, as the hon. member knows. The successful contractor, CON-AIR, was able to complete the work in one day—I am sorry—3.5 hours while the other bidders would have taken about 20 planeloads or 100 planeloads. One wasn't able to specify how long the company would take.

Based on that and the fact that the other companies wouldn't indicate or estimate the time required to have the plane available for stand-by and things like that, it was felt by the medical officer of health and the city—the member must remember they were the parties involved with the contractor—that the BC company would do the job faster and more efficiently and probably for a more reasonable price.

Mr. Roy: You were really caught by surprise by that question.

Mr. Burr: A supplementary question: Is the minister not aware that the local medical

officer of health was told that this was the only company capable of doing the job and that there were other companies on stand-by ready to spray at the very moment the decision to spray was made?

Hon. Mr. Kerr: I am not aware of that. I would think the medical officer of health would be aware of the tenders which were made by the four companies involved. I would think he would be aware of that. The medical officer of health asked my ministry for information as to what companies were available, what companies were in the field and which had the aircraft available. We informed both the city and the medical officer of health of that and the decision was made locally.

REGIONAL GOVERNMENT

Mr. Reed: I have a question for the Minister of Treasury, Economics and Intergovernmental Affairs. Considering the minister's admissions a week ago last Wednesday at the Halton regional meeting that there is duplication evident between municipal and regional governments and that some functions of government can be better performed at the municipal level, does he mean he is now willing to consider redistribution of at least some of the power back to the municipalities?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Mr. Speaker, I am sure these are matters which are being considered by the Halton regional council and by the area municipalities. In due course they may make recommendations to me and to the government for change which we will consider at that time.

Mr. Roy: How come you have got those heavyweights on today?

DAIRY INDUSTRY

Mr. Wiseman: A question of the Minister of Agriculture and Food: In light of the federal government's recent action to cut domestic production of milk and at the same time to allow increased imports of manufactured dairy products, what action does the minister see his ministry taking to protect the dairy industry of eastern Ontario?

Mr. Sargent: Glad you asked that question.

Hon. W. Newman: In answer to the question—

Mr. Sargent: Let me hear you.

Hon. W. Newman: I have been waiting for one of you to ask the question; I thought you might show some concern about it.

Mr. Roy: Why didn't you make a statement in the House?

Mr. Deans: Why didn't you make a statement rather than wait for a question?

Interjections.

Hon. W. Newman: I am not going to make a statement; I am going to answer the question.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. We are wasting valuable time. Order, the hon. minister has the floor.

Mr. Sargent: Read it the way you rehearsed it.

Hon. W. Newman: Mr. Speaker, I think the shortest way to answer the question is to read the Telex I sent to the Hon. Eugene Whelan in Ottawa:

> We are in receipt of a news release of Nov. 4 relative to the future dairy policies. It is completely unacceptable to us to effect the cut in domestic production and at the same time allow increased imports of manufactured dairy products into this country as stated in this news release. I would appreciate from you the detailed reasons why the dairy industry in Canada should be cut back while at the same time products from offshore will be allowed to flow more freely into this country.

Mr. Roy: You couldn't carry Eugene's shoes.

LANGSTAFF JAIL FARM

Mr. Philip: A question for the Treasurer and Minister of Economics: Why was the former Langstaff jail farm excluded from the Woodbridge to Richmond Hill sector of the parkway belt west plan and are you prepared to consider re-including it as requested by the 223 residents who are affected in that area?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Including the Langstaff jail farm?

Mr. Philip: Yes.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Mr. Speaker, we have dealt with that matter before. The Langstaff jail farm is owned by the city of Toronto and to some extent, when we designate something within the parkway belt for public open space, we are indicating that perhaps we

should be purchasing. We have no intention at this moment, to my knowledge, of purchasing it. It's there. I think there is some responsibility, perhaps, with the city of Toronto as to what ultimately happens to it. But, no, it's not my present intention to include the farm in the parkway belt.

That part west of the railway line, which would be a third or a quarter of the property, is better suited for industrial purposes in the long run, but not that part east of the rail line. My colleague the Minister of Energy (Mr. Timbrell) has been making representations on behalf of people in that particular area and we have had staff meetings with them and may well meet with them although the final parkway plan, draft plan—the draft plan under the legislation—has now gone to the printer and has gone to bed. So no further changes will be made in the plan, other than those arising from the hearings.

I might also say that arising out of the staff meetings, the community itself suggested some variations in the alignment and we are studying those. If they prove practical in terms of the city of Toronto, of Ontario Hydro, and the Ministry of Transportation and Communications, and meet the parkway belt criteria, then some modification to the plan may be possible. That would be introduced by the government at the hearing. In terms of the plan which will be published in the next five or six weeks, no further changes are contemplated.

VIOLENCE IN CITIES

Mr. Cunningham: My question is to the Attorney General: Mr. Speaker, with the tremendous increase in crime, especially in the city of Toronto as it relates to violent crime—more specifically I am referring to the untimely and unfortunate death of a young girl in the city the other day—I am wondering if the hon. minister would indicate to this House, and through us of course to the people of Ontario, what plans his ministry has for eliminating some of this? What is the possibility of redirecting the hon. minister's efforts from violence in Maple Leaf Gardens and the violence that we see on television to the violence that we are seeing in the streets today?

Mr. MacDonald: He is trying to outdo Sid Brown.

Hon. Mr. McMurtry: Mr. Speaker, I would be delighted to speak or respond to the hon. member's question for some hours. We really have been giving the problem of violent activity in society, insofar as it represents a breach of the Criminal Code, very serious consideration. I reported to the House the other day our recommendations to the federal government with respect to amendments to the Criminal Code dealing with the violent offender. I believe I reported that, and I believe that we can reasonably expect that the federal government will be bringing in legislation dealing with this problem very shortly.

[2:45]

Certainly with respect to violence in the streets generally, one of the great problems is resources involving police departments, which is of course a matter for my colleague, the Solicitor General (Mr. MacBeth).

I could say I am most interested in the problem of expediting the trial of criminal charges through our courts, because I view the lengthy delays that often occur between an arrest and the ultimate trial disposition of a matter as having a detrimental influence on the effectiveness of law enforcement. I can assure my friend that this is also one area that we're looking at very carefully.

There are a number of other matters, but I don't think it would be appropriate to take up the time of the House at this particular moment. If my friend would like to speak to me privately, I would be very happy to pursue the matter.

Mr. Reid: Make a statement tomorrow.

Mr. Ruston: Supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. We just have a very few moments left. That was a very general question with a very general answer which must have covered the waterfront, I think.

Mr. Ruston: No, it didn't. He missed one very important point.

Mr. Speaker: Maybe we'll get to you next if you'll just sit down.

NORTHERN INDIAN RESERVES EMPLOYMENT PROGRAMME

Mrs. Bryden: Mr. Speaker, I'm not sure to whom to address this question because I'm referring to a statement made by a triumvirate of ministers in Kenora about 10 days ago regarding a proposed programme to help the Indians on the Grassy Narrows and Whitedog reserves, whose livelihood has been threatened

by the mercury pollution there. I did ask one of the triumvirate last night in the Health estimates and he said that this particular part, that is—

An hon. member: What's the question?

Mr. Speaker: If you ask one of them, I think it might be referred.

Mrs. Bryden: —the programme to create new forms of employment, was not under his jurisdiction. Therefore, I would like to ask the other two members of the triumvirate, namely the Minister of the Environment (Mr. Kerr) and the Minister of Natural Resources—

Mr. Speaker: You may ask one of them one question.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Make sure you guess right.

Mrs. Bryden: Perhaps I'll try the Minister of Natural Resources first.

An hon. member: Take your choice. You will get the same answer regardless of which one you choose.

Mrs. Bryden: How much is being provided for this employment-creating programme for the Indians in this area, and what sort of programmes are being proposed to provide them with an alternative means of employment?

Hon. Mr. Bernier: Mr. Speaker, if I may respond to that question—

Mr. Sargent: The answer is no.

Hon. Mr. Bernier: —I think that I should point out that we've had two meetings recently with Treaty No. 3 and the chiefs of both reserves; one was down here in Toronto and that was followed up by another one in Kenora, at which time they presented us a long list of ideas and suggestions that we are prepared to look at. We also indicated to them at that time that we would look at the possibility, and in fact we assured them, that we would be placing a co-ordinator in Kenora with a certain amount of funds that is yet to be determined, to process and to remove some of the bureaucratic red tape in getting some of these employment programmes going on their specific reserves.

I might say that Management Board has recently approved a specific grant for two skidders for the Grassy Narrows area. My own ministry has allocated certain timber limits adjacent to both reserves. However, I have to point out that the logging opportunities are not being taken up to the fullest extent. As an example, over the last five years the Indians in that area have had the opportunity of cutting about 15,000 cords but they've only cut about 3,000. We see this happening with their trapping opportunities; they're not trapping their full quota of beaver, as an example.

These are problems that we're working on at the present time with the chiefs and with Treaty No. 3. I'm confident we'll have something that will be very acceptable to the bands themselves, and I'm sure the hon. member is aware that we've placed two community freezers on those reserves—

Mr. Nixon: Community freezers was the final answer just a year ago.

Hon. Mr. Bernier: No, it wasn't a year ago —at a cost of about $140,000. This year we've budgeted about $100,000 in next year's programme to keep those freezers supplied with fish from uncontaminated lakes so that a source of protein would be supplied to replace the source that was lost to them because of the mercury-contaminated waters.

Mr. Germa: Question, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. There is just time for one more question, and I think we should allow that to the Liberal Party. The member for Kitchener-Wilmot has a question?

KITCHENER COURTHOUSE

Mr. Sweeney: Mr. Speaker, a question of the Minister of Government Services: Would the minister explain why her ministry approved a leaseback contract for a courthouse in the city of Kitchener to a Montreal firm at a cost of $750,000 per year, or a total cost of $15 million, when local contractors have indicated it could be built in full and paid for over that 20 years at considerably less?

Hon. Mrs. Scrivener: I will take the question under advisement, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: The question period has expired.

Petitions.

Presenting reports.

Mrs. Campbell presented the report of the select committee to consider Bills 4 and 5, which was read as follows and adopted:

Your committee begs to report the following bill without amendment:

Bill 4, An Act to amend the Ontario Energy Board Act.

Mr. Speaker: Shall the bill be ordered for third reading?

No? Then it will go to the committee of the whole House.

Hon. Mr. McKeough presented the report of the Ontario Municipal Improvement Corp. for the year ending March 31, 1975; the report of the Ontario Universities Capital Aid Corp. for the year ended March 31, 1975; the report of the Ontario Educational Capital Aid Corp. for the year ended March 31, 1975, and the report of the Public Service Superannuation Fund for the year ended March 31, 1975.

Hon. Mr. Auld presented the Civil Service Commission report for the fiscal year 1974-1975.

Mr. Speaker: Motions.

Introduction of bills.

HIGHWAY TRAFFIC AMENDMENT ACT

Mr. Roy moved first reading of bill intituled, An Act to amend the Highway Traffic Act.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Mr. Roy: Mr. Speaker, I have introduced this bill now on two different occasions. It is the legislation dealing with the mandatory use of seatbelts. It seems to me that with the latest report from the provincial Ministry of Transportation and Communications, which indicates that 476 people, or 61.2 per cent of automobile drivers who were killed in 1974, were not wearing seatbelts and 5.9 per cent of the drivers—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. Just the principle of the bill is involved.

Mr. Roy: I am sorry; I can't hear the Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: We just must explain the principle of the bill, which I think the member has done. Are there further bills?

Mr. Roy: Mr. Speaker, because of the importance of this legislation, I should be allowed to make a short statement.

Mr. Speaker: No, not at the introduction of first reading. Any further bills?

Mr. Roy: Mr. Speaker, I have not finished my statement.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. Your statement should only include the principle of the bill, not the facts and figures or debating it.

Mr. Roy: That's right; that is why the principle is so important, and that is why I am bringing it in.

Mr. Speaker: We would just like the principle of the bill.

Mr. Roy: Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this legislation is to make seatbelts mandatory and to make the enforcement on a gradual basis. I would hope the government would show leadership in this field.

Mr. Speaker: That is the principle of the bill.

Mr. Yakabuski: What is that about leadership?

Mr. Speaker: Yes, the hon. member for St. Andrew-St. Patrick. Order, please, for the introduction of a bill.

ELECTION AMENDMENT ACT

Mr. Grossman moved first reading of bill intituled, An Act to amend the Election Act.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Mr. Grossman: This bill, in effect, would shorten the period of election from 37 days to 30 days and would also amend the advance polling days to provide that the advance polls be three days in number, and be Thursday, Friday and Saturday prior to the election day; and it does, in fact, all fit in with a resolution I have on the order paper.

POST-RETIREMENT INTEGRATION OF INSURANCE MONEYS AND PENSION BENEFITS PREVENTION ACT

Mr. Laughren moved first reading of bill intituled, An Act to prevent the Post-Retirement Integration of Insurance Moneys and Pension Benefits with Increases in Government Social Security Plans.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Mr. Laughren: Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this bill is to prevent the reduction of moneys paid out under an insurance or pension plan because of a general increase or cost of living increase in a government social security plan with which it may be integrated.

Mr. Speaker: Orders of the day.

Clerk of the House: The sixth order, resuming the adjourned debate on the motion for second reading of Bill 8, An Act to amend the Assessment Act.

ASSESSMENT AMENDMENT ACT
(continued)

Mr. Cassidy: Mr. Speaker, I was just beginning to speak when we adjourned the debate last Thursday, and I have managed to be back here in time for this particular debate. There were two ancillary issues I would like to raise with the minister before coming to the question of condominiums which is central to the bill. The first of those questions is a particular question which is affected by the move the ministry is making in this bill and elsewhere—the gradual move toward market value assessment.

West Carleton is the particular area. I have discussed this with the minister and it happens they are in advance of the rest of the province. They have moved to market value assessment because of a chaotic situation that had been created through the appeal process with the old assessment system. The new rolls are out and there is enormous concern, I would say to this House and to the minister, about the results, because there has been no weighting of the results and because there has been what can only be described as a perverse kind of unfair assessment given to one particular class of property, which is essentially not open to challenge by the general ratepayers of that municipality.

Let me give the results very briefly. The report which has been issued on the west Carleton reassessment indicates that residential land assessments are up by 276 per cent, residential dwellings are down a fraction, by 6.9 per cent, recreational land is up by 93 per cent and recreational dwellings are down by 4.6 per cent. But then when you come to farm land the situation is quite different. The overall effect on residential land and dwellings and so on is a doubling to a trebling of their overall assessment. The overall effect on vacant or unoccupied or speculative land that is not used for farm purposes is in certain cases a quintupling or even a tenfold increase in assessment. But farm land assessment is down by 66.5 per cent and the assessment on farm dwellings in the area is down by 50 per cent.

[3:00]

The results, if I can give some examples to the minister: A house increased in valuation for assessment purposes from $20,000 to $60,000 according to the market value programme in west Carleton. People in the area accepted the $60,000 as probably about right; the appeal process will establish any mistakes which may have been made.

Land valued at $2,500 for 25 acres was increased in value for assessment purposes to $25,000. That assessment is probably excessive, but if it's an excessive assessment the owners can appeal it through the appeal process, measure it against recent sales and come up with a figure which is fair.

But after a $60,000 home and 25 acres valued at $25,000, we have a reduction on 92 acres plus a house and a barn, classified as farm land, from $30,000 or $40,000 to $18,000 in assessment. That means the house, which is occupied, the barn, the farm and 92 acres are assessed at a sum which is considerably less than the assessment on 25 vacant acres of scrub recreational land in the same vicinity. Not only that but the tax on that farm, which is running at about one per cent of assessment, will be $180 or so, of which 50 per cent will be rebated to the owner through the farm tax abatement programme of TEIGA, the Treasury.

Another example: A farmer who, people assure me, is not bona fide—he hasn't turned sod or ploughed a furrow for 30 years and hasn't raised an animal for that period of time—has 85 acres and a house which were valued at around $75,000. The assessment has come down to only $25,000, the same assessment put on 25 acres of vacant land held for the long term.

The minister said yesterday that he would look into this when I talked with him privately. He also said that people in west Carleton have the right to challenge the assessment on the farm land. However, that is an exceptionally difficult thing to do and they should not have to do it. It's perverse, it's difficult, it's expensive.

The results are inequitable unless they manage to challenge every last farm assessment, because it is not one or two individual farm properties which have been wrongfully assessed. It appears to be all farm properties both because of the questionable definition of farms on some hobby and recreational properties and because of the very sharp cuts which were given.

The principle that appeared to have been used by the ministry was that in assessing farm land, they took some artificial figure, designed to measure what one farmer would

pay to another for farm land if they didn't happen to be 25 miles from downtown Ottawa. Farm land for farming purposes is obviously changing hands at values far in excess of the $200 or $300 which is indicated by these farm assessments. I would hope that the minister, having had some advance warning, could give us an answer on that.

In the same general area I am sorry the Act does not really touch the problem, which is emerging, about commercial assessment according to the new guidelines being used by the ministry. In west Carleton there are 400 or 500 people who have appeared twice at meetings to protest the unfairness of the situation to which they are being exposed. The small businessmen of the province haven't yet got to that point with commercial assesment.

In shopping plazas which are held by one owner and let out, the ministry is apparently moving to a new basis of apportionment of assessment and of taxes, based on the proportion of the total rent which each individual merchant pays. In these cases, the tax is paid by the tenant and not by the landlord. The effect is—

Hon. Mr. Meen: What's that?

Mr. Cassidy: This is normal on these leases. It's a net lease and the consequence, as I understand it, is that the tenant has to pay the tax on his property.

Mr. Speaker: I must remind the hon. member that he cannot debate something which is not in the bill. The bill has been passed in principle and I wish you would confine your remarks to the principle of the bill.

Mr. Cassidy: The bill has not been passed in principle, Mr. Speaker, but I accept what you have to say. I will conclude that point which I hope the minister will look into by saying the effect is that as the leases on small stores rise rapidly with increasing turnover, they are being forced out of business by increasing taxes, while people like Eatons and Simpsons, do not pay those increases and pay a much lower rate per square foot both in rent and in taxes.

Mr. Good: Now we can start on the bill.

Mr. Cassidy: I admit there was a digression, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Good: It's all out of order.

Mr. Ruston: Why do you permit that, Mr. Speaker?

Mr. Cassidy: That was for a period for about 1½ minutes as Mr. Speaker will acknowledge. Mr. Speaker is aware, as well, that I'm capable of extended digressions and that this, in view of his new eminence, is a very limited one.

On the question of condominiums, it's obvious we welcome the conversion of the government on this question. We approve of the principle that condominiums will henceforth be valued at the same percentage of market value as single family residences in the same neighbourhood. It seems to us that a perverse situation had been created by the ministry in respect to a form of housing which was initially launched six or seven years ago in this province in order to give people a more economical alternative to single-family ownership. It was rather bizarre that people buying condominiums, at half or two-thirds the cost of single family accommodation were having to pay taxes that were equal or greater than that on single family accommodation in the same area.

The hon. minister said that this ministry has been studying this for the last four or five years. I have two comments on that. In the first place, if they've been studying it that long they should have acted sooner because there was such an evident injustice. In the second place, I question to some extent, what the hon. minister has to say, or I question the profundity of the study being taken, because when I talked with ministry officials three or four weeks ago, including those at the very top of the ministry, they were totally unaware of the fact there was a problem. The hon. minister, I think, may regret now the fact that his party was also virtually unaware of the problem.

I can to say to you, Mr. Speaker, being sympathetic to people on this side of the House in your non-oratorical capacity, that there was really quite an astounding meeting held at the Chateau Vanier—a condominium in Ottawa—by the condominium owners of the Fair Assessment for Taxpayers Committee during the course of the election. When representatives from the three parties were asked for their position, the Liberals said that they would set up a committee of the House to look into it because they didn't understand it. We said that not only should condominiums be taxed on the same proportion of market value as single families, but it should be made retroactive, at least for 1975. The Conservative candidate wandered in 1¾ hour late, in high spirits, and totally ignorant about the entire question.

All of the elaborate machinery which Hugh Segal and the other people in the Conservative campaign had created in order to inform the candidates about the issue and the positions of the Bill Davis-Arthur Meen government was for naught, because the Conservative representative had nothing meaningful to say. That may be one of the reasons why the member for Carleton East (Mrs. Gigantes) now graces this Legislature rather than the Premier's (Mr. Davis) former assistant to the former member for Carleton East because of the very strong reaction of condominium owners who knew that they had a just cause and who despaired of ever getting just treatment from the government.

The support that was given the NDP in other ridings like Ottawa West and Ottawa South and Etobicoke is clearly also linked to the fact that it was only the NDP that had been publicly pressing for action to give condominium owners a reasonable kind of deal.

I would appreciate from the hon. minister during the course of this debate a commitment which I think he's prepared to make about the treatment of appeals that are now before the Assessment Appeal Board, or the divisional courts, or even the Supreme Court of Ontario. This government has fought like crazy to avoid giving condominium owners a fair deal.

The most notable case is the Grange case referring to a condominium in Etobicoke. If I can go through the various levels that this has gone through: The assessment was originally unfair. The condominium owners in the Grange condominium appealed to the assessment review court and the assessment review court said they were right that they should be assessed on the same percentage of market value as the nearby single family properties.

The ministry didn't like that at all and decided to send it to the Assessment Appeal Board which is, I think, the local county court judge. The county court judge—that was Judge Phelan—upheld the review court's decision in favour of the condominium owners.

The government then decided to refer to the Ontario Municipal Board. The Municipal Board said they found no evidence to overturn the county court judge. Then the government went along to the Ontario Court of Appeal, which tossed it back to the Ontario Municipal Board because it said the Ontario Municipal Board had not established what the assessment rate should have been. If I understand correctly it was either before the OMB or it was on its way to the Supreme Court of Ontario at this point. Enormous amounts of tax money had been spent by the government in order to frustrate the efforts of condominium owners to get a square deal, and many cases were backed up because of this. They were awaiting the results of the Grange decision. It was just perverse the way the ministry was working.

I understand, from what the minister has said privately, that he is prepared to settle the appeals that are now at various stages on the basis of the principles that are in this bill. In relation to the Ottawa condominiums, that would mean that the majority of condominium owners in Ottawa will get retroactivity at least to 1975, and in certain cases before.

On consideration—and having said that I would work for retroactivity at least for a year—I guess my own personal feeling is that the disruption of rewriting every condominium assessment—effectively every major municipal tax role in the entire province resulting from an amendment to make this entire process retrocative by a year—is pretty substantial. Therefore, if the minister will settle these appeals on that principle, the people hurt most, and who therefore appealed, will get justice and all condominium owners will get fair treatment in the future.

The final point that I want to raise, Mr. Speaker, is on the question of the mill rates paid by condominium owners and the services they provide for themselves. If one thinks in particular of garbage, snow removal, roads and recreation facilities, condominium corporations have become municipalities in themselves. They provide many services provided in other cases to individual ratepayers, single family dwellers, other people who live in a municipality by the municipal government.

In typical cases in Ottawa where this is now being researched, the cost paid by the condominium on those items of garbage, snow removal, road maintenance, reserves for road reconstruction, recreation facilities, pools, that sort of thing, amount to 15 or 20 per cent of the tax bill that they are paying to the municipality.

It is very substantial. We are not just talking about peanuts. Even if you discounted a certain amount of spending which the condominium owners do for themselves—which is higher on a per capita basis than a municipality might pay for those facilities—you are still into an area of maybe 10 to 15 per cent of the average condominium owners tax bill. This he pays out to the municipality and then pays again in his condominium charge for services which the

municipality doesn't provide to him. This needs to be sorted out.

Condiminium owners feel it acutely. They are beginning to hone in on exactly what techniques ought to be used. It seems to me that the minister might contribute to this debate at this time, get his people to work out what kind of an assessment arrangement can be made in order to give them justice in the mill rate question. This would compensate them for services they provide themselves.

There are various solutions: a percentage cut across the board on condominum assessments to take into account the average amount of effort they put in for themselves and which offsets what the municipalities do; a split mill rate for condominiums, although I'm not too cheerful about that one; or a requirement for municipalities to negotiate and either provide services that the condominium owners now provide for themselves or to pay the condominium owners for providing them.

It is done in the case of Chateau Vanier; precedents like that have been set. But the problem condominium people have is that they have no leverage to get the municipality to sit down and negotiate if the municipality is saving money because of services the condomnium owners provide for themselves.

We don't propose to bring in an amendment at this time. It's something that the condominium people themselves are still working out in terms of how to do it. But I think they would welcome a commitment from the ministry to agree that something should be done and done soon and that the ministry will cooperate in doing that. I would like to see it come during the course of passage of the amendments, which are in principle very welcome.

[3:15]

Mrs. Gigantes: Mr. Speaker, I would like to support the propositions put forward by my fellow member from the Ottawa area. As he pointed out, condominiums and the problems associated with the purchase and use of condominium housing has over the last few years been a major problem in the Ottawa area.

We made an estimate during the campaign that in Carleton East we probably had 4,000 condominium units, and five years ago I would doubt that there were any in that riding. These people have had a difficult time right from the start because of the lack of condominium legislation in general. Over the last few years they have moved up from one level of sophistication and got over some of the legal problems they had becoming incorporated and dealing with developers in their condominium association. They have had to become something of tax experts in order to try and work out some kind of arrangement whereby they are not going to suffer a kind of double taxation—an unfair duplication of taxation.

Here again I am attempting to underline the points the hon. member for Ottawa Centre has raised already. The charges associated with condominium living are covering a great many of the services that are ordinarily provided for municipalities.

There is one condominium in Carleton East which serves as a very excellent example of the nature of this problem. It's the Highland condominium on St. Laurent Blvd. within the Ottawa city limits. It consists of two large towers with many units.

It was estimated by the people in that association that these units, detached and made into single family dwellings, would extend over three and a half miles of St. Laurent Blvd., on both sides of the street. At the same time condominium units with $50,000-$60,000 in market value were being assessed at a higher level than single detached homes of the same market value in the same neighbourhood.

Probably the bill, when it is worked through, won't be effective in all cases until 1976, but it will provide some measure of equality of assessment. It will not provide any kind of relief for condominium owners who are paying twice for services—as the hon. member from Ottawa mentioned street maintenance, lighting, snow removal, even sewers, water, fire hydrants, garbage removal, recreation; and security, because many condominium associations provide their own members with some measure of internal security within their development.

So I would add my voice to his in asking the ministry to take up these questions, to consider them very seriously. I would also underline the point he made about our voters' understanding of a lack of concern on the part of the government before this election. My Conservative opponent during the elections had the gall to suggest to these condominium owners at the Highland that they should refuse to pay their municipal taxes. I think the provincial government is to be commended for recognizing that it has responsibility for guiding municipalities in this matter. I should think it should seek to extend that responsibility and try to work out with con-

dominium associations exactly how a fair mill rate assessment can now be established.

Mrs. Bryden: Mr. Speaker, I think elections are wonderful things because they seem to get action on problems that have been with us for quite a long time.

Condominiums were established in this province less than a decade ago and there were a lot of problems in connection with their operation. Very gradually the legislation concerning them has been improved, but there is still a lot of room for further improvement, and this is one of them. Therefore I welcome this piece of legislation, but it did take a long time to bring this measure of justice to condominium owners.

I also welcome the fact that it applies to co-operative apartment buildings, although most of the debate seems to have centred on condominiums. Co-operative apartment buildings have been suffering from the same sort of discrimination in assessment, and I welcome bringing them under this particular piece of legislation.

I think the fact that the government appears to have been operating on the principle that you can put off until tomorrow anything that should be done today justifies the request which my colleague made for some system of compensation for the overtaxation of co-operative and condominium dwellers over the past four or five years due to the lack of this legislation. I would suggest that the minister seriously consider working out a system of compensating these owners in some degree, either on application, or as my colleague suggested, if they have appealed considering it as part of their appeal.

There is only one other point I would like to make. Even though we are giving some tax relief to condominium and co-operative apartment dwellers, we are not really giving them very much relief from the overall burden of the property tax which is hitting all homeowners of this province. There is a time bomb ticking away on that property tax which this government doesn't seem to be recognizing and which is going to affect condominium and co-ops as much as anybody else. I think it is time the government did bring in some proposals for defusing that time bomb. I am referring to the market value assessment which has been postponed until the government hoped elections would be over for a good long time and could bring in the change.

It is going to have to face up to the fact that the moratorium on the bringing in of the market value assessment will soon expire. It appears there is going to be a very substantial shift in the burden of taxation from commercial and industrial to residential homeowners as a result of that reassessment because of the fact that market values have gone up much faster in the residential field. Homeowners are going to have to be protected against that kind of very radical shift in the burden of taxation. The government has yet to bring in any proposals on how it intends to protect them or to cushion that change so that there is not a very substantial increase in homeowner taxes.

There is another thing these condominium and co-operative owners face. The provincial Treasurer (Mr. McKeough) announced the other day that his pass-through of additional aid to the municipalities is going to be reduced to five per cent or six per cent next year even though provincial revenues will go up 12 per cent or 13 per cent. The reason seems to be that during the election year there were a lot of tax cuts to titillate the voters, shall we say, and these tax cuts reduced revenues in this year, which meant that the municipalities were overpaid on what they call the "Edmonton formula" where the provincial grants to the municipalities go up at the same rate as their provincial revenues.

If there is an overpayment on that formula, if the municipalities got more than the percentage increase in the provincial grant, then the province takes it back the next year. This is what the provincial Treasurer indicated to the provincial municipal liaison committee last week is going to happen. That is going to mean a very substantial increase in the property tax rate next year, because I am sure no municipality can operate on a five per cent to six per cent increase with the way the cost of living is going.

That is something I think this bill just doesn't deal with and it is something the government should be looking at.

Hon. Mr. Meen: Mr. Speaker, I welcome this debate, as indeed I welcomed the opportunity to introduce the bill at virtually the earliest opportunity when this House reconvened this fall.

The first speaker in the opposition ranks suggested that the amendment stems from a reaction by the voters on Sept. 18. The member for Ottawa West (Mr. Morrow), I think, put that to rest, but let me underscore some of the history of that.

The matter came to my attention quite graphically in about June this year—I think it may even have been May of this year—but in any event it was quite early in the summer.

I set the staff to work to find out if these problems were as widespread as I was led to believe and as significant as I was told. By roughly, July, I suppose, it was abundantly clear to me that the problem was real, widespread and certainly unjust.

In the summer, well before Sept. 18—yes, it was the hon. member for Yorkview (Mr. Young) who made this allegation—I undertook to do something about it and I proposed two things actually. I proposed the amendment which the House now has before it to include condominiums and co-operatives. I don't know whether I actually thought in terms of co-operatives because they are a small sector of this problem, but certainly I made reference to condominiums and undertook to include them in the section dealing with the definition of a residential owner-occupied dwelling.

I also had the thought that there might just conceivably be a pretty heavy tax loss in some municipalities by this reduction in assessment on condominiums, so I set the staff to work on that score as well to see what kind of dollars we were talking about. I was concerned later on to learn that really there wasn't any—and it's a result of the Edmonton commitment my people advise me —whereby in this year, or indeed next year, the province could assist the municipalities with some form of additional grant to make up for that loss of revenue. That would not be within the four corners of what I was told was implicit in the Edmonton commitment.

However, fortunately, it turned out that the degree of shift of that burden from condominiums to all other taxpayers in the municipalities concerned—which are Hamilton, Toronto and Ottawa mainly; a little bit, I am told, out in Mississauga and Peel, but that's essentially it—is minimal. There is so much other industrial, commercial and residential assessment in these municipalities that the shift is so fractional in terms of percentage and mill rate as to be of no real consequence. I took heart at that and at least we were able to do what I felt was the fair thing to do, namely to treat condominiums as owner-occupied dwellings have traditionally been treated.

The member for St. George (Mrs. Campbell)—I don't see her in her seat at the moment—asked me about our approach to mixed use when a part of a condominium unit may be owner-occupied and another part may be tenanted, so to speak. We would still assess all those units as though they were owner-occupied in the same fashion as we assess every single family or detached residential dwelling—as though it were owner-occupied and not an income producing property.

That same member, the member for St. George, asked me about the shift from commercial to residential and wanted to know what factors would be used to avoid the shift. A number of members have raised this question and I do want to touch on this point.

[3:30]

If I don't refer to other members in the course of this reply I hope they'll understand that I'm not exactly about to reply to each one of them individually. But the fact is that we all know, and we have known for years, since the Smith committee of 1967 drew that to our attention, as did the select committee of 1968 chaired by John White, which a number of us in this House had the pleasure and privilege of sitting on as members that summer. It was drawn to our attention graphically at that time that were we to go to market value assessment—which is the mechanism which the Smith committee had recommended —without some kind of factoring of the assessments in the residential end, there would be a pretty substantial shift of the tax burden from the industrial and commercial sector on the one hand to the residential sector on the other.

And so it is necessary for us to study the assessments in all of the areas of Ontario to determine what factors should be applied.

I might say, Mr. Speaker, that the entire picture of market value assessment, which we undertook in 1970, was completed about July this year. At present there is a committee in the Ministry of Treasury studying this wealth of material my staff has collected. To analyse it they will be putting together computer models of typical municipalities to determine, when they feed in the assessment figures, what kind of shift would occur, and therefore to determine what kind of factoring should be applied to the assessments so the shift will not occur.

Also developing out of our studies and our complete revaluation at market value, has come the further realization—I would expect that those knowledgeable in the field were aware of it long before—that without appropriate policy decision—yet to be made— there could well be shifts of tax burden within a class. This applies to all three—there could be a shift within the industrial class; there could be a shift within the commercial class; and we know that there can be a shift within the residential classes.

There are properties in this city of Toronto still assessed on the basis of an old act passed in 1919, and repealed in 1920, that gave war veterans a preferential assessment which has stayed on those properties ever since. Those properties presumably have an enhanced market value today, reflecting the fact that they pay a pittance in real estate tax. Obviously those taxes will have to come up.

We also found, sir, in the course of doing the assessments across this province, that over a quarter of million pieces of real estate had no assessment on them at all; or were assessed as vacant land when they carried substantial dwellings and other buildings on them. Whether this was due to oversight or whether it was due to other motivation—which I need not dwell on—created in the days when the assessors were municipally-employed rather than provincial employees under our guidelines and the practices which my ministry follows, I cannot say. All I can say is that those properties, when they come on at market value assessment in 1976 for the 1977 year will experience a pretty dramatic increase too.

I don't think we would want to do too much about those because they've been getting a free ride for years. But there are many others that have been paying a relatively high tax who might experience an upward swing, and there are others who might very well experience a downward swing, in the amount of tax that they pay. Now we must assess all of these. The committee in the Ministry of Treasury is studying this at present and will have some recommendations for us, presumably in the next six months. We will have to study this and determine what kind of approach to make to bring properties like this into equity so that everyone is paying a fair and proper tax based on the value of his property.

Mr. Good: That's not going to leave you much time, from next spring to next fall, to do it.

Hon. Mr. Meen: It is thought that with the studies hopefully completed by the summer, it will be possible to reach the determinations of the policies to follow in time for any necessary amendments to the Assessment Act this time next year, or earlier probably, perhaps in October next year, for the assessment rolls in 1976 for 1977 if, indeed, we factor the assessments, or for mill rates if one goes the other way. Those are two basic ways in which you can cushion the tax flow; because the figures for tax is the product of the two, you can adjust the end product by either adjusting the mill rate or the assessment.

The member for Algoma (Mr. Wildman) spoke about Judge Vannini's judgement concerning mobile homes and mobile home parks, but he did indicate that he realized that was not really germane to this debate. I do have some observations to make to him, because I think he could not have read the judge's judgement or he would have understood that what the judge was saying was that if a home had the wheels removed from it he was going to consider that it was sufficiently affixed to the realty, that it would be treated as realty and would be subject to assessment. But if it still had the wheels underneath it, he would consider it sufficiently of a mobile nature that it would not become affixed to the realty, regardless of whether there were drains into septic systems and the like attached to it. He would then say: "All right, you can't assess it for real estate purposes, but as everyone knows we amended the Municipal Act so that those properties are subject to licence fees."

He might want to take a look at Judge Vannini's judgement in its entirety, and perhaps he and I could have some discussions later if he wishes to go into it further.

The member for Waterloo North (Mr. Good) gave a summary, I might say with respect slightly inaccurately, of the history of the assessment rolls and their values here in Ontario.

Mr. Nixon: I've never known him to be wrong before.

Hon. Mr. Meen: I might just correct a couple of items in his observations. He observed that apartment assessments had run in the 40 to 50 per cent region, and that two or three years after assessments were frozen we arbitrarily and unilaterally and without authority under the Act reduced it from the frozen figure—that is, after assessments were allegedly frozen—to 25 per cent.

Mr. Good: It was 25 per cent.

Hon. Mr. Meen: I would just like to correct him on his understanding. It is my understanding, and I have been so advised, that there were a host of apartment-owner appeals before the courts in 1969. When we took over assessments, but before it was frozen, we negotiated with those owners and determined that they were, indeed, highly overassessed. We set their figures at 25 per cent by agreement with them, and then the assessment rolls were frozen. That was in 1970.

To get a little background picture on this matter, one has to look at what has transpired since 1970. Apartment values have not increased substantially.

Mr. Good: Would you then get your staff to tell you the same things they tell me?

Hon. Mr. Meen: They have increased a little bit, but today apartment values still run in this frozen state at around, I'm told, 24 to 25 per cent of the fair market value of the properties, of the apartment houses. Whereas in 1970 owner-occupied residential dwellings—when I say residential properties I'm thinking of that type—ran at the order of 15, 17 or 20 per cent; somewhere in that region if my memory serves me. Obviously, real estate values have continued to go up, and since those assessments are frozen they have represented a continually reducing percentage of the market value of owner-occupied residential dwellings, to the point where today they are in the order of 10 per cent of fair market value.

Condominiums, under the Act, as they have come into popularity in the last couple or three years only, condominiums have—and we have been required to do this—have been assessed on the same basis as their look-alikes, highrise apartment buildings. So they have wound up with an assessment that pressed upward toward 24 and 25 per cent. I am told that this happened with condominiums that are conversions from apartment houses because their assessments were frozen. So when you converted an apartment house to a condominium, you were nailed with an assessment that was of the range of 24 or 25 per cent.

New condominiums, however, were given somewhat of a beneficial treatment. I am told their assessments were in the order of 15 to 17 per cent. All the same, this is substantially larger than the 10 per cent figure that was attributable to owner-occupied residential dwellings of the lowrise style. Hence this inconsistency of about 50 per cent, or something of that sort.

One of the members opposite suggested I should explain the press report of the $200 saving per condominium. That arose through an illustration which I gave to the press at the time I introduced this legislation. I pointed out that the kind of situation that gave rise to the problem was like this: A gentleman would sell a home in a municipality for, shall we say $60,000. Let's say, for instance, that he was paying real estate taxes on that property of $600. That was the illustration I gave. Then, with the $60,000, he purchased a condominium unit in the same municipality and wound up getting a tax bill for about $800. Therein is the spread of $200 which I indicated as being patently unjust for two properties of the same, or roughly the same, market value equivalent. It was that sort of thing that made it very clear that something ought to be done.

In fact, my staff advised me that on average the reduction in tax among the condominium and co-operative owners in 1976 will be about—well maybe it is for the year 1975 for that matter—will be about $230. So my little illustration was not very far off. There will be some where that reduction will be more dramatic than that.

The condominium that is a conversion from an apartment house, for instance, I would expect might see their tax bill cut in half, whereas the new condominium, assessed at say 15 or 17 per cent and being dropped to 10, is going to come roughly down to two-thirds. That is going to depend again on the value of the property, just what the dollar saving is, but it is going to be, certainly, something significant.

Mr. Roy: What about the appeals?

Hon. Mr. Meen: Yes, I will come to the appeals, Mr. Speaker, in a moment.

There were a number of other questions asked. I don't want to duplicate, so I am just skimming down these to see whether there are any in here. I don't want to miss anything.

Oh yes, there was one point here the member for Waterloo North had also mentioned, but I think I have covered it. The market value assessment out in Peel is one that was started some years ago. We have done that again, as I understand it, on the 1970 values, rather than the 1960 values for which the region of Peel is presently assessed. It isn't possible. Somebody suggested that we have had two or three years to come up with these factors. Well we haven't; we only got the assessment finished last July. Indeed if we had gotten it finished as soon as the hon. member had suggested, we wouldn't have had to extend the freeze from 1975 to 1977.

[3:45]

Had all been well, we would have been able to get onto market value assessment across all of Ontario in the year 1974 for this taxation year 1975 and we wouldn't be sitting here in this House this afternoon debating this bill because it would be superfluous.

I would point out, of course, that it is a one shot affair covering the year 1976 since market value assessment in the fall of 1976 for the year 1977 should take care of the problem on a permanent basis. There was no way in which I or anybody else in this House wanted to see the owners of condominium units prejudiced any longer. Once it was apparent what had happened and that something should be done, we set about doing it.

We certainly have welcomed the support from all sides for this bill. I regret, too, that we can't make it retroactive for 1975. It would be nice to be able to fix it up for this year, but I am sure everyone here recognizes the problem the municipalities would face in having to rework not only the tax bills for condominium owners but also all the other tax bills throughout all the municipalities. There would be mayhem to say the least.

What we propose to do, with respect to 1975, though, and for the reasons actually suggested by the member for Ottawa Centre (Mr. Cassidy), is to withdraw or discontinue any and all of the appeals, including the Grange case, which are presently before the courts. They will be settled on the basis of the principle enunciated in this bill.

Mr. Roy: Now you are talking.

Hon. Mr. Meen: This, at least, will look after all of those who were so unjustly treated in 1975 that they had the initiative to appeal.

Mr. Good: They are going to get benefits—with them. I don't know how many there are but I would expect several thousand; quite a number in any event.

Mr. Roy: What about for the previous years?

Hon. Mr. Meen: We will be able to settle the basis of the principle of this bill.

Mr. Good: For what years?

Hon. Mr. Meen: For the year 1975. I would presume, if there are any which are hold-overs from earlier years, those as well.

Mr. Roy: Right, you have some for 1972 and 1973.

Hon. Mr. Meen: That could be. They are small in number; I understand there are a few. It is my intention to discontinue or to settle as the case may be, however it may be necessary, with each of these multitude of actions or cases.

Mr. Roy: Now you are talking.

Hon. Mr. Meen: In 1976 they are taken care of by the Act, and of course in 1977 we go to market value assessment. That brings me to one of the last points raised by members opposite, and by all members for that matter who have participated in this debate from this side of the House as well.

The mill rates for condominiums are felt by some condominium owners to be higher than they should be, having regard for the services which they don't get. That may be so, but the fact is when one goes to market value assessment, in theory at any rate and hopefully in practice, the market value of a condominium unit which one buys reflects the fact that the owner and partner in the condominium building is having to pay a portion of the cost of garbage collection and whatever.

In other words, in the same way as when one buys a residential dwelling, its value may be somewhat different as reflected by the services provided to that residential dwelling. That is off the top of my head, so to speak. That's my estimation of how that kind of problem should resolve itself, at least in 1977—

Mr. Lawlor: Will they be at assessment value?

Hon. Mr. Meen: —when all properties in this province hopefully will be at market value assessment. As I say, in theory it should be taken care of and the problem should disappear.

Mr. Nixon: You are still confident that is going to happen?

Mr. Lawlor: Will it be in the manual?

Mr. Good: Unless there is an election.

Mr. Young: Mr. Speaker, could I ask the minister one question? In respect to the establishment of values for the condominium units, will the provincial assessors now be sent into the condominiums or will the value be worked out through the computers in some other way?

Hon. Mr. Meen: It's a complex procedure. I would imagine the assessors would be inside the condominium unit in just the same way as they are inside residential dwellings when they are assessing them for their market value and determining how they compare. With their figures into the computer, they can say this condominium unit is identical to or sufficiently similar to this one, that a sale of this one then can attribute a value to this one. In other words, on an ongoing

basis market sales will be one of the guiding, if not the major guiding factor, in determining the market value of the property for assessment purposes.

Mr. Young: Does this mean, Mr. Speaker, that the settlement of the present cases before the courts will be delayed until such time as that new assessment is made for 1977?

Hon. Mr. Meen: I don't think so. No, that's not my expectation at all, Mr. Speaker, inasmuch as we already have our views as to their value and their counterpart values in the single-family, detached-dwelling area. I don't think there should be anything like that delay. I would expect that these matters would be settled within the next few months, if not quicker than that.

Mr. Roy: Mr. Speaker, with your indulgence and with the permission of the minister, can I ask the minister a question in relation to his comment about abandoning all appeals and, in fact, the appeal in the Grange case. I was not aware of this case at the time we discussed the bill.

Mr. Speaker: Briefly.

Mr. Roy: Yes, that's taken for granted, Mr. Speaker, I'll be brief. I wonder if the minister would advise, Mr. Speaker, about when you're going to abandon these. The Grange case, of course, was the precedent which all apartment or condominium owners were looking at when they were involved in the appeal process. In fact, some of these appeals date back to 1972. I had some in my riding that started, I think, in 1972. When you tell your people to sell on the basis of section 2 of this bill, will there be any concessions made, or will there be any direction given to your counsel so that maybe costs can be paid over to the people who were under appeal? Because, in view of your legislation now, they were entitled to appeal. As you know, in a court of law or before the assessment review court, the winning litigant is entitled to some measure of cost. And I want to tell you, in some of these cases their costs were relatively high.

Mr. Speaker: Your brief comments are developing into a speech.

Mr. Roy: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I got carried away there. But I just want to say to the minister—

Interjections.

Mr. Roy: —you know what I'm talking about on the question of costs.

Hon. Mr. Meen: Mr. Speaker, on the OMB awards costs, I would suppose that if costs were awarded on the basis of this approach, then that would be part of it. If, otherwise, they are being settled, then it's a matter of compromise—

Mr. Roy: Negotiation?

Hon. Mr. Meen: Yes, negotiation between the parties concerned. But I couldn't give any statement at this point as to just how each and every one of these is to be resolved. I might point out—my staff advises me—that there are some 30,000 appeals, so I underestimated the number.

Mr. Roy: Thirty thousand?

Hon. Mr. Meen: Some 30,000 of appeals. Certainly I'll be anxious to see those out of the way just as quickly as we can, as I'm sure all hon. members will be.

Mr. Good: I am sure you would.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

Mr. Speaker: Shall this bill be ordered for third reading? Committee?

Hon. Mr. Meen: Why waste time with a committee? Anybody got an amendment?

Mr. Roy: I wanted to speak further on section 2 of the bill, Mr. Speaker. Can we have a committee now?

Hon. Mr. Meen: Committee of the whole House, yes.

Agreed.

Mr. Cassidy: The member for Ottawa East wants to get into this debate, Mr. Speaker.

DEVELOPMENT CORPORATIONS AMENDMENT ACT

Hon. Mr. Bennett moved second reading of Bill 6, An Act to Amend the Development Corporations Act, 1973.

Mr. Angus: Mr. Speaker, we in the New Democratic Party have very serious concerns with this bill. We find that we cannot agree with it in its present state. I would like to point out very emphatically that we are not against the concept of industrial parks, but we are against the approach this bill uses. The reasons will become apparent during the course of my remarks.

We are concerned that while the minister in this House and in standing committee of

estimates has referred to this bill as one to provide moneys for municipalities and to develop industrial parks, the terminology of the bill relates to an industrial undertaking which to our way of thinking is much too broad and can lead to a return of foregivable loans to industry under the guise of a subsidy.

If you look closely at the way these funds are directed, they become, in effect, a subsidy to industry at the expense of the provincial and municipal taxpayers. It seems to us that the bill does not provide the necessary assistance to the municipalities to economically establish and expand industrial parks. The cost to municipalities to bring the trunk services—the sewers, water lines, roads, etc.—to the industrial park, may force the municipality to delay other more necessary projects in order to take advantage of these funds; or it may seriously undermine the already shaky financial situation of many of our municipalities.

There is also mention of those services at the other end of the sewer systems, the facilities necessary to treat the effluent of any new industry established. Given the reality that industrial assessment does not adequately compensate municipalities for these necessary trunk services that must be provided, then one questions the whole intent of this bill.

Another assumption of this bill is that increase in industry is good for every community. Take the situation of the riding that I represent and the riding of my colleague the member for Port Arthur (Mr. Foulds). While the idea of increasing the industrial base at Thunder Bay is good, other things that are tied to industrial development are not there.

The particular one that comes to mind is accommodation. We cannot accommodate any more people in Thunder Bay without an increase in our housing stock. We already have the lowest vacancy rate in Ontario, and any influx of new workers and their families will only make that problem much more severe.

This bill should speak to those problems to ensure that those municipalities applying must either have the workers available or the accommodation already there to absorb the influx due to the establishment of new industry.

The other approach would be for the government of Ontario to co-ordinate the supply of money to ensure that additional accommodation is available as new industries are completed. There is more of a need for greater assistance to develop residential accommodation than there is for an increase in industry.

This bill represents an obvious bias, consistent, I might add, with the big business ideas of the Conservative Party of Ontario; an obvious bias in favor of industry over people. The development of any industrial park in Ontario suggests yet an additional loss of class I, II and III agricultural land in this province. This bill must speak to that problem and ensure that no industrial park is built on any of these classes of agricultural land.

When the development corporations were initiated—and announced in Thunder Bay by the former Premier, Hon. John Robarts—it was stated that the intent of the programme was to direct industry into the slow growth areas of the province, northern and eastern Ontario. That was an excellent concept. However, in our estimation, that concept has not been followed through in practice. Too much money has been pumped into industry in selected areas of the "golden horseshoe" of southern Ontario. This only increases the tendency of industry not to locate in northern and eastern Ontario and those southern Ontario communities requiring it. This bill in its present form does not change this reality.

This bill also does not specifically restrict the provision of funds to Canadian firms only. Another area the bill does not speak to, at least within our minds, is a specific provision for funding or providing services for non-profit organizations, for example, a co-operative venture for a particular industry.

We in the NDP caucus would like to see the ownership of any industrial parks or undertakings, depending on what you want to call them, remain under the province or the municipality, and be leased to various industries. This would ensure a continuous return as well as an effective means of control over whatever type of industry is established.

There is, I might add, a precedent within the ministry for this approach. The government of Ontario owns certain former armed forces bases and leases those facilities to private enterprise.

[4:00]

Finally, within this particular aspect of the bill, we suggest that the development of any of these industrial parks must be within the framework of an overall provincial, regional and municipal strategy, something which has been recommended, and yet to our knowledge has not been acted upon.

There are other areas in this bill that we question as well. I refer to section 8, subsec-

tion (1), where it provides for the appointment of a chief executive officer of each of the three corporations. The way the bill is written it gives the Lieutenant Governor in Council the right to appoint whoever it pleases to this position at whatever salary it wishes and to do whatever they decide.

We are concerned about who is to be appointed and at what salary and for what duties. We don't wish to see these positions become part of the "senate" of Ontario; a "senate," I might add, that consists of Tory supporters and defeated or retired members. Any position like that of an executive-director of a development corporation must be advertised so that the people that head these corporations may be the best qualified available. These positions are too valuable to be doled out to the party hacks.

The whole question of autonomy for the northern and eastern corporations must be brought forward once again. I realize this matter has been discussed many times in the House and in committee, but we in the NDP caucus feel this bill should clearly outline the decision-making autonomy for the two corporations and should not rely on ministry regulations alone.

I understand that just this month the directors of NODC reacted very strongly to some of the approaches used by Toronto bureaucrats. The decisions for provisions of money or guarantees must rely solely on each individual corporation with the hon. minister's role as one of inspector, not one of authority and final say.

In summation I would just like to reiterate our concern with this bill. We feel strongly that this bill should go to committee for a very thorough evaluation and redirection.

Mr. Eakins: Mr. Speaker, I rise to support the principle of this bill. I appreciate the opportunity it gives to municipalities to show the initiative to develop industrial parkland, and especially those areas outside of the metropolitan area of Toronto.

There is only one caution I would make. I hope that any development would not take away from the initiative of many municipalities which have previously shown initiative in developing their industrial areas. I refer in particular to the concept of new cities which might be established in areas where municipalities are just getting off the ground industrially. The creation of new cities might take away from what they have already created.

Other than that we support the principle and concept of this bill.

Mrs. Bryden: Mr. Speaker, I would like to commend part of this bill but criticize other parts. I think the idea of extending the grants to municipalities, regional governments and local government bodies generally is a good one, provided it is surrounded by requirements and criteria which will make sure that the money is being spent for a proper industrial development of this province and not just going back to the old system where every municipality or regional government is being encouraged to appoint an industrial commission. I understand that some of them have had to drop their industrial commissioners as an economy measure. If this is just to get back to having industrial commissioners who are going to go in for sort of an auction sale of their community to try and get industry on a scatter basis throughout this province, I don't think it is a good idea. But if this money and this proposal is to get development in growth centres, which the government will select—and this is what we are still waiting to see, and they have been talking about selecting growth centres for quite a long time—if this money is to be used for seeing that there is money for the acquisition of industrial land in growth centres, then I think it is a good idea. But it must be tied in with an overall regional development plan and we are still waiting to see that plan. In the estimates of the Ministry of Tourism and Industry, the hon. minister indicated there was a rigid list of criteria already developed and that there were 59 applications in already for assistance under this bill. I would like to ask him to provide us with that rigid list of criteria so that we have some idea of what sort of rules this money will be handed out under.

He also mentioned in the estimates that there was an inter-ministerial committee which was vetting applications already, but he didn't indicate which ministers were involved. I would like to know that as well.

There is a second point I think should be considered very important in the handing out of this money: If it is to be used for buying land for industrial parks, and that seems to be the main purpose that has been discussed by the government, that land must remain in public ownership; because if it is bought by the province and then given out to private industry, we lose control of that land. If there is any capital gain on that land, it goes to the private developer. We feel, certainly, that once land comes into the public domain in this province it should stay in the public domain and be leased out for purposes which the owner of the land, namely

the province or the municipality or the regional government, considers are the best for the industrial development of that area. That is a very important criterion and I hope that is in the list of the criteria that is being developed for the handing out of these grants.

The other part of the bill, which is to provide subsidies for industrial undertakings, is a great broadening of the Ontario Development Corp. Act. The present Act we have provides mainly for loans and guarantees and for forgivable loans only in areas which are designated as areas of equalization of industrial development. This bill provides that the government can give outright grants or subsidies to any industrial undertaking in any part of the province for any amount.

I think that is much too great a freedom to give to any government, without very definite rules and criteria. That can be the basis of what people in the old days used to call a pork barrel. This Legislature must write into such a bill definite rules, definite criteria before large sums of government money are handed out.

Some of the rules, my colleague has mentioned. There must be a ban on giving it to foreign corporations. It must be given only in connection with an overall industrial and regional development plan, and so on. But I find that part of the bill most objectionable. I think that we have one good thing in it and one bad thing in it which makes it very difficult to support it. So I would urge the government to take another look at that very wide-open clause providing unlimited subsidies, and bring in some proposals that would limit and restrict those grants to very definite criteria for industrial development.

Mr. Good: You would like them all in Metro Toronto, would you?

Mr. Samis: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. First of all, I would like to point out the need for this particular bill, in some form, in view of the economic situation. As the hon. minister knows, for example, eastern Ontario has deteriorated. The case of the north, I think, has been well documented by previous members.

The hon. minister is quite familiar that the problem in eastern Ontario is one of boom or bust cycles, perennial unemployment and things of this sort. We have always looked to the government for some sort of assistance to somehow balance the scales in terms of attracting industry.

We have always looked to the development corporations as a basic vehicle for achieving that objective. However, when we saw what happened in terms of industrial parks within the last 12 months, and here I refer specifically to the creation of the Spencerville Industrial Park, it left many people in eastern Ontario wondering what was really happening.

The minister made a variety of speeches in many municipalities and small communities in eastern Ontario assuring the people that this wouldn't be so, there just wasn't going to be a Spencerville. I then quote from the Globe and Mail on Jan. 29 where the minister did say: "We would be completely off our nut to build a new industrial park there." I again quote from the Globe and Mail: "Whoever was assembling the land, certainly won't get any encouragement from me." And I again quote from the Globe and Mail: "He said it would be extremely difficult to believe that the government can justify such a large purchase."

I am not saying that the minister is necessarily fully to blame in this context. We have discussed this in committee and the final decision wasn't his. But there is a certain jaundiced opinion in eastern Ontario as to who we believe in the government when it comes to the whole question of industrial parks. Is there really an industrial strategy in this government? Do they really know where they are going in the less developed areas of the province, namely the east and the north? Who really speaks for the government in the question of industrial development and economic development? Is it the Minister of Industry and Tourism (Mr. Bennett)? Is it the Treasurer (Mr. McKeough)? Is it the Premier (Mr. Davis)? Who are we to believe and where are we going in this whole question?

In the question of the bill itself, Mr. Speaker, my gravest reservation has already been outlined by my colleagues from Algoma East and Beaches-Woodbine (Mrs. Bryden)—the whole concept of the open-ended subsidy. It is extremely vague and seemingly is open to abuse. I am sure the minister will try and defend the wording of the bill, and I hope he can give us some precise information as to how he envisages these subsidies being used.

In my particular area, we are rather familiar with the concept of forgivable loans to various corporations. I think Stanley Randall was the minister then, I am not sure, but we have very vivid memories of what a forgivable loan can do when it is given, for example, to an American corporation. We recall quite vividly a struggling little

company called Kraft was given a half-million-dollar forgivable loan—

An hon. member: They need help.

Mr. Samis: —to set up a cheese plant in Ingleside, Ontario.

It was explained to the people this would create jobs in Ingleside. This was a stimulant for the cheese industry in eastern Ontario. This was a welcome development for the people of the area. But the fact is, Mr. Speaker, the price we paid in that particular instance was that three small independent locally owned cheese factories had to close down as the result of that. People in eastern Ontario were subsidizing an American company to close down small Canadian companies. This was not a loan, it was a forgivable loan.

So to the people of our area, this whole concept is intolerable and we just don't want to see the concept of the subsidy to be disguised or made into a new version of the forgivable loan. I would hope the minister would explain what percentage of the funds he would see allotted for these subsidies—how much of the overall budget. I would hope he could explain or give us some indication of how much is going to be allotted for industrial development next year. Will American companies be eligible for these subsidies? Will there be preference for Canadian companies or will they be treated on the same basis?

I am always amused to see the government can always find money for the big corporations. Yet when the small farmer in eastern Ontario—whether he is a cow-calf operator or a milk producer or just a general farmer—goes for any form of assistance for income stabilization, they say: "Go to Ottawa. We haven't got the money. We can't provide you with a guaranteed income protection plan." But when the big boys want it, they can find it.

So I would like to ask the minister how he intends to treat American corporations if this bill were ever to be passed. The whole question of equity obviously would come into it. If there are to be subsidies, surely the time has come to have equity for the people of Ontario in any enterprises, because we need that. We want some involvement in the industrial development. If most of these people in the big corporations are to be Americans, then surely as Canadians we should have some equity. If our money is going to be subsidizing American corporations, the time has come for the people of Ontario to have some equity. Not a sellout, but a share.

[4:15]

In the question of the parks themselves, I think my colleague from Algoma East has outlined some of the problems facing the municipality as to the costs of operating, maintaining and connecting the industrial parks with other services within municipal boundaries. I assume the minister will reply to that.

I think the concept outlined—that the properties within those parks should be leased so the people of the community have some degree of equity, some share in their industrial development—makes a lot of sense. If it's totally sold out then, obviously, they lose real control over their industrial development in that context. And the concept of leasing seems to me to make a lot of sense.

The most important thing is that this bill should be considered in the context of an overall strategy. Is there one for industrial development in eastern Ontario? Or in northern Ontario for the small communities? Or is it just part of another ongoing series of ad hoc arrangements? With another election coming up within the next—who knows how many months or years—will we be seeing another series of announcements geared for ad hoc electoral politics, or will we see some overall development plan once and for all?

Obviously, in eastern Ontario the top priority is decentralization, and I am assured that the same priority applies in the north. The question of disincentives has been discussed in committee. Is it really wrong to suggest and to force companies who want to locate in the "golden triangle," to say to them in plain simple language: "Maybe you're right to do so, but we as a government will say you'll pay a price for exercising that right by locating in the Toronto, Hamilton, Oshawa golden horseshoe."

It's obvious the smaller municipalities in eastern Ontario and northern Ontario can't compete effectively and equitably with the services offered in southern Ontario, especially when you're next to the Quebec border.

I'd like to point, as has been pointed out in the context of the Olympic Games, and the hon. minister brought this up as well on Quebec Hydro, to the political question. If industries are interested in the Quebec market, it's far more profitable for them to locate inside of Quebec than to locate in eastern Ontario. The Province of Quebec, for a variety of reasons, offers more grants and more subsidies to small municipalities.

The Ottawa Valley and the St. Lawrence Valley can't offer the same tax deferrals, tax holidays, tax arrangements that municipalities in Quebec can.

That puts them at a disadvantage when they're competing for industry with, say, a municipality in southern Ontario. That should be taken into consideration. They're not competing on an equitable basis. There is the political consideration, the economics.

The member for Algoma East also brought up the question of who would be the chairman and how they would be appointed; the directors as well.

Mr. Angus: Fort William.

Mr. Samis: Fort William, I'm sorry. The question has to be clearly established that this doesn't become a dumping group or a refuge or a burial place, in some cases, for any defeated Tory candidates, bagmen, party presidents or anything of this sort. What we want for the development corporations is people who have demonstrated their ability, their interest and their skill in the field of business and industry. I would hope that the hon. minister would be able to assure us that the appointments would be totally non-partisan. While I respect my predecessor from the riding of Stormont, I would hope that the hon. minister would not succumb to the temptation of appointing a former cabinet minister on narrow partisan considerations. What we need are people who have proven their ability and their experience.

In summation, I would like to say I'm extremely sceptical of the whole concept of subsidies, and I remain quite unconvinced of the need and value of subsidies as outlined in this bill.

Mr. Deans: Mr. Speaker, you've heard some of the arguments put forward by my colleagues with regard to the legislation before us. I think the government has to understand that as a party, we think it would be quite appropriate if the government were to offer subsidies to municipalities in order that they could provide services that would assist them in encouraging industrial development.

We think it would be appropriate for the government to spend money to develop roads; to spend money to ensure hydro power; to spend money to make sure that appropriate docking facilities were available; to spend money to make sure that there was an adequate transportation system.

We think that it is appropriate for the government, through whatever agency it deems to be appropriate, to spend money to encourage the development in areas that are under-developed. But we don't think it appropriate for the government to use taxpayers' money indiscriminately, and to give it to private corporations. I don't think that anyone should have any doubt about that.

We don't think that it is right that we should continue to tax the workers-earners of the Province of Ontario for the purpose of giving that money to corporations. Let me put it to you this way: If a corporation is on such shaky ground that it can't go to the financial institutions of this province, this country, or this continent, and raise the necessary capital to carry on its enterprise, and if it is, in the judgement of the government, a necessary corporation—one which provides employment and one which given some kind of incentive might be able to achieve a fairly solid financial foundation—then it might be appropriate for the government to give this corporation a loan. That loan could bear interest or no interest; that loan could be over an extended period of time but it should be a loan.

If it is decided by the government at some point to encumber the corporation by putting it in a further indebted position by insisting that it be by loan, then it is also appropriate for the government to take equity in that corporation or company in order to ensure that its affairs are managed in a proper and satisfactory way. But we don't agree with handouts.

If you want to spend money to provide services—if you want to give municipalities money in order that they can purchase land for industrial purposes—if you want to develop transportation or energy sources in order that there can be those things available for industrial development in the Province of Ontario—so be it. But we will not, notwithstanding the minority government situation, stand by and allow the government to tax the public of Ontario for the purpose of giving the money to the corporations in this province.

In essence what we are saying to you is, we will oppose the bill because we see that as being the principle of the bill.

It may be that we worry a little bit about who will be appointed as the director—and we do, given the government's record. It may be that we would be concerned that municipalities might somehow be deprived of the opportunity to gain access to additional funding for industrial development purposes,

but we think that can be overcome—if the government wants that to happen, it can be done very easily. But, we are not going to go back to the system we had a few years ago, and I want to make it clear. We are not going back to the system which we discarded—which allows this government to raise money and to hand it out indiscriminately.

I am going to ask the minister if he would give serious consideration to withdrawing the bill, because the bill, if you want it to go through this House with some degree of unanimity, has to be much broader and more explicit. We have to know in the legislation what the conditions are going to be that will be precedent upon any decision with regard to the giving of money in the province. We have to see it right in the legislation.

Let me take you to the bill itself—the Development Corporation Act, 1973, Chapter 84. I think, quite frankly, that the way this amendment has been drafted is wrong. I think the amendment does not speak to the bill itself—so let me give you that as a possible way of redrafting it. To begin with, it clearly sets out in section 11 of the bill: "The objects of the corporation are to encourage and assist in the development and diversification of industry in Ontario, including —without limiting the generality of the foregoing—the provision of financial assistance by loan, guarantee or purchase of shares or other securities." I put to the government that if they now intend to grant the corporation additional powers, powers to give money, powers to provide subsidies directly to private corporations, then that section of the bill has to be amended first. You can't achieve that by amending section 12, which is in effect the operative section of the bill, the explanatory section, the section that qualifies what is contained in section 11.

Section 11 clearly says "financial assistance by loan, guarantee, purchase of shares or other securities." It does not give the corporation the power to grant subsidies to private individuals or private companies. You, therefore, cannot in section 12—by adding a rider to the section which deals with the way in which the corporation may carry out its business—change substantially the intent of the corporation. That's what you are doing.

So, I suggest to you, that if you were going to do this, you would have to have amended section 11, to add the words subsidize, in order to make it technically correct. But even if you made it technically correct, Mr. Speaker, we would still oppose it, because the bill is wrong. If a corporation is in such a condition that it cannot raise money on the money markets, cannot afford a loan, cannot provide sufficient equity in order that the government may enter into an equity situation with the corporation, then it is in question whether or not its worth, in the Province of Ontario, justifies the expenditure of taxpayers' dollars. So, I want to tell you, so that you don't misunderstand me: we oppose the bill. We oppose that principle of the bill, and we will divide the House.

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Speaker, this legislation is, I think, a further blank cheque to an already powerful terms of reference which you have now. In other words, it's a complete expansion of your terms of reference in the whole business.

It's always been my submission that this, Mr. Speaker, is the biggest pork barrel in all Ontario—this department here. It was set up by Mr. Macaulay to use public funds for political purposes. Throughout 13 years, I've watched this government and this department use these moneys—hundreds of millions of dollars—strictly for political reasons. Now we're going to compound the folly of this department by giving them further powers. A case in point: I've been sitting in this place for almost 13 years now—

Hon. Mr. Meen: Except for a few days.

Mr. Sargent: —and never once, Mr. Speaker, never once have I personally had a loan approved for my people. Never once. I found in the estimates last week that there were 12 or 13 loans given to my people in the last two years. But I didn't know about one of them. It was handled by Mr. Winkler. The fact is that this man could walk into our election area with the Premier (Mr. Davis) and get up and say, with the Premier on the platform with him, "I have here a cheque for $500,000 to keep RCA Victor open. I will guarantee the people of Ontario that RCA will not close. No one will lose his job. In fact, we'll expand the operation. I've got $500,000 in my pocket to prove it." This is the way they use this department—public funds to buy votes.

[4:30]

We have a case in point of Minaki, an area that went broke. A book value of $1.25 million. This department, this hon. minister, gave them $5 million. No term on the note; no terms of interest and no repayment programme. Involved in the directorship of this

is the head of the Conservative Party in the north. It's a completely political deal.

Over the years they have used this department, giving forgiveness loans to American corporations, most of them in excess profits brackets. They have given them millions of dollars to take over our economy.

A case in point: A man in Cayuga had a small plant and he couldn't pay his payroll one week. He went to the community and the doctors and lawyers went to the bank and for a few months they got him credit at the bank. When the bank closed in, and the man came to Queen's Park to get a loan from the ODC, they wouldn't give him any money. So the man sold the plant to a firm in Buffalo, which came across and borrowed money from the ODC, and everybody was happy.

They would loan to an American corporation but a Canadian citizen couldn't get it. Now if you think those things are not important, I say this is a great area for fraud and corruption. It's been going on for years. Now the hon. minister comes to us and says, in effect, "I want to appoint more fat. I want 16 members on section 1. I want 14 on 2 and 14 on 3." More fat. What the hell do you need 16 directors for on a company

Mr. Ferrier: More jobs for defeated Tories.

Mr. Sargent: That's right. And what is he being paid? No, they want a chief executive officer empowered—appointed by the Lieutenant Governor.

Mr. Ferrier. That is a job for Eric.

Mr. Riddell: A job for Winkler.

Mr. Sargent: I don't know, I haven't talked this over with my whip or my party leader. But I, as one, will vote with the official opposition to block this—

Hon. Mr. Welch: That is obvious.

Mr. Sargent: —type of thievery, where they have the head of the public Treasury, at all times, to buy votes for this sloppy administration over there. I think it is time the public of Ontario should know what the hell is going on in things like this.

Mr. Sweeney: Mr. Speaker, a question of the hon. minister please. It occurs to me that the whole tenor of this Act, not just the amendments, but the Act as well, reflects a use of land, among other things. I would ask the hon. minister if he could indicate whether or not his ministry, or in conjunction with other ministries of the government, there is any long-range province-wide land use policy of his government to which this ties in? Or is it, just as someone suggested earlier, more ad hoc-ery?

Hon. Mr. Bennett: Mr. Speaker, first of all, may I deal with the basis of the bill? Because there would appear to be some misunderstanding as to the purpose of the bill, which very clearly is to try and assist municipalities in northern and eastern Ontario to have funds either to purchase and service industrial parks or to service industrial parks that they presently own under the municipality.

As far as loans go to other than municipalities, they are directly related to those who might own industrial lands within a given area and who are prepared to enter into an agreement with the municipality to make those lands available for industrial development at a set price under contract arrangement with the municipality where they do not own any land of their own. A municipality would indicate that by the agreement and encourage the government of Ontario through the Development Corp. to extend the same type of financing to that park as they would to one completely and singularly owned by the municipality.

Mr. Martel: What about subsidies?

Hon. Mr. Bennett: Yes, I will talk about subsidies because I think we come to that relationship in some of the remarks of various speakers.

It is not our intention nor has it been our intention to get involved directly, if possible, with private companies except where they happen to own land. The municipality does not own land at this point and the municipality believes it is in the best general interest for industrial development that it tries to encourage the private owner into opening his or her land for that purpose.

Mr. Deans: That doesn't say that.

Interjections.

Hon. Mr. Bennett: Coming to the subsidy as we call it, I want to say to the member for Wentworth that I fully supported his position in his remarks this afternoon, about going back to the old plan.

I am sure members will recall that shortly after I had the opportunity of becoming Minister of Industry and Tourism and reporting for ODC, it was one of my announcements that we would get rid of the forgivable loan programme because I was not convinced it

was in the best general interests of the people of this province. It is not our intention to go back to that at all.

I very carefully want to get on to the point of what we have been able to do for municipalities. Many members have joined me in my summer tours when I have been around the province speaking to municipal leaders and industrial commissions and so on. In the process we clearly—

Mr. Martel: Tory members.

Hon. Mr. Bennett: I am not speaking of Tory members. I think if you check with your own party you will find there were a number who travelled with me during the course of activities.

Very clearly, the one thing municipalities told not only me but those who were with me was they did lack the funds to open up municipally-owned industrial land or to acquire municipally-owned land for industrial purposes. They went along with the point that it was very difficult to convince members of council that they should try to buy land and maybe hold it for a period of four or five years before attempting to sell it off to industry. They suggested to us that some encouragement was required and we believe there is. We believe encouragement is required to make municipalities get along with opening up industrial property so they have serviced land available and ready for sale to industries which wish to come into their communities.

What we are proposing, in the way of subsidy, is very clearly this: If the municipality does not own land and wishes to acquire it, we are prepared to lend sufficient funds to purchase the land up to 50 per cent of its value. That should include servicing within the industrial park. If the municipality already owns the land and is at the point of trying to find sufficient funds to service it to make it ready and available, we are prepared to support the requirement of funds up to 75 per cent of the cost.

Where does the subsidy come in? The next step is that there is an interest factor and we have indicated that it would be 10 per cent. We are prepared in the first year of the loan to forgive the entire interest factor. In the second year we are prepared to forgive 75 per cent and the third year 50 per cent; in the fourth year 25 per cent and in the fifth year there will be no further forgiveness of interest. Principal payments and interest payments will commence in the sixth year for a 10-year period.

If lands are sold in the interval the credits will start to come back to the government for whatever lands the municipality has sold. I make it very clear that the land is owned by the municipality and we are supporting it financially to make the land either available or serviced on the market.

Mr. Deans: That is not what the bill says.

Hon. Mr. Welch: That is the whole point of it.

Mr. Deans: If you want that in the bill put it in there.

Hon. Mr. Bennett: I think it is very clearly in the bill—

Mr. Deans: It is not very clearly in the bill; it is nowhere in the bill. Section 5, subsection 6, does not deal with municipalities at all; it deals with persons.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The minister will continue.

Mr. Deans: It says any person and a person is not a municipality. The bill doesn't say what the minister says, and if he wants that he should amend the bill now.

Hon. Mr. Bennett: I was asked, Mr. Speaker, by one of the members as to some of the criteria and I would be pleased to submit that to the members for their review and input. Very carefully and very clearly it covers some of the concerns that have been expressed.

The member for Fort William (Mr. Angus) indicated the concern regarding prime agricultural lands going out of use. In the criteria, we indicated first of all it must have the clearance of the municipality that they wish an industrial park. We do know there are some municipalities in this province that are not looking for industrial expansion or development at all and others are dying to have it.

Mr. Deans: You are so wrong.

Hon. Mr. Bennett: So we demand that there be a resolution of the council indicating clearly to the government that they wish to have an industrial park.

Mr. Deans: That is not what the bill says.

Hon. Mr. Bennett: Secondly, there are other areas which will require information as to what the servicing is; the availability of the labour force or the possibility of the labour force; the other amenities of the life that exists in that community that would be compatible with industrial development and expansion—

Mr. Deans: It is not in the bill.

Hon. Mr. Bennett: —indeed, whether the zoning on the land that they're intending to use is approved in an official plan or under a zoning by-law. If it is in agricultural use at this time, it would then have to have the full approval of the Ministry of Agriculture and Food of the Province of Ontario. We believe those are some of the criteria that we require to make sure that we're on the right road.

The member for Fort William spoke about the Northern and Eastern Ontario Development Corps., needing to have their autonomy. I think that in the estimates committee I spoke at some length on that particular issue as the result of a member of the committee inquiring about it. Each board has its own directors from their respective parts of our province. What we're asking for in the expansion is because the Ontario Land Corp., which will be the financing agent for the funds required in this programme, require under their Act that they have one member from their board on each one of our development boards.

May I just digress for a minute. The member for Grey-Bruce (Mr. Sargent) spoke about the chief executive officer of the corporation. I recall very clearly in estimates a year ago the member raising the issue about certain people who were on the staff of the development corporation and suggesting that it should take a different position. I accepted his views on that date and I say to the House today that the chief executive officer should be the chairman of the corporation. We have at the moment Mr. Jim Joyce, who is the chairman of our corporation. It is my intention and feeling that he should become the chief executive officer of the corporation, where he has the rights to be chairman and also can oversee the administration of its operation. That's the reason for the amendment as it is proposed in the bill at this point.

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Speaker, will the minister answer a question?

Mr. Speaker: I think, at this time, questions are out of order.

Mr. Sargent: It's on a point of clarification regarding the bill.

Mr. Speaker: It is a point of clarification?

Mr. Sargent: Yes, sir.

Mr. Speaker: Will the minister accept the question for a point of clarification?

Hon. Mr. Bennett: Yes.

Mr. Sargent: My concern is this: clause 5, section 6, says "... grant a subsidy to a person carrying on an industrial undertaking in Ontario." If the hon. minister can guarantee to me that no developer will be subsidized by his department for putting in services, then he has something worth talking about here.

Mr. Speaker: I think that is more than a question.

Mr. Sargent: But not when you give a blank cheque, sir, to developers—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Mr. Sargent: Just a minute. I'm talking about the clause—

Mr. Speaker: Will the hon. member place the question to the minister for clarification?

Hon. Mr. Bennett: Mr. Speaker, I think that I've already covered it but I'm pleased to go over it again. Very clearly what he is referring to is that if a developer in a particular community happens to hold what they believe to be the prime industrial land for development purposes, and the municipality cannot acquire if for one reason or another—and I'm not prepared to say—

Mr. Deans: They can get it by expropriation.

Hon. Mr. Bennett: I'm not sure, Mr. Speaker, that the Expropriation Act is going to allow them to take it over for an industrial park. The limits of expropriation are very confined.

Mr. Deans: That's the tax—

Mr. Makarchuk: What price are you going to get for it?

Hon. Mr. Bennett: Mr. Speaker, I'm prepared to answer the question if the hon. members would, for a moment, allow me. Very clearly, if the municipality is not in a position to acquire the land on an open purchase position because of its limitation of funds, or because they believe it's not in their best interests at this point, but they would like to see the land developed—

Interjections.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

[4:45]

Hon. Mr. Bennett: We are saying very carefully and very clearly that if Lindsay, for example, wishes to enter into an agreement with a private owner, a long-term agreement where the price is pegged for the industrial lands, and the municipality is pre-

pared to come to the ministry and request that we supply the financing for the infrastructure on that project, we believe it is in the best interests of that municipality. It might be; could very well be—

Mr. Deans: I'm sorry. It doesn't say that.

Hon. Mr. Bennett: —it will only be if the municipality in itself enters into the agreement, and not because we believe—

Mr. Deans: That is not contained in the bill.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Hon. Mr. Welch: You can amend it in committee then.

Mr. Deans: No, we can't. It's the principle of the bill.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Hon. Mr. Welch: No, it is not. The minister is speaking to the bill. Listen to him.

Mrs. Bryden: Mr. Speaker, will you permit another question of clarification?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Hon. Mr. **Bennett:** I think I dealt with the request of the member for Beaches-Woodbine for criteria and I am prepared to submit to the members the full list of criteria because we believe it is essential that municipalities know exactly where they stand when making an application for possibilities of entering into the programme.

The ownership of the land, I again emphasize, will rest in the name of the municipality, and not in the name of the Crown. They will be out with their industrial commissioners or with groups they have retained to try to sell the land and to promote industries to come to their particular communities. It will not be—I want to emphasize once again—it will not be forgivable loans we are dealing with.

Mr. Sargent: That is not the way it reads.

Hon. Mr. Bennett: There is an incentive in the programme in the reduction of interest to municipalities.

Mr. Martel: A rose by any other name.

Hon. Mr. Bennett: I agree with the member for Cornwall (Mr. Samis) about the situation regarding the border between Ontario and Quebec. I have mentioned the situation on more than one occasion. We have again opened up the opportunity of discussing with the Province of Quebec some of the situations that are inherent in some of the contracts that they call for. I am not giving the House any assurance at this time that we are going to get a reversal of position but we will continue to press for it.

The board of directors, has been in my opinion, a group of people—and we have had names submitted from various people in communities—who are competent and qualified businessmen. We believe the loans we have made have been made without friend or favour and in the interests of the communities to which they have applied.

It would be wrong to say that with every loan that is submitted to me that I could completely concur in all of the comments, but in the long run I think the members of the board of directors of each of the corporations have a deeper insight into the requirements of their communities.

Mr. Deans: You may believe what you are saying is what will happen, but the bill does not restrict it to that.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Mr. Martel: That is the issue.

Mr. Deans: If that is what you want, put it in the legislation and I will believe you. And I will tell you further that the bill that follows, which qualifies it—

Interjections.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Hon. Mr. Bennett: Mr. Speaker, there was a question raised by the member for Cornwall, I believe, about the ownership of the land and what happens after the land has been developed and is ready for marketing. As to what will happen, that of course is the decision of the municipalities since they will be the owners of the land. It might be their opinion that they would like to lease it rather than sell it, but I warn the House that municipalities will find themselves with a great deal of money tied up in industrial land and maybe the rollover will not be fast enough for them to continue to have funds to expand into further industrial parks.

Once again I listened to the comment that perhaps we should very clearly force companies—I believe that was the expression used—to locate in certain areas of our province or that we should establish a penalty situation so they will not move. Let me just warn the House that in this day and age we are not in the best bargain-

ing position, nor is any government, in trying to tell companies they are going to go to A, B or C. As I explained in estimates committee, a great number of them—

Mr. Martel: No, we just pay the bills.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. Order.

Hon. Mr. Bennett: It is fine for us to say we are going to force somebody, but if we force them out of our province altogether, very little has been accomplished for any of us. If one wishes to try that situation and lose an industry, be my guest. But I, along with people in the ministry, have been trying to encourage industry to come to the Province of Ontario, along with the assistance and help of the municipalities that are interested in it as well. We are going to offer the greatest assistance we possibly can.

An hon. member: You might have gone to Europe with us. It would have done you some good. You might talk to—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Hon. Mr. Bennett: Mr. Speaker, the basis of the bill, again, is to assist municipalities in opening up industrial land. I make no apologies to this House that it's principally looking at northern and eastern Ontario. We believe those are the areas that must have the assistance.

Mr. Deans: It doesn't say so.

Hon. Mr. Bennett: The terms of reference and basic criterion will clearly indicate to the members as to what we are intending to do. Someone asked the question as to those municipalities which have requested assistance or to be reviewed under the programme. While they have not had all of the criteria at this point, they've had the assistance of our field staff in assisting them in going over some of the criteria and looking at some of the requirements that they will have to meet.

First of all, in eastern Ontario we have 18 communities that have made general inquiries of the plan. We have six that have supported their request by a resolution. These were Carleton Place, Renfrew, Smiths Falls, Trenton, the township of Gloucester and the township of Goulbourn. In northeastern Ontario we have 10 that have made requests.

I can say to the members from the other parts of the Province of Ontario that there have been applications for consideration from central Ontario, eastern and west-central Ontario and southwestern Ontario.

I should say to the member for Beaches-Woodbine the inter-ministerial committee is made up of this ministry, of TEIGA, and the ministries of the Environment, Housing, Natural Resources, and Agriculture and Food. The inter-ministerial committee, along with the people from ODC, will do a preliminary review of the plan. At that point it will be submitted to the ministry people for a complete review, that's the Ministry of Industry and Tourism. If we believe that the criteria is met and that all other things are in order, we will then forward it on to the Ontario Development Corp. It will do the financing and review the requirements for financing—whether the municipality can carry the responsibility of financing it over a period of time.

Mr. Deans: But you can change that at any time. It doesn't say that anywhere. That is what you intend to happen.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please; the hon. minister has the floor.

Mr. Deans: I know, but he's misled.

Hon. Mr. Bennett: The one question I should speak to just briefly is the one that the member from Wentworth raised, and that was on the US companies and what are we going to do about them. First of all we are not looking at the American companies or foreign companies—and I prefer to use that expression, because I do not think we should zero in at any one country of the world.

Frankly, if American companies or foreign companies are to come here, take over assets of Canadian companies or do some development, they will have to do it with the concurrence of the organization at the federal level, who we consult with when applications are made.

Mr. Deans: I didn't raise that, by the way.

An hon. member: No, it was the member for Cornwall.

Hon. Mr. Bennett: The member for Cornwall; I'm sorry.

An hon. member: They look alike.

Hon. Mr. Bennett: I believe we have covered most of the inquiries made to us this afternoon. I submit to the House second reading of this bill, which I believe is a step in the right direction to assist municipalities in putting industrial land available for use immediately.

Hon. Mr. Kerr: With control.

Mrs. Bryden: Mr. Speaker, will the minister permit one further question of clarification?

Mr. Riddell: Come on, you have got yourself into a hole and now you are trying to get out of it.

Mr. Deans: You people don't even understand the bill. You'd have given them a blank cheque.

Mrs. Bryden: If the minister is convinced that subsection 6 of section 5 means nothing more than giving interest subsidies to local governments, is he prepared to redraft that section to state exactly that? Because it does not state that at the present time.

Mr. Good: That's not on the principle of the bill.

Hon. Mr. Bennett: To try to answer the question as simply as possible, one of the things that we must be able to do for some municipalities is see that they can put land on the market at a realistic dollar value. Whether the land happens to be held by the municipalities solely or whether they are entering into a long-term agreement with a private developer, is why it refers to persons, but the "person" is only applicable where the municipality enters into the agreement and not the government of Ontario.

Mr. Deans: That is not contained in the bill.

Hon. Mr. Bennett: I think we will deal with the bill clause by clause, but overall we are prepared, yes, to look at the elimination of it, but have to make some provision that it relates singular to municipalities and their special agreements.

Mr. Deans: The bill, then, is flawed. Take it back and bring it back in the form it should be in.

[5:00]

The House divided on the motion for second reading of Bill 6, which was approved on the following vote:

Ayes	Nays
Auld	Angus
Belanger	Bain
Bennett	Bounsall
Bernier	Breaugh
Birch	Bryden
Breithaupt	Burr
Brunelle	Cassidy
Bullbrook	Davidson
Campbell	(Cambridge)
Conway	Davison
Cunningham	(Hamilton Centre)
Drea	Deans
Eakins	di Santo
Eaton	Dukszta
Edighoffer	Ferrier
Evans	Foulds
Ferris	Germa
Gaunt	Gigantes
Givens	Godfrey
Good	Grande
Gregory	Laughren
Grossman	Lawlor
Haggerty	Lupusella
Hall	MacDonald
Handleman	Makarchuk
Henderson	Martel
Hodgson	McClellan
Johnson	Moffat
(Wellington-Dufferin-Peel)	Philip
Johnston	Renwick
(St. Catharines)	Samis
Jones	Sandeman
Kennedy	Sargent
Kerr	Stokes
Kerrio	Swart
Lane	Warner
Leluk	Wildman
MacBeth	Young
Maeck	Ziemba—37.
Mancini	
McCague	
McEwen	
McKeough	
McMurtry	
McNeil	
Meen	
Miller	
(Haldimand-Norfolk)	
Miller	
(Muskoka)	
Morrow	
Newman	
(Durham North)	
Newman	
(Windsor-Walkerville)	
Nixon	
Norton	
O'Neil	
Parrott	
Peterson	
Reed	
(Halton-Burlington)	
Reid	
(Rainy River)	
Rhodes	
Ridell	
Roy	

Ayes

Ruston
Scrivener
Singer
Smith
(Simcoe East)
Smith
(Hamilton Mountain)
Smith
(Nipissing)
Smith
(Hamilton West)
Snow
Spence
Stephenson
Stong
Sweeney
Taylor
Timbrell
Welch
Wells
Williams
Wiseman
Worton
Yakabuski—79.

Clerk of the House: Mr. Speaker, the "ayes" are 79, the "nays" are 37.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

[5:30]

Mr. Speaker: Shall this bill be ordered for third reading?

Mr. Deans: No. On a point of order, I would like to ask—I may not be able to add—who is the other one?

An hon. member: The member for Grey-Bruce (Mr. Sargent) voted "nay."

Mr. Deans: Oh, thank you. I apologize.

Hon. Mr. Bennett: Committee.

Mr. Speaker: I would ask the hon. minister to which committee should the bill go.

Hon. Mr. Bennett: Committee of the whole House.

Mr. Speaker: Committee of the whole House. So ordered.

Hon. Mr. Welch: Mr. Speaker, before calling the next order perhaps all members of the House would like to join in congratulating Mr. Holtby, the first clerk assistant, for his first round of the session and being so successful in recording the vote. That's quite a remarkable feat.

MUNICIPAL AMENDMENT ACT

Hon. Mr. McKeough moved second reading of Bill 7, An Act to amend the Municipal Act.

Mr. Good: The purpose of this bill, Mr. Speaker, is for the first time in history to allow municipalities to secure a loan by way of mortgage.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. There's so much noise in the chamber we can't hear the speaker.

Mr. Good: I have spoken to various municipalities and conventionally the way that industrial land has been purchased previously is by the issuance of debentures by that municipality or by paying from current revenues. This bill is closely associated with the previous bill. I am rather mystified as to why the development corporations, when they lend money to the municipalities, would want to take back a mortgage.

Similarly, I am mystified by the wording of the bill which says:

> . . . security therefor to the corporation [may be] by way of a mortgage or may furnish such other security as the corporation considers appropriate.

I would like to address a few questions to the provincial Treasurer (Mr. McKeough), if he could disengage himself from his conversation.

Mr. Speaker: There is too much noise in the chamber for the hon. member to be heard. Order, please. Would the private conversations please cease or be removed?

Mrs. Campbell: We will wait for the NDP as usual.

Mr. Good: With all due respect, Mr. Speaker, I don't think I should have to compete with a private conversation being held by the minister with another member of the chamber who has crossed the floor to engage with the Treasurer, when it's the Treasurer's bill that's going through this Legislature. John, will you get out of here, please?

Mr. Nixon: Take that!

Mr. Ruston: Turn the mikes off.

Mr. Good: Are you new around here?

Mr. Ruston: Kick him out, Eddie.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: Dust him right off.

Mr. Roy: Anybody else you want to get rid of?

Mr. Good: The wording in the bill, Mr. Speaker, would appear to indicate that the conveyance or the mortgage given need not even be on the land for which the money was borrowed. So, conceivably, I suppose, a municipality could mortgage its city hall to borrow money from the development corporation to buy industrial land. It seems a rather ridiculous situation to me.

Traditionally and historically, municipalities have been able to borrow money on the strength of their ability to raise money through taxation. Now we have introduced an additional method whereby municipalities can give a mortgage back to the development corporation in return for the money. What I am concerned about, Mr. Speaker, is if a mortgage is given back on the industrial land purchased by the municipality to the development corporation for the money received, how will this affect the title of that land when the municipality goes to divide it up into smaller parcels and sell it to various industries? In my view there would be a cloud on that title until such time as that mortgage has been discharged. Maybe the mortgage isn't intended on the land purchased by that loan. Maybe it is going to be on the works buildings down at some other municipality or the city hall; maybe on the mayor's limousine. I don't know. But I think that some clarification should take place.

Personally, I don't see any need whatsoever for the development corporations to require a mortgage back from the municipality. Surely, that is not going to affect the interest rate from the municipality. The municipality's ability to pay depends on its ability to raise money by means of taxation. If, on the other hand, their ability to repay the loan is contingent on the sale of that land, something's going to have be done about that mortgage, so that there isn't a cloud on title when that land gets to be developed. In the private sector, I believe there is a procedure whereby a blanket mortgage given as security for debentures or bonds or something is relieved bit by bit if certain parcels of that land are sold.

So, I think we certainly support the idea of the municipality borrowing money from the corporations, as we did in the last bill. Certainly, I hope that each municipality represented by a member of the NDP realizes that that party has voted against the companion bill, denying municipalities the right to borrow money from the corporations. I would ask for explanation. Mr. Speaker, as to why it seems necessary that the municipalities should now, after never having been allowed to do this, be required to give mortgages back to the ODC or the Northern Ontario Development or Eastern Ontario Development Corp. Basically, what effect is this going to have on title to that land when the municipality wants to dispose of it?

Mr. Swart: Our party was going to pass on discussion of this because we believed that this was basically a housekeeping matter and, in fact, was probably beneficial to the municipalities. I would first deny what my friend to the left has said about the NDP denying the right in the previous bill to borrow money. That was not the purpose of the previous bill, and our House leader made it very clear why we voted against that bill, but I point out that this bill provides an option for the municipality. It must no longer just have an agreement with the development corporation, but it can, in fact, provide a mortgage.

I suggest there might be some cases in which the municipality, if there was a mortgage on the property and it had not sold, might prefer to let the Ontario Development Corp. foreclose if it saw fit. The land would still be there. It would still be there for development purposes. I suggest this gives an option to the municipality which it didn't have before, and therefore we in our party can see no disadvantage to the municipalities by having this option.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Mr. Speaker, I think there are just two or three points. First of all, the municipality—I am putting this in lay language—as I understand it, has to have some authority to give a piece of paper to the Crown indicating that it has entered into an agreement whereby it owes some money. I don't suppose it matters whether it is called a mortgage or a promissory note or whatever, but they have to have that authority and this bill gives them that authority.

Second, the lawyers tell me that it would only be on the piece of property in question; it wouldn't be on the courthouse or the mayor's car. The third question is that of the normal provisions for partial discharge, which I am told is the correct term; as a piece of the property is sold, the mortgage will be discharged on that portion and there will be a clear title.

Mr. Roy: With your permission, Mr. Speaker, may I ask a question of the min-

ister? He said the mortgage of the security would be only on the piece of property involved, but the bill doesn't say that. The bill goes on to say, "or may furnish such other security as the corporation considers appropriate." So the possibility is—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. If you have a question, ask it. Any discussion should go to committee.

Mr. Roy: Mr. Speaker, the reason I make this comment—

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member may ask a question for clarification.

Mr. Roy: The question is simply this, that it is open, according to the bill, to mortgage the mayor's car or any other security that the corporation may deem fit. Doesn't the bill say that?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Mr. Speaker, the lawyers tell me not.

Mr. Roy: Read the last two sentences.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

Mr. Speaker: Shall the bill be ordered for third reading?

Mr. Roy: I would like to discuss this point in committee.

Mr. Speaker: Shall the bill be ordered for third reading? I don't hear a dissenting voice, so it is carried.

Mr. Roy: Committee.

Mr. Speaker: Was there something I didn't hear? All right then. The committee of the whole House, Mr. Minister? Agreed.

BILLS OF SALE AND CHATTEL MORTGAGES AMENDMENT ACT

Hon. Mr. Handleman moved second reading of Bill 9, An Act to amend the Bills of Sale and Chattel Mortgages Act.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

Mr. Speaker: Shall this bill be ordered for third reading? Agreed.

ASSIGNMENT OF BOOK DEBTS AMENDMENT ACT

Hon. Mr. Handleman moved second reading of Bill 10, An Act to amend the Assignment of Book Debts Act.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

Mr. Speaker: Shall this bill be ordered for third reading? Agreed.

CONDITIONAL SALES AMENDMENT ACT

Hon. Mr. Handleman moved second reading of Bill 11, An Act to amend the Conditional Sales Act.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

Mr. Speaker: Shall this bill be ordered for third reading? Agreed.

[5:45]

RESIDENTIAL PREMISES RENT REVIEW ACT

Hon. Mr. Rhodes moved second reading of Bill 20, An Act to provide for the Review of Rents in respect of Residential Premises.

Mr. Davison: Mr. Speaker, I must say that it's an absolute delight to have the opportunity to debate a bill such as this in the Legislature. I'm sure that my party colleagues who have served in previous Parliaments have dreamt about such bills.

It's truly amazing what a close call in an election can do to a political party. Before Sept. 18 a Tory politician could have been described as one who stood for what he thought others would fall for—

Hon. Mr. Meen: Are you reading a speech from your father?

Mr. Davison: I beg your pardon?

Hon. Mr. Meen: Carry on if you're reading a speech.

Mr. Davison: But now that they are viewing things from the brink of disaster, staring down into the abyss of eternal opposition, it seems that a Tory politician stands for what others think, or else he falls.

I for one don't really mind the government introducing NDP policy—mind you, they've been able to botch it up in a few places. They put me in mind of the student who manages to fail his exam even though he has a cheat sheet.

Of course, all this means that the Tories will have to change the colour of their election signs from Chargex blue and gold to shocking pink.

Mr. Speaker: We're going to get to the principle of the bill I presume, right away?

Mr. Davison: We certainly are.

Mr. Speaker: Because that's what this action is all about.

Mr. Davison: We're talking about the principle.

Mr. Sweeney: This is par for the course.

Mr. Davison: Actually, in the next campaign I think they could even switch right to red, because I understand the Liberals are abandoning that, having found a more suitable colour called chameleon.

Mr. Singer: You should know.

Mr. Roy: Stevie wouldn't go for that.

Mr. Davison: Mr. Speaker, if for a moment I could address myself to the reasoned heads, opposite, who came up with the bill. I would remind them of what George Elliott once said: "It's never too late to be what you might have been." And to this end I have with me several NDP membership cards, and would be happy to sponsor their application for membership.

I would refer you to Hansard of Oct. 30, 1975. I asked the Minister of Housing (Mr. Rhodes) the following question during the oral question period:

> Does the proposed rent review legislation apply to all rental premises, specifically small business, commercial and industrial premises? And if not, why not.

Hansard clearly showed the minister's reply as:

> The hon. member should wait until the legislation is introduced in the House next week, at which time we can have a full and proper debate on the legislation and on the bill.

Unless the minister wishes to claim he was misquoted, I would like at this point to avail myself of his kind offer.

I'm sure that when most members read the title of Bill 20—An Act to provide for the Review of Rents in respect of Residential Premises—they would assume that the Act didn't apply to small business, commercial and industrial premises. But not me. To prove that I'm not a doubting Thomas or one to unfairly make accusations, I went over the bill with a fine-tooth comb. I examined the fine print with my reading glass, and you know what I found? Nothing.

The bill does not apply to small business, commercial and industrial premises. So I asked myself, as I asked the minister, if not why not? Indeed, why not?

Perhaps the minister and the government feel hesitant about using somebody else's ideas. I realize that whether an idea is old or new, it's value depends on how intelligently someone uses it. And I further realize that intelligent use of ideas isn't the government's forte. However, this bill stands as evidence of the government's willingness to expropriate the concepts of others, and, therefore, I can't imagine that this is a reason for them to commit the sin of exclusion.

Perhaps the minister and the government are afraid of shopping-mall owners, and developers, and the other scurrilous creatures that inhabit that dark world of high finance.

Mr. Roy: What do you call it?

Mr. Davison: Perhaps the minister and the government feel they have already offered their best supporters enough offence as it is. Perhaps the minister and the government are trying to protect their unholy alliance.

That really can't be the reason, because haven't these same Conservatives shown their fine courage in their brave stand against the apartment developers. Of course they have. How could we doubt it for a moment?

Perhaps there's a very simple explanation for the exclusion.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: That's a fine speech dad wrote.

Mr. Nixon: The minister is above that kind of thing.

Mr. Davison: He is not in the gallery pulling the strings, though.

Perhaps there is a simple explanation. Perhaps the hon. minister and the government really meant to protect small businessmen from rent-gouging, but the typist bungled it, as was claimed during the election campaign on the matter of the GAINS supplement. I wonder, in a different vein for a moment, because it is not my nature to be uncharitable. I wonder if the government in the case of rent-gouging in commercial-industrial premises, doesn't consider that the case against the gougers has been properly documented. I suppose that is a possibility.

During the election campaign we all watched horror story after horror story unfold concerning rent gouging. After that, I thought, as I suspect most members of the House thought, that nothing about rent gouging would surprise us. But it is not so. Late in October, I received a telephone call from a man in Oakville, Ontario. What he told me later led me to accuse the council of the

corporation of the town of Oakville of being rent gougers of the first order. I would ask the members to keep this case in mind because I think it indicates that we have to seriously consider the advisability of section 12, subsection (a) of this Bill 20. However, I merely mention that en passant.

I would like to share some of the details and background of this case with the members of the House. Mr. George Fenton operates a second-hand furniture store at the premises at 181 Church Street in Oakville. It is an old firehall that is owned by the town. I might add that he is held in very high regard by the business community of this town. I would like to read excerpts of a letter that he received, dated July 15, 1975, over the signature of C. R. Demerais, solicitor. It says:

> Council, on July 8, in considering the matter of your tenancy, decided to offer the property to you for one further year at a monthly rental of $400 commencing with rent due Sept. 1. One full month's notice of increase is required, and therefore your Aug. 1 rent will remain at the previous figure of $250.

That is a rent increase of 60 per cent. I might add that on top of the usual clause about paying his own heat, hydro and so on, his lease carries the stipulation that he pay for any increase in the taxes on the property. During Mr. Fenton's tenancy, little or no maintenance was carried out by the town on those premises. Mr. Fenton is being driven out of business by rent gouging. Let me read you the opinion of his accountant:

> Mr. Fenton, you are not making any money now, despite all the hours you put in and the hard work you do. What do you expect to be the result with the rent increase along with all your other overheads, which are increasing so rapidly?

Unfortunately, Mr. Fenton's case is not an outstanding exception to the rule.

Mr. Shore: Maybe his accountant gave him good advice. He wasn't making any money anyway.

Mr. Davison: In Oakville, in Hamilton, as in many other areas of the province, small businessmen are being driven out of business or their operations are becoming more and more marginal as a result of rent gouging.

On Friday, November 7, 1975, the day after this bill was introduced in the House, the Hamilton Spectator chose the story as its headline article. The headline was, "Rent Hikes Pegged at Eight Per Cent." It was a very long article, and near the end of it they had a couple of sentences on how I was attacking the government over the exclusion of small businessmen and that I had claimed that rents on commercial properties had been subject to worse rent gouging than those on residential premises. Those two short sentences they had in that long article had a very remarkable effect. On the weekend—last weekend—I received several phone calls about rent gouging in this sector. What I am about to tell you is incredible. I am sure that my fellow members will be as shocked as I was.

The lowest rental increase that I was informed of was 100 per cent. Surely increases of this type are gouging in anybody's book.

Mr. Shore: How large a sample have you got there? Three? Four?

Mr. Foulds: You will get a chance to make your speech later.

Mr. Davison: There was something else the callers had in common that I found to be more disturbing than the increases themselves. Every one of them, to a man, refused to allow me to make their names or the circumstances of their cases public. They were all afraid that their landlords would retaliate with even greater demands. I think, as a matter of fact I'm sure, that some small businessmen are afraid of more than just the financial threat involved.

It's a dirty business and I guess as long as some of these shady characters are not affected by the law, we will never know just how bad the rent gouging is in this area. I'm not going to call it a reign of terror, but it's certainly a reign of intimidation and it's high time the government stepped in, broke up the clouds and let some sunshine in on these seedy operators.

Most people would cite the government's inaction on the issue as evidence it really doesn't care about small businessmen. I don't wish to be unkind but the lack of legislation does add credence to these charges. This and other assaults on small businessmen throughout the province, whether by private concerns or the government, should end immediately. We can't allow them to be forced out of business and they must remain competitive.

Small business must remain the backbone of our economy because without it the people of our province, the consumers, are at the mercy of big business and huge multinational corporations—and they don't have any mercy. Although I don't expect the government to believe it, bigger is not better. If the govern-

ment thinks that by ignoring the problem and doing absolutely nothing about it, it will go away, it won't.

Further let me remind the government of what Molière said about the results of such a course: "It is not only what we do but also what we do not do for which we are accountable." If the government persists on its course, it will find this out at the next election and will have four years in which to contemplate it as the third party.

If the hon. Minister of Housing would state that small business, commercial and industrial premises were not included in the legislation simply because such premises did not fall under the jurisdiction of his ministry and some other minister had such legislation ready and was about to bring it forward to the House, I would accept that. Actually, that might be preferable because legislation to protect small businessmen should be much tougher than this watered-down Bill 20. I'm sure my colleagues will have a great deal to say about the condition of this bill.

In conclusion, with all sincerity, I plead with the government not to throw small businessmen to the wolves and not to turn its back on the plight of small businessmen.

The House recessed at 6 o'clock p.m.

CONTENTS

Thursday, November 13, 1975

Falconbridge layoffs, questions of B. Stephenson: Mr. Deans, Mr. Laughren, Mr. Martel .. 497

Oil and gas prices, questions of Mr. Davis: Mr. Deans, Mr. Nixon, Mr. Foulds, Mr. R. S. Smith 498

HOME programme, question of Mr. Rhodes: Mr. Deans 500

Asbestos emissions at Johns-Manville operation, question of B. Stephenson: Mr. Deans 500

UN Zionism resolution, question of Mr. Davis: Mr. Nixon 501

Light rail transit study, question of Mr. Davis: Mr. Nixon 501

St. Joseph's Hospital staff reduction, question of Mr. F. S. Miller: Mr. Yakabuski 504

Aerial spraying contract, question of Mr. Kerr: Mr. Burr 504

Regional government, question of Mr. McKeough: Mr. Reed 505

Dairy industry, question of Mr. W. Newman: Mr. Wiseman 505

Langstaff jail farm, question of Mr. McKeough: Mr. Philip 505

Violence in cities, question of Mr. McMurtry: Mr. Cunningham 506

Northern Indian reserves employment programme, question of Mr. Bernier: Mrs. Bryden 506

Kitchener Courthouse, question of Mrs. Scrivener: Mr. Sweeney 507

Report, select committee to consider Bills 4 and 5, Mrs. Campbell 507

Report, Ontario Municipal Improvement Corp., Ontario Universities Capital Aid Corp., Ontario Educational Capital Aid Corp., Public Service Superannuation Fund, Mr. McKeough 508

Report, Civil Service Commission, Mr. Auld 508

Highway Traffic Amendment Act, Mr. Roy, first reading 508

Election Amendment Act, Mr. Grossman, first reading 508

Post-Retirement Integration of Insurance Moneys and Pension Benefits Prevention Act, Mr. Laughren, first reading 508

Assessment Amendment Act, Mr. Meen, second reading 509

Development Corporations Amendment Act, Mr. Bennett, second reading 518

Municipal Amendment Act, Mr. McKeough, second reading 531

Bills of Sale and Chattel Mortgages Amendment Act, Mr. Handleman, second reading 533

Assignment of Book Debts Amendment Act, Mr. Handleman, second reading 533

Conditional Sales Amendment Act, Mr. Handleman, second reading 533

Residential Premises Rent Review Act, Mr. Rhodes, on second reading 533

Recess 536

SPEAKERS IN THIS ISSUE

Angus, I. (Fort William NDP)
Bennett, Hon. C. Industry and Tourism (Ottawa South PC)
Bernier, Hon. L. Natural Resources (Kenora PC)
Bullbrook, J. E. (Sarnia L)
Burr, F. A. (Windsor-Riverside NDP)
Bryden, M. (Beaches-Woodbine NDP)
Campbell, M. (St. George L)
Cassidy, M. (Ottawa Centre NDP)
Cunningham, E. (Wentworth North L)
Davis, Hon. W. G. Premier (Brampton PC)
Deans, I. (Wentworth NDP)
Eakins, J. (Victoria-Haliburton L)
Ferrier, W. (Cochrane South NDP)
Foulds, J. F. (Port Arthur NDP)
Germa, M. C. (Sudbury NDP)
Gigantes, E. (Carleton East NDP)
Godfrey, C. (Durham West NDP)
Good, E. R. (Waterloo North L)
Grossman, L. (St. Andrew-St. Patrick PC)
Johnson, J. (Wellington-Dufferin-Peel PC)
Kerr, Hon. G. A. Environment (Burlington South PC)
Laughren, F. (Nickel Belt NDP)
Lawlor, P. D. Lakeshore (NDP)
MacDonald, D. C. (York South NDP)
Makarchuk, M. (Brantford NDP)
Martel, E. W. (Sudbury East NDP)
McKeough, Hon. W. D. Treasurer, Minister of Economics and Intergovernmental Affairs (Chatham-Kent PC)
McMurtry, Hon. R. Attorney General (Eglinton PC)
Meen, Hon. A. K. Revenue (York East PC)
Miller, Hon. F. S. Health (Muskoka PC)
Newman, Hon. W. Agriculture and Food (Durham North PC)
Nixon, R. F. (Brant-Oxford-Norfolk L)
Philip, E. (Etobicoke NDP)
Reed, J. (Halton-Burlington L)
Reid, T. P. (Rainy River L)
Rhodes, Hon. J. R. Housing (Sault Ste. Marie PC)
Riddell, J. (Huron-Middlesex L)
Roy, A. J. (Ottawa East L)
Ruston, R. F. (Essex North L)
Samis, G. (Cornwall NDP)
Sargent, E. (Grey-Bruce L)
Scrivener, Hon. M. Government Services (St. David PC)
Shore, M. (London North L)
Singer, V. M. (Wilson Heights L)
Smith, R. S. (Nipissing L)
Stephenson, Hon. B. Labour (York Mills PC)
Stokes, J. E. (Lake Nipigon NDP)
Swart, M. (Welland NDP)
Sweeney, J. (Kitchener-Wilmot L)
Taylor, Hon. J. A. Minister of Community and Social Services (Prince Edward-Lennox PC)
Welch, Hon. R. Culture and Recreation (Brock PC)
Wells, Hon. T. L. Education (Scarborough North PC)
Wiseman, D. J. (Lanark PC)
Yakabuski, P. J. (Renfrew South PC)
Young, F. (Yorkview NDP)

No. 14



Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT — DAILY EDITION

First Session of the Thirtieth Legislature

Thursday, November 13, 1975

Evening Session

Speaker: Honourable Russell Daniel Rowe
Clerk: Roderick Lewis, QC

THE QUEEN'S PRINTER
PARLIAMENT BUILDINGS, TORONTO
1975

CONTENTS

A list of the speakers taking part in the debates in this issue of Hansard appears, in alphabetical order, at the back of this issue.

Daily contents of proceedings also appears at the back of this issue. Reference to a cumulative index of previous issues can be obtained by calling the Hansard Reporting Service indexing staff. Phone 965-2159.

Hansard subscription price is $15.00 per session, from: Sessional Subscription Service, MGS, 9th Floor, Ferguson Block, Parliament Bldgs., Toronto, M7A 1N3. Phone 965-2238.

LEGISLATURE OF ONTARIO

RESIDENTIAL PREMISES RENT REVIEW ACT

(continued)

The House resumed at 8 p.m.

Mrs. Campbell: First of all, Mr. Speaker, I would like to say that I am deeply distressed at the procedures by which we are dealing with this legislation. It had been my understanding that the Attorney General's (Mr. McMurtry) bill would already have been before the House. I really don't like this method of proceeding with two parts of the same problem. They were dealing with rent review; we're dealing with the ceilings, as it were, on rent increases. We are not permitted really to know what the bill is which will grant security of tenure. I find as I have reviewed the statement by the Attorney General that there appear to be some dichotomies between the two pieces of legislation. I suppose my position at the moment is that I protest this method of proceeding on a matter of such urgency and of such concern to a great many citizens of this province.

When we look at the bill itself, I have some real reservations about it. I was rather amazed when the bill was introduced and the Attorney General's statement was introduced to find that the official opposition was so cheerful and joyful about this presentation. In my view there was not too much to be joyful about, notwithstanding the fact, of course, that this party obviously supports the principle of rent review and, of course, the matter of security of tenure.

I would like to indicate, if I may, some of my real concerns with the bill itself. It's interesting to me that in this bill we are requiring tenants to come forward virtually one at a time to protest rent increases. There is no provision for a class action. There is provision presumably for a class action in the security-of-tenure legislation to come. It is true, of course, that rents do not all come due at the same time. I appreciate that problem and the mechanics of it. But it does seems to me that where a group of people are involved with increases at the same time they presumably ought to be able to move collectively in this bill as in the others.

I am disappointed that we have approached this rent review legislation on the basis of percentages at all. Mr. Speaker, you may recollect that our bill did not provide this kind of percentage increase approach at all. We felt that there should be a proper review, and that we should take into consideration the increases which had been allowed prior to the legislation, in determining whether or not any increase was justified at all. What has happened is that with the government position prior to the election—their position—I don't remember how many positions they had during the campaign—

An hon. member: Five.

Mrs. Campbell: Was it five? My colleague informed me it was five different positions.

Mr. Roy: Or was it six, John?

Mrs. Campbell: What happened was we simply allowed landlords, certainly in this community, to increase their rents in many cases far beyond what one would deem to be legitimate increases based upon increased costs. Now of course the eight per cent proposed in this particular bill, in section 3, provides for a minimum of eight per cent increases on top of some that were well over 50 per cent in parts of my riding. My riding, I have to point out—and I'm sure almost everyone in this House must know that riding because most of you live in it at least part of the time – is about two-thirds apartment-tenant-occupant in character.

My thinking about the matter of rent increases may to some extent at least have been predicated upon a report of Central Mortgage and Housing, which came out in June of this year. It indicated only a 13.3 per cent average increase. Once I saw the breakdown of that particular report, I found that, interestingly enough, in St. James Town, they dealt with 14 properties. It happens that there are, and I believe I'm correct, 16 buildings in that particular area. Of the 16, two are limited dividends and four are Ontario Housing. These were all part of the total report. So one can see the distortions there

would be if one pursued it to Flemingdon Park, which I believe has much the same kind of picture, and other areas. I find it totally unacceptable to rely on that report for the purposes indicated.

So with all these massive increases which have taken place—I point out to you again, and I'm sick of pointing it out that Lynwood and Avenue Road increased by $215 a month—and now on top of that they will have the dandy little gift of another eight per cent. I find it very difficult to understand how a government which purports to care could bring in that particular provision.

Another thing that disturbs me in the bill itself is the provision of rent review officers. You may recall again, Mr. Speaker, that we provided for rent review boards which would be municipally appointed, because it is obvious that the conditions vary across this province. But now we have rent review officers appointed by the province, and this doesn't give tenants a feeling of security in the decisions which may be reached by one officer. You have your rent review board, which is a board of appeal, as it were—whatever the name of it is, and I have forgotten it now. But there is really no provision even there to ensure that there will be at least somebody on that board who understands the plight of tenants.

I must say that I do congratulate the minister on one aspect—that he has seen fit to take this legislation out of the courts, something which the Attorney General did not see fit to do. But I really am at a loss to understand how the two pieces of legislation can dovetail together.

I would like to look at the exclusions, which really disturb me. Why should one exclude land owned or operated by the government of Canada, the government of Ontario or by an agency of either of them. It is a fact that there are people in Ontario Housing, for example, who perhaps are improving their financial position. Since it is, in essence, rent-geared-to-income housing, one might wonder whether it is equitable—when so many people really need to get into Ontario Housing and there isn't any for them—that we should protect that particular group.

I recognize the freeze that has been on Ontario Housing for senior citizens. Nevertheless I have drawn to the attention of two ministers a case at 155 Sherbourne in my riding where, by reason of increases in old age pensions and in GAINS, their rent has increased in Ontario Housing from $51 a month to $104.

I'd like to point out that when the Liberals introduced, through our leader's private member's bill, the GAINS programme, we were talking about disposable income. You may remember that we tried to get a commitment from this government at the time we were discussing GAINS—and the former minister is nodding because he remembers that we wanted the Minister of Housing to be committed to not increasing the rents simply because of increases in pensions and in the GAINS programme, or as a result, at that time, of the introduction of the GAINS programme.

[8:15]

I worried then because we couldn't get that commitment. Here we see it, just as we thought it would be. I am interested too that at this time there is no recognition of the fact that a prestige apartment building built on university property in the city of Toronto, which doesn't pay full land taxes by virtue of charters, is able to increase its rent from $295 a month for a two-bedroom apartment to $425 as of the end of this month. And that bothers me.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: They are controlled. They are under control.

Mrs. Campbell: I know, but no provision is made here, as it ought properly to be, that you deal with that very question now and ensure, particularly when the Treasurer (Mr. McKeough) is going to cut back on funds to municipalities, that at least they are going to have to pay land taxes like anybody else.

I would just like you to pay some attention to the inequities which are indicated as a result of the lack of clarification in this bill. We also exclude luxury apartments. I guess it's luxury at $500 a month. That seems to be the situation. It is interesting to note, in view of the fact that this particular provision was introduced not too long ago in this bill, as it came into the House the numbers of landlords who have increased the rent from $312 to over $500. I would like to know where that tenant stands in appealing to anyone if he or she has been forced into the position of signing a lease and then become a person paying $500. I would like to get some clarification of that too.

It is a fact that there are other exclusions which bother me greatly. I don't understand the meaning of the exclusion of the four units. I really don't understand why we have excluded slum landlords and rooming houses. Interestingly enough, if one reads the statement of the Attorney General, he applies tenant security to weekly tenants, and in my

riding most of the weekly tenants live in rooming houses. And I am quite aware that at the present time rooming house tenants are not covered under the Landlord and Tenant Act provisions.

Let me give you some examples of people —these have just been brought to me over the dinner hour — who live in houses with four units. There are 150 tenants involved in this particular group. They are not covered. The trust company, which is, I am told, the manager of the particular group of buildings, I am informed, has done nothing to maintain them. And yet the rents have escalated. In fact, I'm advised that they're trying to put a clause in the new leases that they can evict people during the lease if more than $1,000 worth of renovations is required by the housing inspector. It seems to me that that is somewhat intimidating, because if tenants are afraid—and I don't know how many tenants one could count that aren't afraid these days—I suppose they won't let anybody know what needs to be done in these buildings. But by the same token, for some reason, these people are excluded from the bill which is before us. And I can't understand why.

It seems to me that it is evident as we review this legislation that this government has acted as I suppose we ought to have expected it to do, to be brought kicking and screaming into this particular piece of legislation, withholding as much as possible from any real conclusions. It's interesting too that the rent review officers may make an order for a rebate of rent in certain circumstances. It doesn't say when; there is no indication about when.

In this city, notwithstanding the legislation, it is very difficult for tenants to find out who really owns the place. You know, there are changes very rapidly during the course of a very short period of time. So, while the penalty looks to be reasonable, one wonders about the mechanics of collecting. One wonders how one gets the money back. There is no provision for a registration of an order against the land. I just don't understand why, when we come to the point of recognizing need, we have to hold back in the ways in which we are holding back under this bill.

I would like to hear from the minister if he is able to tell us how these two bills are somehow going to work together, because I think it's essential that we know that as we debate this bill. If it is a fact that we're going to give security of tenure to rooming house tenants in one bill, but no control in the other, where do we go from there? I wonder what the design has been behind this kind of introduction. But perhaps the minister can allay my fears. I hope so.

As we go through the bill, one notes that there is a period of time at which the increases are somewhat open-ended. I'd like to hear more about that. I'd like to hear more about why we go from eight per cent fixed to eight per cent maybe to no per cent or something. As I say, we in this party have always felt that it was important to us and to the community at large to recognize the increased costs of landlords. There was no question about our position on that. We do say we do not believe we either want to see or could see government building all of the housing needed right now let alone what may be needed in the next two, three, four or five years.

We have a concern about recognizing the costs of landlords but equally we have a concern about fixing the maximum as a minimum, if you like—or vice versa—in this first clause. One of the things I'm finding, too, is a great deal of confusion in that landlords who are now offering a one-year lease—I must say thank you very much; at least the government has done that; we're being offered leases now which is a new switch in many cases. The landlords are now saying, "Of course, since the lease is for a whole year, we should be able to charge 16 per cent—eight this year and eight next." This sort of thing has to be very carefully considered. I'd like to know how you're going to proceed. Because this is the position they are taking.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: Talk to your colleague.

Mrs. Campbell: I don't have to talk to my colleague. I know what is being offered.

Mr. Nixon: She has talked to her colleagues.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: She missed one.

Mr. Nixon: He is a great guy; he is going to make his own speech.

Mrs. Campbell: All right. Technically—but this is the proposition they are putting forward.

Mr. Singer: You've got very little assistance there tonight at all. Where are they?

Mr. Nixon: Empty blue chairs and the Minister without Portfolio, who is everybody's friend. He is not going to be of any help. Even Yakabuski has gone out.

Mr. Singer: Even the aspiring cabinet ministers aren't here. Yakabuski, Eaton and the guy from Oriole.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The hon. member for St. George has the floor.

Mr. Singer: I would have thought Bob Eaton would be here. This is bean-board night.

Mrs. Campbell: I would like to say this, it seems to me—

Mr. Singer: What happened to Williams?

Mrs. Campbell: —that with the way in which this bill is proceeding, and as I understand it is going to proceed, I would like very much to ask this minister to make a statement to ensure that we can remove some of the confusion in the minds of people who are very much disturbed about their position with leases coming due at this moment in time. I think it would be very helpful if he would make some statements that would clarify the position of both the landlord and the tenant.

The principle of the bill obviously is one which we support. There will be, without question, amendments brought forward on it after we've had the opportunity of hearing from the public, as I understand we shall be doing. I would ask the minister to think very seriously about the scheme of this bill as it is affected by the Attorney General's bill. If he can address himself to that, perhaps I may be able to work through my problems with the two pieces of legislation at least, because I can't see them together at this point in time.

[8:30]

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Ottawa Centre.

Mr. Nixon: This may take 10 or 12 minutes, so relax. Bill, are you really looking forward to this?

Mr. Ferrier: What are you doing over in that corner?

Mr. Nixon: This may take 10 or 12 minutes, so relax.

Mr. Cassidy: One of the benefits of this new House to me, in terms of my personal health, is the fact that Bill Ferrier now sits behind Tony Grande. Therefore Tony Grande can suffer the hearing problems that I occasionally suffered.

Mr. Nixon: Bill will applaud you, no matter what you say.

Mr. Gaunt: Bill is a fan.

Mr. Cassidy: Mr. Speaker, for obvious reasons I welcome the debate this evening and I welcome the bill which has been put forward by the government. Perhaps I could start with that tone because the hon. minister may already have sensed that while we have a number of reservations about the details of the bill—reservations I may say which are so grave that if the bill weren't corrected we might oppose it on third reading—we agree with the principles of the bill and we intend to support this bill on second reading.

Interjections.

Mr. Cassidy: I think as far as the NDP caucus is concerned, when the vote comes up on second reading we will vote for the bill with a unanimity which will not mark the secret feelings of either the Liberal Party on my left—

Mr. Singer: How do you vote with secret feelings. That is a good one.

Mr. Cassidy: —or of the government party which has eventually come around in order to draft this bill.

Mr. Nixon: I didn't know you were the psychiatrist in your group.

Mr. Cassidy: The conversions that have taken place both of the antediluvian party of the Conservatives of this province—

Interjections.

Mr. Cassidy —and of the antediluvian party of the Liberals in this province—

Mr. Nixon: To your left.

Mr. Cassidy: —over the last month, or the last years, are remarkable to behold.

Mr. Roy: Thank God we've got you.

Mr. Cassidy: The rumblings which we have heard, particularly may I say from the newer members of both the Liberal and the Conservative caucus, who say privately: Well, I don't like what we are doing, but I guess we have to go along because our leader says we are going to do it.

Mr. Nixon: Now who could possibly talk to you frankly? Even your own colleagues don't talk to you.

Mr. Cassidy: I can name a few names like that.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The hon. member is supposed to be discussing the principles of the bill.

Mr. Cassidy: On the contrary, Mr. Speaker—

Mr. Singer: You are impugning motives, which is against the rules.

Mr. Cassidy: In the NDP caucus, I have to say, I have been viewed as a force of reaction.

Mr. Roy: Don't limit that to the NDP caucus.

Mr. Cassidy: Any comments that I have had to make about rent control have been viewed as the last gasp of the bourgeoisie and that my efforts to moderate the new members of our—

Mr. Singer: Do you really think people spend that much time viewing you?

Mr. Cassidy: —caucus are matched only by the efforts of the leader of the third party to keep the new members of his caucus in line.

Mr. Nixon: Who is to your left—

Mr. Cassidy: I want to talk about—

Mr. Singer: He does little else than view you.

An hon. member: All of the leaders of that party are to your left.

Mr. Cassidy: That's right, to my left physically but—

Mr. Nixon: This is the new sexy Cassidy.

Mr. Cassidy: I want to say, since it is probably appropos—I am not sure if the member for Hamilton is in this House—but some years ago a close relative of mine ran for the leadership of—

Mr. Singer: Close relative? Think of your father with more respect.

Mr. Cassidy: —of the Liberal Party of Ontario. He was supported by Mr. Singer, as I recall.

Mr. Singer: That's right. A fine man he was, too. Too bad it didn't carry through to the second generation.

Mr. Cassidy: And by a number of other people who were young Turks in the party at that time.

An hon. member: I would have voted for him had I been around.

Mr. Cassidy: I want to say to the House and I want to say to the Liberal Party both: With hindsight, what my father did was really a mistake, because the party was beyond redemption and is beyond redemption today.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: Your father made one mistake. He made one mistake.

Mr. Singer: That wasn't a mistake. He made another one.

Mr. Nixon: They caught him in bed with your mother.

Mr. Cassidy: It may be—

Mr. Speaker: Order! I think the hon. member wants to get on with the principle of the bill now.

Mr. Shore: Which bill are you on?

Mr. Cassidy: It may be that the Liberal Party, which has made many mistakes in the last 30 years—

Interjections.

Mr. Cassidy: —my father was a socialist too. You didn't know what you almost got. It may be that the Liberal Party, which has made many mistakes in the past, made a mistake at that time as well.

Mr. Nixon: Your father doesn't need defending, but you do.

Mr. Roy: The member for Ottawa Centre is a mistake.

Mr. Speaker: Could we get on with the bill, please?

Mr. Cassidy: Yes, let me talk about the bill.

An hon. member: You are disturbing the hon. minister.

Mr. Cassidy: The hon. minister? Rent control, yes.

Mr. Singer: He always spoke well of you.

Mr. Samis: Behind closed doors.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: Rent control.

Mr. Cassidy: Mr. Speaker, as spokesman for a party which has consistently advocated protection for tenants—

Interjection.

Mr. Cassidy: —and rent control in this province for a number of years, it's obviously—

Mr. Nixon: There have been two years of inactivity. Don't give us that business.

Mr. Cassidy: —a pleasure to speak in this particular debate. I want to say that—

Mr. Roy: It's not a pleasure to listen to you.

Mr. Cassidy: —Conservatives have dangled this plum before the electorate on a number of occasions before. I have a headline here which says "Ontario Plans To Control Rent"—

Interjection.

Mr. Cassidy: It says, and I quote—it's from the Globe and Mail—"The Ontario government plans to introduce legislation to regulate rents at the current session of the Legislature."

Hon. Mr. Taylor: This is it.

Mr. Cassidy: This was in February, 1969.

Mr. Moffatt: And you were still a Liberal then.

Mr. Nixon: That was when you were a Liberal.

Mr. Cassidy: Bert Lawrence—

Interjections.

Mr. Cassidy: It was about that time that an NDP member, the member for Wentworth (Mr. Deans), first introduced to this Legislature a bill that would have provided for a rent control. It was also at about that time that the city of Ottawa, which was then experiencing difficulties which have now become—

An hon. member: Hurrah!

Mr. Cassidy: Well!

Mr. Nixon: There is the next speaker. Come right in now.

Mr. Cassidy: The member for Renfrew South (Mr. Yakabuski) should be on the stage for making that kind of an entrance.

Interjections.

Mr. Cassidy: It was also in 1969 that the city of Ottawa—

Interjections.

Mr. Cassidy: —that the member for Wentworth presented a bill. That was the first time that the NDP publicly advocated in this House that there should be protection for tenants against rent gouging.

The rent gouging which was beginning at that time has gotten consistently worse, year after year. I don't need to introduce a whole lot of horror stories into the Legislature, because the principle of rent control has now been accepted. Even the government accepts that what we have talked about over the last three or four or five years is a legitimate concern which requires legislation. I would point out though, to give one example, that CMHC figures themselves indicate that the rents on vacant apartments, which had been increasing by 15 to 20 per cent in 1974, were increasing from 20 to 35 per cent in 1975. As you know, Mr. Speaker, being a man who is a cognoscenti in urban matters of note, the—

Interjections.

Mr. Cassidy: —rent increases on vacant apartments are very quickly reflected in the pattern of rents that occurs in buildings generally. For the record, on June 20, 1973, some seven or eight months before the member for St. George, I introduced a bill into the Legislature which implemented my party's policy on rent control. If I can read the principles that were given in the explanatory notes of that bill, they will illustrate that we, unlike the party opposite and unlike the party to my left, have consistently hewn to the same principles of rent control every time we have talked about this subject.

Mr. Nixon: There is certainly something repetitious about you.

Mr. Cassidy: We said at the time that the purpose of our bill was to set guidelines to govern rent determinations and to provide tenants with security of tenure. We said that starting from the rents that prevailed at the end of December, 1972—this bill was introduced in 1973, and would that it had been accepted at that time—rent increases for residential accommodation in major Ontario cities should be justified only in relation to increases in the costs—not in relation to scarcity or the increase on new accommodation or to speculative factors.

That is a position that we hold to today. We said then and we say now that our intention was that most rent settlements would continue to be made without reference to government but with reference to the principles laid out in the Act. We called for a landlord and tenant tribunal, which is comparable to the landlord and tenant tribunal in this Act. We called for a network of rent regulation officers located in major cities around the province who were comparable to the rent review officers suggested in this particular Act.

We have suggested—this doesn't happen to be included in the Act—that the rent review officers would mediate disputes between landlord and tenants over rent initially. If they couldn't reach an amicable informal solution, they would make a rent determination, and if that was unacceptable to either party then they could appeal to the landlord-tenant tribunal. The structure is similar, although we did not at that time include a maximum permitted rent or rent guideline as is proposed by the government. In fact it had been proposed when we came up with some—

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: Is this 1972?

Mr. Cassidy: June 20, 1973. It was debated in this House a while later. We also, at that time, called for security of tenure along lines which have been imitated, with a number of changes, in the bill to be proposed by the Attorney General (Mr. McMurtry).

It was said, and I regret the fact, that our proposals, which at that time should have been adopted, were rejected by the government. They were defiled by the government. They were simply anathema to the government. When this bill was debated in May, 1974, for the first time in the Legislature, the former member for Peterborough, one of the many who fell by the wayside in this election, and whose successor sits to my right now, decried the bill.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: The whole caucus is to the right of the member.

Mr. Cassidy: I'm suggesting that they think that I am to the right of them. He said, mouthing what then was the ministry's line: "I think you have to look at the long-term effects of these things. I suggest that once you impose any controls it becomes more difficult to remove them." Then he recalled the difficulties of removing rent controls after the war, and he said that the results of removing rent controls were often more disastrous than the imposing of the rent controls themselves at the time. The line had been laid down and it was reiterated on many occasions, particularly during the disastrous tenure as Housing Minister of the hon. member for Carleton-Grenville (Mr. Irvine), a man who must bear a great deal of the responsibility for the fact that Ontario has been liberated from 25 or 26 Conservatives who sat in the last House and that Ontario now has a new official opposition.

Interjections.

Mr. Cassidy: The government's cronies in the development industry began to spend money as though it were going out of style this spring in order to give the official government line about rent controls. They said it has happened in New York and it could happen here.

Hon. Mr. Welch: What has that got to do with this bill?

Mr. Cassidy: They said that in New York, where rent controls have been tried, quality neighbourhoods have been turned into slums as buildings deteriorated. In neighbourhoods that didn't go to rack and ruin, they said, New York saw a black market created where tenants bartered apartments and leases for large sums of money.

Mr. Nixon: Just like those island leases.

Mr. Cassidy: They didn't mention the fact that six other major American cities with exactly the same urban problems as New York didn't happen to have rent control. The members of the UDI had made zillions of dollars, tens and tens and hundreds of millions of dollars, out of the backs of their tenants.

Mr. Nixon: Oh, zillions! That's a lot of dollars.

Mr. Singer: Zillions?

Mr. Cassidy: Quite a return.

Mr. Nixon: Some of the minister's best friends are UDI millionaires.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: How many zeros in a zillion?

Mr. Cassidy: They were using some of those gains that they had taken from their tenants in order to back this government, just as they had used some of the money that they had taken from tenants over the years in order to contribute to Conservative campaign funds in order, they hoped, to have the assurance that rent control would never darken the door of the Province of Ontario.

Mr. Nixon: Did UDI contribute to the minister's campaign?

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: I don't think so.

Mr. Cassidy: I quoted some comments from the UDI with reason.

Mr. Nixon: What's that intra-uterine?

Mr. Cassidy: If I can bring the record up to May of this year, the city of Toronto was making an effort to get rent controls before the private bills committee of this Legisla-

ture. It was up against the entrenched opposition of the member for Carleton-Grenville, that great urban expert, who called the city of Toronto's bill a disaster and put up as his mouthpiece a rather able Minister of Housing, Mr. Warren, who has now just become the commissioner for the Toronto Transit Commission.

Mr. Singer: He was deputy minister.

Mr. Cassidy: Deputy minister. The ministry line then was so different from the ministry line now that it almost rivals the flip-flop or the conversion which has taken place among the deputy ministers. The department's line has changed just about as radically and dramatically as has the minister's line. "In the ministry's experience," said Mr. Warren, the deputy minister—confusing his position — "after careful research and visits to other jurisdictions where rent controls have been tried, such controls have worsened the situation in the long run." In Quebec, he said, they haven't worked. In Boston, Mass., he said, the rental crisis has been intensified since controls were enacted. In New York, he said, rent controls were administratively unworkable. So the line went on, and I think the minister has got to explain his situation now. We know where we stand, and we have been pretty consistent, but neither the minister nor his department is being consistent at all.

The deputy minister said then that controls drive private builders out of the market.

[8:45]

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: Right.

Mr. Cassidy: Right, says the minister. Mr. Warren said it is unfair and unworkable to control the prices of one commodity without controlling the other commodities. He has said that maintenance would deteriorate, and this is a question that the minister needs to talk about.

He alleged that black markets would develop and that key money would begin to be charged, and then alleged, in the most amazing, rather leap of analysis, that income transfers which would take place would largely be from poor tenants to equally poor landlords.

I want to put on the record, I think it was in a gossip column or some—

Mr. Roy: We don't want any gossip in here.

Mr. Cassidy: Well no, this was fact as a matter of fact. It was a real estate column that I happened to pick up when I came back from the election.

Mr. Mancini: That's a good source of information.

Mr. Cassidy: It referred to a certain Mr. Berman. Mr. Berman, whose first name I can't recollect, is executive vice-president or administrative vice-president of Cadillac Fairview Corp. He is one of these poor landlords of whom the ministry talked.

This man, who has spent the last several years of his life ripping off tenants, now has the chutzpah to be spending $3 million, according to the press, on a modest little mansion up in the territory around King City —up in the millionaires' belt north of Toronto.

Mr. Nixon: He couldn't get a lot on the island.

Mr. Cassidy: I suppose that he couldn't afford the rents in St. James Town so he had to find a little something that was more suitable to his means. Those are the kinds of ripoffs that have been taking place.

Mr. Roy: You are getting great support from your front bench.

Mr. Cassidy: As recently as June, the former Minister of Housing (Mr. Irvine), was getting up in the Legislature on a point of privilege in order to assure the House that he had been misrepresented when the Toronto Star said that there was a move under way at Queen's Park to limit rents.

So it went. Then he began to feel the heat, and maybe the Premier (Mr. Davis) began to get to him as well. There were two or three members of the Legislature, including the member for Ottawa West (Mr. Morrow) who began to let it be known privately in caucus that maybe things weren't quite all they ought to be.

The member for Ottawa West had a $70 or $80 increase on Clearview Ave., where he lives, just outside the great riding of Ottawa Centre, and it began to come home to some of the tenants.

Mr. Morrow: On a point of order, just to correct the record, the hon. member for Ottawa West didn't have a rent increase. Some of his neighbours had.

Mr. Nixon: I would think the member for Ottawa West would be protected.

Mr. Cassidy: In other words, speaking on behalf of the middle class and upper middle class, who harbour in the same building as

he does, some of the Conservative members began to feel the heat as well.

The former Minister of Housing, on July 4 of this year said that the matter of rent legislation would be determined in the next few days. Then on the 10th he said that the statement on rents would be made "when the cabinet decides what my statement should be"; poor man, he never really understood what this was all about. Then on July 17 he said: "The government has discussed the matter of rent controls very seriously and fully in the last two days. I am expecting to make a statement very shortly." And so it went.

Finally came the statement, and never has the mountain laboured so hard to produce the mouse that came up on July 30.

Dear Donald Irvine, the line was still there; rent control didn't work, nothing could be done, and then he said:

> Government intervention on a wide scale would follow as one of the major disadvantages of rent control because of the withdrawal of private developers from the rental market.

Never did the ministry acknowledge that there has been a massive withdrawal of private developers from the rental market in Metro Toronto and other Ontario cities over the last year or two, and this has taken place alongside of gouging and enormous rent increases. There have been problems with private development in Montreal and Vancouver but they have not been as intense a withdrawal as has taken place in Toronto and tenants have not had to cope with rent increases of 20 per cent to 30 per cent.

The former Minister of Housing alleged that there would be a decline in the quality of building maintenance; that assessment values would drop and lower the municipal tax base; that black market practices would come; there would be the creation of a large bureaucracy to enforce controls and grave difficulties with the eventual return to a free market.

He promised an aggressive policy to promote construction—this was the old housing-by-headlines thing which we have had from the government these many years—and then he came forward with this programme:

The government would try to increase the supply of rental accommodation. Nothing has been heard about that.

The government would provide financial support to the landlord and tenant advisory bureaus. Nothing has been done about that.

The ministry was holding discussions and had had a pledge from the Urban Development Institute that its members would introduce into their code of ethics a requirement that all UDI tenants receive a complete explanation of requested rent increases. Nothing has been heard about that.

The core of the whole thing was the establishment of rent review boards in low-vacancy areas, whatever those were, at the request of the municipality with the power to look at landlords' books. All very well except that the only thing they could do would be to publicly expose unjustified rent increases through the holding of public hearings and other appropriate methods.

At that point the retreat was on in full flight, because it was evident within hours that the public would not accept the idea that landlords could be publicly exposed, either in the press or through some other more vivid means, and that this would somehow shame them into charging more reasonable kinds of rent.

The government then began to adopt the first of many other positions. "Decision 1975," the Conservative policy book, talked about the powers of rent review boards to bring to light unjustified or excessive rent increases.

A few days later, the Premier said that if the rent review boards were too weak, the government would develop a mechanism to deal with rent gougings.

Next the rent boards were to get temporary rollback powers, and then the review boards were to get the power to take the landlords to court. God knows what happened after that.

What was happening was that the Premier in particular—we didn't hear much from the then Minister of Housing in these days—was reacting under the pressure of not just the member for Scarborough West (Mr. Lewis) but the 900,000 tenants of this province and their families who were crying out from the bottom of their souls for action on rents.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: What rent is Stephen paying in Florida?

Mr. Cassidy: I haven't a clue. I haven't a clue. We will deal with rent control in Ontario first. Hotels are going to be exempted under the Act anyway—

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: He owns a condominium.

Mr. Cassidy: Oh, no. It's the Premier who owns the condominium, and I haven't heard that he is lending it to Stephen.

Mr. Nixon: Oh, they are pretty chummy.

Mr. Cassidy: As late as Sept. 12, the Premier was saying that although a tenant might be protected, if the tenant moved the landlord could raise the rent to any level between leases. Then he went on to say that he couldn't see why landlords would take advantage of that particular kind of freedom.

On Sept. 13, there was the famous advertisement of which the Conservative Party has washed its hands of responsibility but for which it was chastised by the election expenses commission. Headed, "Notice to Tenants", it talked about unfair rents being adjusted or rolled back and asked tenants to file their complaints. That was a setup, because there was an effort there to say after the election that the response to this rather inadequate and clearly partisan advertising, paid for out of government funds, had been so slight that there wasn't really a problem out there and therefore no action would be necessary. I am pleased to note that the government has not taken that particular position.

It was around that time that the government said it might use the courts, which have been notoriously pro-landlord, and use the Unconscionable Transactions Relief Act, an Act which has been used five times since 1923.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please, I wonder if the hon. member would get to the principle of the bill, rather than review history?

Mr. Cassidy: I think this is interesting, Mr. Speaker, and it is useful to put it on the record once and for all. People will want to know how many positions the government has taken, and maybe the minister can get up and tell me of a few positions the government has taken of which I was not aware.

Mr. Mancini: You just like to hear yourself talk.

Mr. Speaker: Perhaps the hon. member would get to the principle of the bill.

Mr. Cassidy: Mr. Speaker, I would point out as well that in this chronology I have now arrived at Sept. 18 whose events are perhaps known to you, Mr. Speaker, and where the vote clearly reflected a mandate for rent control from the electors of the major urban ridings.

There was still shilly-shallying after that, though. On Sept. 25, the Premier said the plan wasn't going to change, it would remain that weak. On Oct. 1, the then Minister of Housing, who obviously hadn't been in touch with everything which had been happening over the previous two months, warned that if there was a shortage of rental space, he might have to consider legislation to regulate the rental accommodation industry, something one thought the rest of the government had promised some time before.

Then, on Oct. 9, the Premier said maybe there would be alternatives to the promised rent review boards. This was at the time when he and the new Minister of Housing had enormous difficulty in communicating and were doing most of their communicating through the pages of the Toronto Star and the Globe and Mail. The minister immediately he came into office said rent review doesn't work; we've got to do something else.

It appeared the whole network of pledges made by the government during the course of the election had gone down the drain.

Finally, we come to the discussion which has taken place over the last few weeks: Support from the social planning councils; support from the Metro tenants; support from a number of other groups—important groups—which have given a great deal of thought to the questions of rent control; and support for schemes of rent control rather than rent review. Refreshing, may I say, from the minister was the statement he read in this House a week ago tomorrow, in which he said, "As the minister responsible for housing I am and must be concerned with the possibility that rent control could have an adverse effect on the development of rental accommodation."

Everybody agrees that is a problem and a problem which must be discussed: I hope it might even be discussed during the course of this debate. He mentions that a reduction had occurred in certain other jurisdictions and saw it as a distressing side effect of the strong medicine of rent control. Then he tied this government's rent control programme to the federal anti-inflation programme.

Pierre Trudeau had come along and had taken the government off the hook. He had given the government a ready-made excuse when its friends from the UDI came in quite properly feeling, perhaps that they had been betrayed. They asked "How come you guys, who've been holding the pass for us for some time, have let us down and have brought in this legislation which we, the developers, find so unacceptable because of its interference with our sacred right to make unlimited profits?" Anyway, there's an enormous change of

view which is reflected in the bill and that's what I want to come to now.

It's somewhat difficult to talk about the bill without going through some of the major points two or three times, particularly since I appear to have left some of my notes behind.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: Ad lib it. Go ahead.

Mr. Cassidy: I want to begin by summing up our position on the bill and the major areas where we dissent from or disagree with the government. While we welcome the government's belated conversion from the toothless principles it had advanced before, we still feel there are major weaknesses in the bill. We do have every hope, however, that the necessary amendments can be made in the minority government situation in order to make the government's bill effective.

We have the following major differences and I'll go into them in more detail. The first—and the difference which is most crucial—is our grave unease about the exemptions which have been written into the bill, particularly the exemption of fourplexes and other small rental units even when a landlord owns many such buildings. That is clearly unacceptable.

We have had some heart-searching in caucus on the position we enunciated a week or two ago and we now feel that all landlords should be treated the same and that there should be no small landlord exemption. Small landlords, like large landlords, will be untouched by this bill if they are not gouging and if they are proposing only reasonable rent increases. We think that is the proper kind of exemption. We think any landlord who gouges, whether he is a small or a large landlord, should come under the requirements of the bill.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: We may amend it.

Mr. Cassidy: Okay, the minister indicates that there may be an amendment in that direction. I'm happy to see that. That is crucial to us. We will also oppose the government's proposal to leave rents in new buildings totally without restraints.

[9:00]

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: You've got trouble there.

Mr. Cassidy: That's okay. We feel that the exemption of roomers and rooming houses is unjustified and we'll have some more to say about that. Just to comment on the exemptions, I don't think that anybody, whether it was the ministry staff, the minister or even ourselves, were aware of just how much rental accommodation exists in the Province of Ontario in detached houses, in doubles, duplexes, semi-detached houses and so on.

Approximately a third of the rental accommodation in the province is in single family houses, row housing and semi-detached. If you estimate that only 10 per cent of the remainder of apartments are in duplexes, triplexes and fourplexes, then that means that 40 per cent of Ontario's tenants live in properties that would be exempt if the bill were to stay as it stood.

Moreover, according to the 1971 census, two-thirds of the families in the province—and that is just counting larger families with a couple of kids or more—live in rental accommodation which would be exempt if the hon. minister isn't going to change his proposals.

Second. We categorically reject the government's decision to bring in rent control for only two years. The government, I think, is arguing that this is a temporary measure which will be taken off once their other programmes succeed in alleviating the rent crisis that exists in the province right now. Frankly, we don't accept that it is possible to do that within two years. We notice that even the federal anti-inflation programme has an expiry date of December, 1978, which is a year and five months after the expiry proposed for this particular programme. We tend to think that the timing of this programme has got political motives and that the government has said to its right wingers: Look, we'll bring in rent control for two years because we have to because of those nasty New Democrats. We can't avoid doing it right now. Then, we will go to an election next spring or fall. We'll get our majority back—which is a futile hope—and once we have our majority back, we can let the bill die.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: What are you worried about then?

Mr. Cassidy: Well, it is okay.

Interjections.

Mr. Speaker: Order please. The hon. member has the floor.

Mr. Cassidy: In the unhappy event that an election were to return a majority of the Conservative persuasion—it would be very unhappy may I say to the hon. member from Woodstock—it would then be possible for the government to pass legislation to rescind rent control if that was its philosophical position, in a year, in two years, in five years. That would be up to the government. But we feel that rent control should stay for at least as

long as the rent crisis lasts. We cannot see any signs that measures being taken by either the provincial or federal governments will solve that problem within the space of two years.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: We disagree.

Mr. Cassidy: I would say too that as far as the New Democratic Party is concerned, we believe that rent control is necessary over the long term because of the need to bring into more equal balance the rights and responsibilities of landlords and tenants. We think that tenants right now are victimized. We noted that many people, for the first time in the Province of Ontario, can expect to pass their lives as tenants, whereas in the past, the bulk of the population expected, and did in fact, become homeowners at some stage in their life cycle.

If people are going to be tenants on a permanent basis, then they need the protection of a security of tenure which is being proposed by the Attorney General (Mr. McMurtry). You can't have security of tenure without rent control. You can't have rent control without security of tenure. Tenants can't gather together and negotiate with their landlords in common, unless they have the protection of the two complementary measures of rent control and security of tenure.

Third. We disagree with the government about the degree of retroactivity. Too much gouging took place in the first half of 1975 to be ignored. We felt, as a caucus, that there was an awful lot of gouging that took place back in 1974 as well and I would say that it was with great difficulty that we eventually came to a position which we felt was responsible, even though we knew that it left some people high and dry, that the retroactivity should be to the end of 1974 and not to an earlier date. We feel though that is the least that the government could do to accept our position that the rollback, which is accepted in principle by the government, should be to the end of December last year and not just to the end of July.

We also feel, in the same vein, that the 8 per cent permitted increase for this year proposed by the government is too high. The experience in BC and in Quebec, and the experience which I think the ministry may have discerned here in Ontario as well, is that the average increase in operating costs in Ontario this year, and certainly in the other two provinces, related to rents, is equal to about 6 per cent. That is what the maximum permitted increase should have been allowed for all of 1975 and not just for a portion of it.

Finally, while we welcome the proposals for security of tenure which are coming forth in a week or so, we deplore the fact that unlike the landlord-tenant review tribunal, unlike the rent control proposals, that the government is proposing to leave other landlord-tenant disputes in the hands of the courts which have been proved again and again to be insufferably pro-landlord. That's not this minister's fault. But we would see a joint administration so that the rent review officers and the landlord-tenant tribunals should in fact acquire jurisdiction over evictions, maintenance disputes, all of the other stuff that affects landlords and tenants in residential tenancies under the Landlord and Tenant Act, rather than having a divided jurisdiction in two or even in three portions if you consider the jurisdiction under the small claims court as well.

Just before the session began, the NDP caucus enunciated principles on rent control. I want to run through them briefly and I want to congratulate the government for having the good sense to adopt the kind of proposals and structure that we proposed on a number of occasions. We said that as a basic principle rents should be allowed to rise only to the extent needed to offset increases in operating costs. The government agrees in part. It will be determined during the course of the committee stage whether the government agrees completely or not.

We have said that the rent control system should encourage tenants and landlords to determine rents in accordance with this principle, but that it should also protect tenants against intimidation and give both parties the right to appeal any rent determinations. In large measure the government has agreed with that particular point.

We have said it would be wrong to permit rent increases from the current inflated levels. The government agreed. We said that rents should be rolled back. The government agreed. We said that rollbacks should go to December, 1974, and that rents for all of 1975 should be re-calculated on the basis of increases in operating costs. Unfortunately, the government was not prepared to go that far, although they had accepted the principle of a rollback.

We said there should be a rebate of excess rent paid by tenants during 1975, whether they had moved or stayed in the building, and the government agreed. That, we believe, is important and we congratulate

the government for having the fortitude to accept that particular principle.

We said that landlords should justify rent increases to the tenants as a matter of course whenever they sought to raise rent. The former Minister of Housing (Mr. Irvine) talked to the UDI about that back in July. Nothing has been done about it and it's unfortunate that the government has provided that the justification by landlords will come only if a tenant initiates it by asking the rent review board to look into a proposed rent increase by a landlord. Landlords will not otherwise be forced to justify every rent increase as a matter of course.

We have said that tenants should have the right to examine the books of the landlord. The government gave way a little there by saying that the rent review officer should have that right. If the rent review officers could allow tenants to look over their shoulders, it would probably satisfy the principle that we put forward.

We said that tenants should be able to deal with the landlord as a group. The government seems to agree, but some of the mechanisms it's proposed are imperfect and need to be improved.

We have said that security of tenure should be a basic right for all tenants and was an essential part of our rents policy.

We said that no eviction or refusal to renew a lease would be permitted without just cause being shown. That is a revolutionary change in the nature of contract law as regards housing in the Province of Ontario, and I'm glad to see that that is being accepted by the government. I think that will have tremendously positive effects on the quality of family life and the way people relate to their communities, on the way people can live as individuals and on the decisions people make between choosing to be tenants or owners. In one stride it does a tremendous amount to make more equal the position of tenant and the position of owner-occupier. It's very welcome that the government has agreed with that principle.

We said that beginning in 1976 every rent determination should be subject to appeal to local rent offices and the government has agreed. We have said there should be rent offices in every major centre of the province with power to make rent determinations. The government has agreed but unfortunately has not agreed with the suggestion that the rent offices also be able to investigate landlord-tenant problems and arbitrate evictions in other landlord-tenant disputes.

We can discuss that during the course of the committee. That might be seen as a refinement or a further elaboration on the development of landlord-tenant law which has at last emerged from the freeze into which it had been put over the last five or six years by the government. I hope the minister will consider that kind of change positively, whether or not it is possible to bring it in at this session of the Legislature.

We suggested that municipalities have the power to run their own rent offices or pay their own rent review officers if they pay 25 per cent of the costs. In other words, if they were willing to pay a part of the freight they should have the power to run them and there should therefore be more opportunities for local input. A number of municipalities in Metro Toronto in particular feel quite strongly about that and so do the organized tenants' groups within Metro Toronto.

It was our feeling that rent control should not be local option because many local councils would reflect the propertied interests and the developers' interests, as they have so faithfully in the past, and they would not bring in rent control even if it was desperately needed. We did feel that if a municipality wanted to have that kind of participation, it should have that power. I see the minister has taken note about that and might be prepared to act.

We recommended a provincial landlord-tenant tribunal which could make a final rent determination on appeal by landlord or tenant. The government has agreed. We said that the tribunal and the rent offices should be under the jurisdiction of the Ministry of Housing. The government has agreed. We said that the landlord-tenant tribunal should be the final appeal for all other landlord-tenant matters. There, again, the government has not agreed but I hope it would consider that idea favourably.

We suggested that in 1975, because of the administrative problems of landlords trying to make the system collapse, there should be no appeal and there should be a fixed allowable increase of six per cent. The government disagreed on the numbers and on the effective date but accepted the principle.

I can say we had some difficulty in going along with the idea we should start the scheme without an appeal. That was rather difficult for us, as we were thinking it through. We felt some relief when we saw that the administrative device we had chosen to get rent control protection quickly was

also acceptable and had been adopted by the government.

We proposed the use of a rent guideline of six per cent starting in 1976 which would be a dividing line. Landlords would have to appeal if they wanted a higher increase and tenants would have to appeal if they felt their increase was too great. That again was basically an administrative device designed to keep most rent determinations out of the bureaucratic system. I may say that we in the NDP have probably more interest in avoiding excessive bureaucracy than the government, given the fact that in the past Social Democrats and socialists have tended sometimes to be tarred with the view that we are over-bureaucratic. We thought very carefully about this and we are rather pleased that the government adopted the mechanism we had suggested.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: You had better have a talk with Barrett. Talk to BC. Work with him. Work with Barrett.

Mr. Cassidy: That's right. It's also what the BC government has arrived at after a couple of years of rent control. I think Quebec is sort of heading in that direction, although it still has a tenant-initiated scheme.

Our feeling is a tenant-initiated scheme is simply too weak for those tenants who are easily intimidated—the old, the weak and the poor. Therefore, the tenant initiation without any protection of the maximum rent increase or of a rent guideline was not workable.

We suggested a reduction of maintenance and services would justify a tenant appeal or a rent cut. The government has agreed.

[9:15]

There is a difference between the government and us over the question of what the rent guideline or the maximum permitted increase should be. The government appears to have chosen a number which is as high as it can get without, it hopes, bringing down the wrath of this side of the Legislature on its head.

We would suggest that the maximum permitted increase be related to the average increase in operating costs which has been experienced over the previous six-month period, annualized—put on an annual kind of basis. The best figure we had to start with was six per cent; starting around April of next year, we could see a new determination of what that rent guideline or maximum-permitted increase ought to be. I think the minister would agree, and I think the legislation provides, that there's about a 90-day notice to landlords of what the maximum permitted increase is going to be. But there are real differences between the government and ourselves about the initial levels.

If the government accepts the principle that we put forward, that the maximum permitted increase be at or very close to the average increase in operating costs as it relates to overall rents, then I hope—

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: You used the BC formula, didn't you?

Mr. Cassidy: No, we did not use the BC formula, in fact. I hope the minister will comment about this; there's obviously room for some difference. Obviously as well as far as we are concerned, eight per cent is a hell of a lot better than 15, 20 or 25 per cent, which were the rent increases that people had been experiencing before. Although we want to tighten it up, there is perhaps some honest disagreement which doesn't have to—

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: You're both wrong, so we'll go to nine.

Mr. Cassidy: Mr. Speaker, at the time we suggested that small landlords who were owner-occupiers and had no more than two rental units, whether they were a couple of lodgers in the top floor or the owners of a duplex or triplex, ought to be exempt. As I was saying before, though we now feel on reflection, and particularly as a result of the calls we have had—we've had a deluge of calls in the last four days, many of which have come from the tenants of owner-occupier landlords who are experiencing gouging—that gouging landlords, whether they are small or large, should be covered by this bill. Any small landlord who isn't ripping off his tenants will be protected from any penalty under the Act. Therefore, we feel that there should be no exemption for small landlords or for small buildings.

We suggested that rent controls should apply to mobile homes parks until there was adequate separate legislation. We're glad to see that the government agrees.

Now we come to the question of new housing. Here the exemption route has been taken by this government; it has been taken by the Quebec government, and at this time it has been taken by the BC government. What we found out, though, when we listened—and we did listen to developers—was this: They kept on saying, "Look, if you have rent controls then we can't get a reasonable return on our investment." In fact, as far as we are concerned, we are not opposed to landlords getting a reasonable return on investment.

We understand that so long as there is going to be a mixed rental housing market, in which some housing is provided privately and some housing is provided publicly, then an investor who is going to put up a building, or a landlord who is going to buy a building from the speculative builder or the developer, has got to be guaranteed that he can get a reasonable return. Otherwise he's simply not going to do it.

While we have all sorts of ideas about co-operative housing, non-profit housing and that kind of thing, it is very possible that under an NDP government, as in British Columbia, for various reasons we would find ourselves relying on the private sector for a certain proportion of rental housing to be built.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: They are not building any.

Mr. Cassidy: They are in British Columbia, as a matter of fact.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: You'd better tell the minister because he has not seen it.

Mr. Cassidy: Rather than give you a complete exemption, we felt that we should simply come to the point that the developers made, which is to guarantee that they can, in fact make a reasonable return on their investment, whatever that may happen to be.

We therefore propose that owners of new buildings would in fact set a fair rent on new units which would provide a reasonable return on their investment and then have that fair rent approved by the rent officer or tribunal. Given the nature of bridge financing and the way these things work, we would have anticipated that in many cases that fair rent would have been developed and approved on an interim basis or on a provisional basis by the rent review board before the building was even erected, in order that the landlord or the developer could go to his financing and say: "Look, I have an assurance that I can have this kind of return on my investment, if I build my building. Will you give me a mortgage?" If they said yes, then he could go ahead.

Then what we suggested was that the landlord would be free to charge less than the fair rent but that increases above the fair rent level would become subject to rent controls. In other words, if a landlord wanted to cut his rent by half in order to fill the building up immediately and then increase the rents over two or three years to the fair rent level, that would be legitimate because the tenants who took advantage of the bargain rents that might be offered in order to fill up the building would be informed as they came in that the fair rent was such and so and would, therefore, be under warning that before very long their rents could rise to the fair rent level and until that time they would be subject to rent control.

That's a lot fairer than having a five- or seven-year exemption and bringing a person into a building at $250 a month without any knowledge of whether his rent is eventually going to top out at $350, $450 or $550 a month. You've got to have a ceiling in there. You can't have a particular exempt sector.

We've said in our principles that the local rent officers in the Ministry of Housing should lay heavy stress in making full information available to the public about rent increases, trends in operating costs and landlord-tenant rights. Frankly, apart from that ad that was inserted for political purposes during the campaign, the record of the ministry in communicating what people's rights are and the record of the ministry in getting information about what is actually happening in the rental market as in the housing market generally is actually deplorable. The emphasis on information is not found in the bill and I hope there is a commitment during this debate that one of the major functions that's carried out by the government will be public information so that people know where they stand.

I can say that when I talked with the rent control people in Quebec one of their major complaints was the fact that for 25 years they've had rent control on a temporary basis. Their Act has been renewed year after year but they've never been able to hire anybody for more than a year at a time. The consequence is that the good people that they would hope to have had for information purposes, public education and so forth couldn't be hired. They've had to make do with people who were willing to experience the risk of constantly being subject to being fired if the bill wasn't renewed at the end of the year.

Mr. Foulds: Is that the collection plate?

Mr. Cassidy: It isn't quite that, Mr. Speaker.

Hon. Mr. Meen: We'll send it over there to you.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: I will tell you one thing, you wouldn't recognize one.

Mr. Foulds: We do it at all our meetings.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Mr. Cassidy: The point I'm making is that if the government brings in rent control for only two years then you will have that problem of getting good people to make an effective rent control system and to make both landlords and tenants understand what are their rights, their responsibilities and obligations.

Finally, in our principles we suggested that there should be a comprehensive revision of the Landlord and Tenant Act, and that may come. I hope that it will come eventually. It's not contained in this bill but we hope it comes soon.

I don't want to comment at length about the bill itself. I think that I've had a fair amount of content in what I've had to say here. I have some specific points which I hope the minister will begin to consider now, which is why I'm putting them on the record and they will come up again in committee.

First, there is no incentive for a landlord to make repayment of the rebate if he has been charging an excessive rent in 1975. All he needs to do is sit back and wait to see if the tenant challenges him by going to the rent review board. There should probably be some penalty on landlords who don't pay.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: There is.

Mr. Cassidy: No, there isn't.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: They've got 60 days to pay or face a $2,000 fine.

Mr. Cassidy: Secondly, there is no sanction to enforce the orders of the rent review board. That was, I'm sure, an oversight.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: You don't go after everyone with a bat. It is not like kicking the member off the island. They are ordinary people.

Mr. Cassidy: No, but if you can be fined for charging a rent of more than eight per cent higher in 1975 you surely ought to be subject to a fine if the rent review board orders you to roll back the rent increase to eight per cent and if you continue to try to charge the tenant a 15 per cent increase. That isn't contained in the Act.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: He is violating the law. He's subject to a $2,000 fine.

Mr. Cassidy: No, that is not contained in the Act.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: It is sure supposed to be.

Mr. Cassidy: I'm sure that it was intended but it is more of a drafting error than anything else. On the maximum permitted rent increase, I have spoken about the principles that we think should govern how that rent increase should be determined. It should not be a figure plucked from the air which is what the minister seems to have in mind.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: We plucked our eight when you got your six.

Mr. Speaker: I wonder if the hon. members would direct their comments to the Chair, please?

Mr. Cassidy: Mr. Speaker, with great pleasure I direct my comments to you particularly as I know you are following this debate with avid interest.

Mr. Singer: Following this debate with avid what?

Mr. Foulds: He is trying. He is right on the edge of his seat.

Mr. Cassidy: There are real problems with the questions of renovation expenses, of normal maintenance expenses, of abnormal maintenance expenses and of what the ministry chooses to call without definition "capital expenses." We are coming to the view that in the cases where there is an unavoidable refinancing—for example, a rollover of an eight per cent mortgage where the rate is going up to 11 or 12 per cent, that there should be some provision in the legislation in order to permit a landlord to pass that cost on to tenants. But we are damned determined to prevent a situation where speculators can take the cost of the speculation out on tenants, or where landlords can refinance at inflated rates of interest in order to get venture capital for other things, or in order to give some payola to their uncle or their mother-in-law. That has simply got to be prevented.

We find it difficult to see why proposed increases of over eight per cent should be subject to review, but that landlords should not be subject to review on the portion of the rent increase that lies between zero and eight per cent. There is a bias in the legislation which has come in unintentionally—or maybe subconsciously—which puts too much emphasis on tenant initiation. To give an example, if a landlord fails to justify a rent increase after he has been challenged by the tenant, the tenant has got to apply to the rent review board before he can get an order from them that he doesn't have to pay more than seven or eight per cent. Whereas if the

said landlord fails to justify, then surely the whole application for a rent increase should collapse and the tenant should revert to the previous rent.

In the case of class actions—if a landlord has got to go before the board, then obviously he is doing a class action on behalf of all tenants in a particular building. But there is no indication that tenants who don't object to a rent increase will be informed if the landlord has got to go before the board. Clearly they should be, so that they can participate if they want do so.

Another problem—a very simple problem—is one of information. It is very difficult for a tenant moving into an apartment to know what on earth was the rent charged for that apartment six or nine months ago. The previous tenant may have gone to Timbuctoo. Tenants in the past have not been too forthcoming with their neighbours about what they pay. We need a simple, accurate, effective, and accessible system of registration of rent increases. And that should probably be handled by the rent review officers in each particular area, and made accessible to tenants who want to find out what the rents were and what the rents are. In fact, landlords should probably tell the tenant what the previous rents were on a unit whenever they seek to change the rent.

In the bill, the government is leaving tremendous latitude to the rent review officers about how they take into account excessive rent increases that took place before July 30, 1975. And if the retroactive date is not changed, then it seems to me that what the minister has said in words—about how gouging before July 20 could be rolled back by application of a tenant after Jan. 1—should be made much more explicit during the course of the bill.

We rather question the way in which the tribunal and the rent officers are being set up. We don't know whether the rent officers are going to be full time or part time. The tribunal will not be a true tribunal because it will sit with only one member at a time. There is no guarantee of equal tenant representation on the tribunal—and there should be.

We question whether a $2,000 penalty is nearly adequate for some of the things that are being done by landlords and as I have said, there is a serious technical weakness that orders of the rent review officers which are disobeyed are not followed up with sanctions of the penalties that are provided.

[9:30]

Finally, there is the question of the exemptions which the government has talked about. We don't see why government-owned property should be exempt. There have been serious abuses of tenants by the owners of limited dividend housing and those tenants have not been protected by CMHC.

There have been serious problems with public housing tenants. I can give an example; I have a tenant who lives just outside of my riding who happens to be a tenant activist and whose rent is rising from about $140 a month right now, to something approaching $300 a month, in one jump.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: What of her lease?

Mr. Cassidy: It is doubling.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: Is it a one-year lease?

Mr. Cassidy: She is not protected by a lease, because although her income has been coming from LIP projects and things like that, the local housing authority deems that she has been receiving public assistance—which is not true—and therefore did not give her the protection of a lease. Now that she has a paying job, she is being charged a rent which is far in excess of what either the market rent for that unit would be or the full recovery rent would be.

The minister isn't aware of that. We will come to this during the course of his estimates, but it seems to us that so long as the rent scale is so inequitable; so long as people are being gouged by OHC, that the OHC and other public housing should come under the jurisdiction of rent control.

I have spoken about the small landlord and small building exemptions. We don't think there should be either one.

Luxury apartments: We don't see why rich, as well as poor, shouldn't benefit from this particular legislation.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: Get off that middle road.

Mr. Cassidy: After this bill has come through, somebody has to protect the rich people in this province.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: The halo on Stephen's head is enough; not on yours.

Mr. Cassidy: I just want it to be clear that when it is a question of principle, we feel that legislation in the province should serve everybody in the province.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: But you are.

Mr. Cassidy: The government is notorious for legislation which discriminates against the poor. We don't wish to be known as a party which discriminates against the rich.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: You discriminate against the man.

Hon. Mr. Meen: Your halo is slipping.

Mr. Cassidy: I have spoken about the question of new accommodation and the alternative that we would have to bring it in under rent control but to allow landlords a fair rent that would give them a reasonable return. We also don't think that the government should have the power to make further exemptions without coming back to this Legislature. We do happen to agree that an exemption on seasonal accommodation would probably make sense.

Just to sum up: Clearly, we welcome the bill in principle. We hope that it can be improved during the course of the committee. We intend to do everything we can to improve the bill along the lines we have expressed. We hope to have the co-operation of other parties in making amendments along the lines that I have suggested and along the lines of others that we may suggest during the course of the committee stage. We welcome the fact that the bill is going out to committee so that various interested groups, including landlords, and developers as well as tenants and municipalities, can comment on the bill. We in turn intend to co-operate with the other parties in order to make this bill the best kind of bill possible.

We would have to reconsider our support on third reading if the bill is not improved. It seems to me that the hon. minister is prepared to make a number of essential improvements. I hope that he will co-operate with us, as we will try to co-operate with him, in order to ensure that now that rent control has at last been accepted in the Province of Ontario, that we can do everything possible in this Legislature in order to make a workable system; a system that will work for a long period of time; a system which will provide effective protection for tenants and at the same time remain equitable for landlords and the other people in our society.

I had hoped to talk about what happens beyond controls, about the other measures that are necessary as part of housing policy, because controls on their own are not a panacea. I would suggest that that will come up during the course of the housing estimates or perhaps in other speeches during the course of this debate.

I would say to the hon. Minister of Housing: You've come a long way, baby. I hope you come a bit further. We congratulate you for the degree of conversion you've expressed up until now.

Mr. Shore: Certainly our party, as our spokesman did before, agrees in principle with the concept of this bill.

Mr. Foulds: Were all of you unanimous?

Mr. Shore: I would like to stress, particularly to the NDP, that we haven't got any in to the secrets of the other caucuses that they appear to have.

Interjections.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The hon. member for London North has the floor.

Mr. Shore: I don't mind the interjections because we're here till 10:30. Let me know when you're through, and then we'll get started.

Mr. Foulds: A fine speaker.

Mr. Cassidy: This is one leadership campaign that's going to come to a halt right tonight.

Mr. Shore: Are you almost through?

Mr. Cassidy: Yes.

Interjections.

Mr. Shore: We have no secrets of other people's caucuses. We agree in principle with this document. But I want to stress, particularly to the party opposite, that they have no licence, in my opinion, to the theory that they're the most humane and only humane body in the Province of Ontario. I believe that we have, and I believe that opposition members have and the government too. I truly believe that.

Mr. Nixon: Hurray for the Liberals and the Tories!

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: You've come a long way, baby.

Mr. Nixon: We're all good guys with very few exceptions.

Mr. Shore: What I would say addresses itself equally to the belief that we have a responsibility to all the people, taking into account the philosophy and concept that we do believe in this rent control aspect, for a period of time. But we also believe in the free marketplace.

Mr. Foulds: Do you believe in a period of time or do you believe in rent control?

Mr. Shore: That's what we said. The deepest thing that we believe in is the availability and opportunity for housing for people in this province. All the controls in the world are useless, if people haven't got any place to stay. The member for Ottawa Centre (Mr. Cassidy), may very well succeed in his controls—

Mr. Haggerty: He has two homes.

Mr. Shore: —but they may have to have some tents. I submit to you, Mr. Speaker, that the free market and the public market is the best place.

Mr. Cassidy: Would you use the marketplace and not—

Mr. Shore: The member for Ottawa Centre had an hour and a half. Surely he covered a good number of his points. I only want 15 minutes.

An hon. member: What points were they?

Mr. Nixon: Take as long as you need.

Hon. J. R. Smith: Keep on rolling. Keep on trucking.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The hon. member for London North has the floor. Would you give him the courtesy of hearing him?

Hon. J. R. Smith: We are enjoying it.

Mr. Shore: Surely the government and the members opposite should recognize that we've had a lesson in history tonight and we've had a lesson in theory.

I want to give members a few practical lessons, if I might. There are very serious areas of this document, albeit sound in principle, to which I would hope the committee will address themselves positively. One of them is that we never want to lose the opportunity of having the free market.

Mr. di Santo: Why?

Mr. Good: They wouldn't know anything about that over there.

Mr. Foulds: Why not vote against the bill?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Mr. Shore: Can Hansard hear me at least?

Mr. Nixon: Hansard is all-hearing.

Mr. Shore: One of the members opposite said he had a great deal of sympathy for the small businessman. I want to tell the same member so do we and always will have. I must tell him that for every Cadillac, if there are any, there are many hundreds of free enterprising people in this industry today, and don't ever forget it.

Mr. Foulds: Is that Cadillac the automobile or Cadillac the developer?

Mr. Shore: I would hope, in respect to my colleague who has made her point and left, that we will not be totally parochial in this matter. We should not constantly think in terms of universality. I believe truly that the problems that may exist in Toronto may not exist in Ottawa or may not exist in London or may not exist in Hamilton or certainly may not exist in other communities. Let's address ourselves to the fact that everything isn't total universality. I would also like to stress certain other aspects which must be kept in consideration for the benefit of people who want rental accommodation. That is, there is constant refinancing required on these properties and that is at all times subject to re-negotiation. We don't want to lose sight of the opportunity for people wanting to sell properties; retroactivity must be looked at.

I submit there are so many good things in this bill that I'm convinced the private sector, along with the public responsibility and some minor but real adjustments, could make this thing work. If we're not prepared to give on this and to take that into consideration I would want to stress that the shortsightedness of members opposite particularly—

Mr. Moffat: Are you looking for support here or opposite?

Mr. Shore: —may well make serious problems for us five and 10 years from now and that is not what we are trying to do. We want housing in this province and let's not lose sight of the private sector.

Mr. Grossman: In rising to speak in this debate, I'll try to avoid all the standard routine words that go through the rhetoric that we have to go through on this. We've already heard them.

Mr. Good: Why don't you get them all in the cabinet? We wouldn't have to listen to him.

Mr. Grossman: I quote—they couldn't be my words—"the poor aren't participating;—"

Mr. Nixon: Now we are going to have the pearls of wisdom.

Mr. Grossman: "—panacea; gouging; payola; $3 million homes." The official opposition has covered all that rhetorical territory.

Mr. Ferrier: Your dad used to do that.

Mr. Grossman: We don't have to go through that because none of them is applicable. After taking credit for three-quarters of the bill, which they'll try to do but can't, they still feel obliged to use those tired old words. That's okay; those will help us next time around.

Mr. Warner: Your policy goes through a revolving door.

Mr. Grossman: The first is the limit to four units which has been talked about earlier. I've been deluged with calls also this week, although in my case the deluge isn't 10; it's 40 or 50. Most of those have been from people who live on the same street as a highrise building for example, but they happen to live in duplexes or fourplexes and these people, quite properly, feel hard done by. They say they might bear the brunt of the new scheme. They are in an unfair situation; they're not protected and their neighbour is.

They're saying in very many cases their building is like dozens of others owned by the same person who is in the business and is entirely unaffected by this legislation so long as he retains four units in each building which is part of his empire. The tenants in these buildings, I suggest, are very much entitled to protection in this period of time. In a very real way they would be discriminated against should this four-unit minimum be kept in place.

Because of this situation I have taken this matter up with the minister over the last week since the bill was first introduced. I'm happy to say he has indicated that as far as that particular provision is concerned, he would be happy to co-operate and is hopeful that perhaps something can be worked out and that provision eliminated.

I think that's a very progressive step and in my mind, notwithstanding all the tired rhetoric from the other side, we now end up with a bill which does the job. As the member for London North (Mr. Shore) has pointed out, it still leaves some viability to builders to continue to develop suites so that we don't get locked in to a ridiculous long-term situation which calls for more and more rent controls and less and less development. The bill as it stands with the exception that we absolutely must remove that four-unit provision will, I think, get us over the next period of time.

[9:45]

One other concern I have is the fact that although in several sections the words "notwithstanding the terms of any tenancy agreement" are used, nonetheless landlords and tenants could perhaps get together and by way of a separate and different document agree not to be bound by the terms either of this Act or the amendments to the Landlord and Tenant Act. Such a document could be interpreted as not being part of the tenancy agreement, being a separate and distinct document. Yet the landlord could conceivably produce that separate and distinct document at court and say, "We had a distinct and separate agreement, which we entered into for other reasons, by which the tenant agreed not to appeal the lease we had entered into to the rent review board".

In order to avoid that happening, I would suggest that reference be made to a provision such as in in section 82 of the Landlord and Tenant Act which uses the words "This part applies to tenancies of residential premises" and so on, "notwithstanding any agreement or waiver to the contrary." I think that is quite important to retain the integrity of this Act and to see there are no violations by anyone trying to find loopholes in the Act.

I feel obliged, before finishing by remarks, to point out to the member for Ottawa Centre (Mr. Cassidy) that while the tenant must give a certain notice to the landlord that he is unhappy with his rent—that's all the tenant need do—it is the landlord who must then carry forward the steps to the court to get any of the increases provided for under the Act. The instigation is indeed in the hands of the landlord.

With regard to the penalty provisions, they are explicit in the Act. Sections 3(1) and 3(2) call for the rollback and where the rent has been paid the rollback must be paid back within 60 days of assent. Later on in the Act there is—

Mr. Riddell: You have got a co-pilot.

Mr. Grossman: —section 15, which is the penalty provision for violating section 3. Those two items are covered. Together with the package I have referred to—eliminating the four-unit restriction—I submit the bill is a highly effective one from the standpoint of both the landlord and tenant in this critical time.

Mr. Ferrier: I consider it a privilege to enter into this debate. I think the member for London North did a good job in speaking up for the private enterprise people of this province.

Mr. Nixon: You can speak for the United Church. That's my church; go ahead.

Mr. Ferrier: You fellows need Ted Culp over there to move you a little bit to the left.

Interjections.

Mr. Ferrier: I think one of the reasons we are in this situation today is because governments have opted out, to a significant degree, of their responsibility to provide sufficient housing for the people of this province. They have left it to the private sector and the private sector has been so interested in making money it hasn't been looking toward the needs of the people. The free market has obviously caused the situation we are in today and we need more intervention by the government.

I am glad to see you in the chair, Mr. Speaker, for this portion of the speech I want to make because you have been one of the outstanding voices on problems in northern Ontario. I am most discouraged by the exclusions in this Legislation because the minister comes from northern Ontario. He has travelled northern Ontario and he was supposed to be the Conservative Party's main voice in northern Ontario, particularly in the northeast in the last election. Somehow or other things didn't pan out for him that well in the northeast, but he knows northern Ontario.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: I got the work done.

Mr. Ferrier: But do you know how many highrises there are in northern Ontario?

Mr. Nixon: In Bruce Mines, Sturgeon.

Mr. Ferrier: We have got three or four lowrises, but there are very few rental units in my riding that will be covered under this Act. You exclude single family dwellings.

Mr. Nixon: That is, over $500.

Mr. Ferrier: You exclude homes where there are more than four units—or is it six? —four or fewer residential units. That pretty well says that the Act doesn't have too much bearing on a city like Timmins. Timmins is a city where development is taking place. Texasgulf is in the midst of an expansion programme, and the demand for houses is very great. People are calling up two and three times a day wanting to find rental accommodation, and there just are not very many units available. They talk about Thunder Bay having probably one of the lowest amounts of rental units available in the province. I don't think Timmins is very far behind. As a result landlords have been taking advantage of the tenants.

I have a case here that was phoned to me earlier in the week. A woman had moved into a new apartment where the rent had been $175. The rental agent said, "I haven't heard from the landlord but I think $175 will be all right." The landlord hasn't answered any of her correspondence, but when she did get word by telephone she called back on the phone and she didn't want to speak any more than the three minutes. When the three minutes were up she hung the receiver up. She was pretty concerned about her money. He wants the rent to go up $75—from $175 to $250 a month. And your legislation here doesn't cover that situation.

Mr. Haggerty: Sounds like Ontario Housing.

Mr. Ferrier: It doesn't cover the situation of the working people who are renting a single family dwelling. During the election people came to me saying "my rent has gone up $50". And so it goes.

This legislation isn't going to have much effect on us in Timmins. The people have been gouged in the rents that they have been charged and we were led to believe that you were going to provide some kind of protection—not just for the people here in Metropolitan Toronto, or Hamilton, or London, or Ottawa. We thought that you were going to bring in legislation that would help us in northern Ontario—the people who are being taken advantage of there.

Maybe you are thinking of Sault Ste. Marie as being the southern part of Ontario now, I don't know. But I would have hoped that this minister would have looked toward the needs of the people in the north as well as the needs of the people here in the south, and would have granted some kind of protection for our people.

I hope that the minister will be amenable to amendments. Why should you exclude single homes which people rent? There has been gouging taking place there just as much as it has been in these apartment buildings across the way in St. James Town or up there in Wilson Heights or wherever it is.

Mr. Singer: What is going on in Wilson Heights?

Mr. Ferrier: The tight housing market is as acute in a city like Timmins as it is right here in Toronto, and the percentage increases are just as large.

I am pleased that in this legislation the limit of rent increases that you are allowing is eight per cent. We think that it could be six per cent, based on studies in BC and elsewhere showing that the costs to the landlord have not gone up more. At least it's better than the 10 per cent that you originally talked about when you talk about pay. We would like to see six.

I agree with what my colleague from Ottawa Centre (Mr. Cassidy) stated, that only an owner-occupied house with perhaps two units may be exempt. Whenever people are taken advantage of by excessive rent increases, those kinds of tenants, wherever they live, should have adequate protection. There are good landlords who have not been ripping off the situation as it exists in the province, who have been responsible and who have not been raising their rents unduly. This kind of legislation is not going to apply to them. They don't see that they need rent increases above what is offered here. Those landlords, whether they rent one room or whatever it is, who take advantage of other people need to have this kind of legislation imposed upon them. Wherever the strong are taking advantage of the weak, then we as legislators should be seeing that there is some protection afforded to those who are in a vulnerable position. This is why I'm glad to see that there is going to be security of tenure brought in, because we all know that anybody that raised a complaint would be looking for another place if this kind of legislation providing security of tenure is not enforced at the same time. Landlords could make things pretty unpleasant for those who complain against them if there was not some way of protecting them.

The Act does freeze the rent at the eight per cent increase until Jan. 1976. I had an interesting experience on Saturday. I had an owner of one of these mobile parks come in and tell me of the expenses that he had in the last summer in adding about 45 more pads for mobile homes and the interest that the Industrial Development Bank had placed upon him. He had raised his people's wages a dollar and his expenses had gone up considerably. He had sent out notices before this legislation was introduced increasing the rent on those mobile homes by 20 per cent. He was jumping about that high in my office saying that he needed some kind of protection to charge more than the eight per cent. He said that he wasn't even nearly recovering his costs and that he hadn't increased his rent for two years.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: What did you tell him?

Mr. Ferrier: I hadn't read the bill at that point, so I said I'd look into it and pass the letter on to you. I said I'd act as a courier.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: You were going to pass that on to me. You handle it yourself.

Mr. Ferrier: I said to him the legislation should have within it the possibility of a landlord, if he feels his costs are much higher than that, of being able to go and open his books and argue a case before a rental review officer: I see that this will be in effect on Jan. 1 and that that kind of a person can go and argue that case. The other side of the coin was that one of his tenants came into my office. I said to him that the man said he hadn't raised his rent since March, 1973, I think it was. The tenant said the owner added on $10 a month last year to the rent to cover for taxes and he said that that guy shouldn't have the opportunity of raising his rent by eight per cent. That's too much, he said.

[10:00]

Under this legislation, he has the opportunity to appeal that it not be eight per cent. It will be interesting in some of these situations, but at least the mechanism is there, as I understand it, for those kind of situations to be resolved. I think that that is important. One doesn't want to see too much bureaucracy creep in, but at the same time citizens have the right on both sides of the coin to argue for an increase or decrease.

From the decrease point of view there are landlords in this province who put no money at all into the house by way of repairs, decorations or any of these kinds of things. They do as little as possible. You hear some tenants say that there has been nothing done on the house for three years. In those kind of situations the tenant can come and argue before the rent review board that the eight per cent is away out of line. Perhaps there will be some way of getting that kind of accommodation brought up to standard for those tenants.

I think that the time limit stating when this bill is supposed to cease to be is not the best way of handling this. I think that rather than having the Act automatically repealed on Aug. 1, 1977, that we should take a look at things to see if this rental market has improved; if rents are stabilized;

if there is more rental accommodation on the market; if the government itself has moved in in a fairly major way and has provided many more family rent-geared-to-income situations and senior citizen accommodation; and see if the mortgage programme of Ottawa has some bearing on providing more houses; and if the market itself begins to respond; or whether there has to be a great deal more infusion of public participation in housing, as I think there will have to be. I think the legislation should leave this open-ended and not repeal it.

The government, of course, doesn't like this legislation. They had to be cornered and manoeuvred into bringing it in in the first instance. The first day that the minister took office in this portfolio he was trying to find some way out of bringing this kind of legislation in.

Mr. Hodgson: You don't believe that, do you?

Mr. Ferrier: I certainly do.

Mr. Samis: Read what he said.

Mr. Ferrier: I heard him on the CBC radio up in my riding—

Mr. Yakabuski: He was good, wasn't he?

Mr. Samis: Wasn't he ever.

Mr. Ferrier: He was saying that you didn't need to come in with rent review legislation —there was another way of doing it.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: That's right.

Mr. Ferrier: To this day he hasn't told the people of Ontario what he had in mind. The Premier (Mr. Davis) was trying to do some fancy footwork to not embarrass his minister and to try to live up to a pledge that he had made. But in fact it took my leader to announce what our programme was and what should be in rent review control legislation and what we were demanding of this government. After that was on the record and the public of Ontario could see it, the minister did come in with this kind of bill.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. That last remark was not correct, because I made a statement in this Legislature the day before your leader made his press release.

Mr. Hodgson: The member should stick to the facts.

Mr. Ferrier: You made a statement in the Legislature but you had to—

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: I gave you the content of the bill.

Mr. Ferrier: You gave us the content of the bill but you didn't—

Interjections.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The member for Cochrane South has the floor.

Mr. Ferrier: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'm glad that you're there to protect the rights of this member over here against the strident, noisy voices from across the way.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: Let the record show the Speaker is protecting the hon. member.

An hon member: Uninformed voices.

Mr. Samis: Protecting his rights.

Mr. Ferrier: I'm glad to know that the present member for St. Andrew-St. Patrick (Mr. Grossman) is no longer going to carry on the rhetoric and the kind of speeches that the former member in previous Houses for St. Andrew-St. Patrick could rise to on certain occasions. Perhaps he will move into those kind of speeches if he is here long enough.

Another thing that this bill does is exclude the government of Canada and the government of Ontario in any housing projects that they are administering.

Mr. Warner: We will fix that.

Mr. Ferrier: One of the offending ministries that is taking advantage of its employees and is raising rents in a most gouging fashion is the Ministry of Natural Resources. I can tell you, Mr. Speaker, of an incident that takes place in the town of Kapuskasing where the Ministry of Natural Resources has 10 houses. The government is raising the rent in these houses.

Mr. Yakabuski: They are cheap rents.

Mr. Ferrier: From May 1, 1974, until Sept. 30, 1975, the man was paying $54.

Mr. Yakabuski: What do you expect in Kapuskasing?

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: Oh, shame!

Mr. Ferrier: For a six-month period you jack it up to $66.23.

Mr. G. E. Smith: He is a great landlord.

Mr. Bounsall: A 20 per cent increase.

Mr. Ferrier: Then for the next six-month period you jack it up to $77.73. How much increase is that?

Mr. Bounsall: That's 17.5 per cent.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: Tell him, professor.

Mr. Ferrier: Then for Oct. 31, 1976, to March 31, 1977, you have jacked it up to $85.09. That's an increase of 57.6 per cent in slightly more than a year. The government is taking advantage of its own employees and is putting in a section in the Act that allows it to do that kind of thing.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, with respect, the member is out of order, but I would wonder if he could inform me, in order to respond properly, about the type of accommodation that the employee of the Ministry of Natural Resources is living in?

Mr. Speaker: Is this a question or a point of order?

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: It's both.

Mr. Ferrier: I am very happy that the minister is interested in the people of northern Ontario.

Mr. Yakabuski: It must be a tent.

Mr. Ferrier: I am very surprised that he, as a former parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Natural Resources, wouldn't be aware of the kind of accommodation that his former ministry is supplying to the employees.

Mr. Yakabuski: It is a tourist tent you are talking about?

Mr. Hodgson: Summer accommodation.

Mr. Ferrier: Some of these are three-bedroom houses. They are quite small. They have to use a bedroom for a dining room.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: Three-bedroom homes?

Mr. Ferrier: Of course, this is much below the market that other people would be paying.

Hon. Mr. Bernier: Indeed it is.

Mr. Foulds: It's for a two-week period though.

Mr. Ferrier: This government is going to freeze their wages though, and let Ottawa decide what kind of increases they are going to get. Those people in northern Ontario have to pay more for food and heating and this kind of thing.

Hon. J. R. Smith: Lots of fresh air.

Mr. Ferrier: It would have been a lot better if you didn't exclude yourselves from this kind of legislation and let yourself off the hook. I am glad to see that at least an election can express the will of the people, that democracy can have some real effect, that it can work, that a government over there that argued that rent control would mean that the accommodation would go all to pieces—

Mr. Yakabuski: Haven't seen it yet.

Mr. Ferrier: It's been shown—

Mr. Yakabuski: Wait and see.

Mr. Ferrier: —by a brief I got from the Metropolitan Toronto Social Planning Council that that kind of thing doesn't happen at all. It happens with as great frequency, or more so, in those jurisdictions where there is not rent control. So that's a red herring that the developers bring across the picture to try to justify their rent gouging—

Interjections.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: Take a little run over to Sweden. Take a little trip over to Sweden. Take a little trip over to England. See how things work there.

Mr. Ferrier: —and their social irresponsibility and they're building up fat reserves for themselves—

Interjections

Mr. Ferrier: —where they're refinancing their apartments because of the appreciated value to get more money to go and take advantage of other people.

The developers and the big landlords in these UDI situations certainly are not the great corporate citizens that they would have us believe. Else they wouldn't be taking advantage of people the way they have and we have to bring in this kind of legislation.

Interjections.

Mr. Ferrier: We need amendments to this Act to take into account homes in northern Ontario—single homes and those situations where there are units less than four. The bill here is very deficient. It may look after the tenants in the apartments here in Toronto, but it doesn't do justice to the very acute

situation that we have in Timmins, or other smaller communities in northern Ontario where the highrise boom hasn't come, but where there are many tenants who have just as much right to be protected from gougers as the people here in Toronto.

I feel that this only does about 60 per cent of the job that should be done. I hope that in committee, the hon. minister will think of his northern Ontario roots and of his friends and acquaintances in northern Ontario and he will see that justice is done to us up there rather than just look after the people in the big exploiting towns of southern Ontario.

Mr. Cassidy: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. I just want to point out to the hon. minister, in view of his comment just now, that statement of the member for Scarborough West (Mr. Lewis) on the policy on rents from the NDP was issued on Thursday, Oct. 30, which was a week before—

Mr. Singer: That is not a point of order.

Mr. Cassidy: —the hon. minister's statement about rents in the House.

Interjections.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Speaker, now that we've straightened out who said what before who, let's get back to the bill. I think one serious flaw is that this bill is coming in as a single part of what should be a three-part programme. Number one, we should have a bill to do something about rent. Number two, we should have the Attorney General's (Mr. McMurtry) bill here with us. And number three, the hon. minister should have brought a package on home-building or apartment-building or housing construction so we can see. What the hon. minister is doing, unfortunately, is stopping for a while—now I hope for a very short time—new construction in Metropolitan Toronto.

Goodness knows that those figures have fallen and fallen badly. I know in my constituency, where 60 per cent of the people live in apartments, how seriously they feel some kind of relief is needed. I knocked on a lot of apartment doors during this last campaign and I know the stories that were told to me. I came back here and through the campaign determined to try to do something to help them. But it isn't going to help them if controlled rents are going to force the deterioration of the buildings in which they live. It isn't going to help them unless they are given some choice in the marketplace of going someplace else to live.

[10:15]

I think the government has made a mistake in not having made up its mind soon enough as to which direction it was going to move in. Your record during the campaign and during the first weeks of this 30th Legislature has been absolutely atrocious. You weren't going to do it. Then you were going to have rent review boards that were going to embarrass landlords into adjusting by publicity. Then you were going to do something with that wonderful statute, the Unconscionable Transactions Relief Act. Then, finally, the present minister got into the saddle and he said, "I don't think any of it is any good," and he and his leader had a public discussion about who was right and who was wrong, until finally they agreed and now we have got this.

There are a lot of flaws in this. It was put together quickly. We will get into some of the flaws into committee. There are going to be lots of people come on the landlord side and on the tenant side who will say it is wrong because A doesn't fit in with B and so on. I think the most serious mistake is that we haven't got a full package. What I believe is needed in Metropolitan Toronto—and I speak as a Metropolitan Toronto representative and I have been that for a long time—is an alternative source of housing supply, and we haven't got one.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: Public or private?

Mr. Singer: Hopefully private. But the people who have built houses and apartments up until now, if we believe them—and I am inclined to believe some of them—are going to say, "We are just not interested this year or next year, or the year after, until it becomes a little more obvious that we can turn our money to good investment; that it is going to work for us; that it is going to produce a reasonable profit. We might just as well go to the trust company and buy a guaranteed investment certificate and get 10½ per cent. At least it is safe there. There is that savings account deposit guarantee and all that sort of stuff. Why worry?" And what is going to happen to the tenants? There is going to be a black market.

It is just so sad. Some of us remember the wartime controls, and with all of the loyalty that most Canadians had for the war effort, we remember the army of civil servants, of judges, of lawyers, of prosecutors, the investigators, who were necessary to try and keep that system somewhat honest. Well,

we are not at war. We may be in an economic war, but we are not in a physical shooting war, and it is going to be a great deal harder. We are going to try to do it, I gather from what I hear from government, with a minimum of expenditure. This minister is going to have a terrible job trying to enforce what is here; trying to get people before these rent review officers, trying to get people before the courts, as the Attorney General is talking about, and deal with them in any reasonable way.

It has been suggested that if the landlord is going to be ordered to refund money who is going to be able to find him. And if the landlord is entitled to get more money and the tenant says, "Too bad, I am not going to pay it," and the tenant goes off and disappears, equally a hardship is going to take place. There are people who are small investors who are not going to be able to cope to the extent that large investors are. What about people in OHC? I worry very much about the people in OHC. They are exempted completely, and the rents keep on creeping up. I have a very large Ontario Housing development in my constituency; Lawrence Heights. About 6,500 people live there. Every time the minister's colleague gives a GAINS raise, or somebody gives a pension raise, or something else, OHC seems to grab it off.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: What do they pay for energy? What do they pay for heat?

Mr. Singer: All right. But the people who can't afford to pay, who live in OHC, are dug in there seemingly for ever because the minister exempts OHC homes from some control. That should be another part of the policy. It just is no use to say, since it is public money that is going in there we are going to keep on grabbing what other parts of government or other arms of government or other governments are giving them. Those people, too, need some relief and some kind of protection. Hopefully we are going to get some of them to move out of there, such as the young couple that goes in there, starts to work, begins to earn more money, has more and more of its income taken for rent—yes, sure it does—and is never able to get ahead.

One of the minister's predecessors—the Frigidaire salesman, what was his name?

Mr. Givens: Stan Randall.

Mr. Singer: Stan Randall came out with the great idea that we are going to let those tenants in Ontario Housing buy their own homes. That programme just never got to Toronto. I don't know whether it came into force anywhere else in the Province of Ontario. But I don't know why the minister hasn't—

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: CMHC gave it thumbs down.

An hon. member: They did it in Guelph.

Mr. Singer: It was announced here and Randall sat over there in the second seat from the end of the front row—I remember him well—and that was a great idea. The government has to do something for those people who live in Ontario Housing but all it has done here is exempt Ontario Housing.

Without throwing new burdens in the minister's direction, what is going to happen in those buildings where there is a percentage of Ontario Housing units taken up? Ten units in a 100-unit building, say, are OHC. Ninety units are controlled and 10 units are uncontrolled. It's going to present a very serious kind of a problem.

I worry at the way this is going to work. I worry that one arm of government is talking about raising hydro by 25 per cent and another arm of government is talking about controlling rents. I worry about the burdens which are going to be put on one group of people in our society to prove—what? That hydro's going up? That municipal taxes are going up? It's many months after the event. To prove all these basics are going up and therefore, in addition to their eight per cent, they should get some more on the put-through basis.

We recognize all these things are going on. Suppose we have isolated the grasping, greedy, miserable landlord we hear about from time to time. How much investigation is the minister going to make before he can really prove that the new mortgage financing has been a fake in order to authorize a greater put-through?

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: It isn't easy.

Mr. Singer: That he hasn't padded his figures by taking his wife, his cousins, his daughters and his aunts and putting them all on the payroll at high rates of pay to deflate?

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: Tell them.

Mr. Singer: It's going to take armies of investigators to try to establish this. There are some greedy landlords. There are some good landlords, too.

Mr. Foulds: Are you for or against the bill?

Mr. Warner: Where do you stand?

Mr. Singer: Certainly we are for the bill. If you came with me into my riding and talked to the tenants who live in 60 per cent of the housing units in my riding you would recognize it. What I'm complaining about, if you would listen—

Interjections.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The hon. member has the floor.

Mr. Singer: You people are unable to understand. You had a nice young NDP candidate who ran against me, who tried to sell this policy—not very successfully; he ran a bad third this time. You used to have an NDP candidate who came within 20 blocks.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. Would the hon. member get on with the bill?

Mr. Singer: They don't accept you fellows at all in my riding.

Mr. S. Smith: Earn money from Vern.

Interjections.

Mr. Singer: I think I can convey my messag to the minister this way: This bill is better than nothing but it is really not very good because it isn't part of a package. I am certainly not going to applaud very loudly until I see what the rest of the package is. I heard the Attorney General say what he said. I haven't seen the statute yet and I want to see that. I also want to hear, most importantly, from the minister, how he is going to get more housing accommodation into the Metropolitan Toronto area. It isn't just enough to say we'll build more highrise apartments.

Every time somebody wants to build a highrise apartment some citizens of our community—I don't know that they all sit in those seats over there—some citizens of our community say not here, not there, and not anywhere else. We need more houses. Is the minister going to do it by taking everything into public control?

It's going to take an awful lot of convincing in my direction to convince me that government can build housing units cheaper than private enterprise can build housing units. Or that the government can look after housing units better than private enterprise can.

Mr. Foulds: What is the average price of a house on the free market in Toronto?

Mr. Singer: The solution to this very serious problem which our society faces involves all segments of the community. It involves an understanding on behalf of those people who sit on municipal councils that we need more housing in our large cities. It involves an understanding on behalf of the people who sit here in this Legislature that every time somebody comes and says, "I want to build a new development over there" we don't get speeches from all over the place, including this Legislature, saying, never, never, never.

We've got to have a housing programme. We've got to have a control programme—a short-lived one. We've got to have an understanding. And just making these great speeches about how terrible it is, isn't enough.

I'm going to support the bill—my colleagues are going to support the bill—but we look forward anxiously and eagerly to the rest of the programme that I think the minister is obliged to introduce before this Legislature has lived too many more weeks.

Mr. McClellan: Mr. Speaker, I would like to comment very briefly on the truly extraordinary nature of this bill. It might more appropriately be called an Act to provide for the Exemption from Review of Rents of Residential Premises. The minister has managed, by a number of devices, to exclude an enormous number of people from coverage of the bill. I want to stress again, as has been stressed by our previous speakers, that this is totally unacceptable.

Section 1(f) of the bill excludes all roomers by virtue of the definition of residential premises as containing bathroom and kitchen facilities. Section 12(c) manages in a short sentence to exclude all single family housing —attached or detached, duplexes, triplexes and fourplexes. The combination of exclusions and exemptions in those two clauses alone amounts to virtually 50 per cent of the tenant population of this province, and probably exemptions for 50 per cent of the landlords of this province. That's a remarkable achievement. I think if the minister had thought a little bit more about it, and worked a little harder, he could have excluded all tenants and all landlords. And so he could have had his cake and eaten it, too.

I want to deal as well with the totally spurious exemptions that are dealt with in the rest of section 12. There is no reason

to stigmatize further Ontario Housing tenants by singling them out for an exemption from the provisions of the Act. There is absolutely no reason for mentioning limited dividend housing. There is no reason for excluding the so-called luxury accommodation — assuming that when the Act becomes amended to include single-family housing, the minister may be surprised to learn that $500 a month is not considered luxury accommodation in the Toronto housing market. In many parts of Toronto $500 is the starting price for the rental of a relatively modest home. It is not a luxury rate.

Interjection.

Mr. McClellan: I'm telling you that prices in the Riverdale area of this city begin at that level, and there are other areas as well.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. Will the member have further remarks to make another day?

Mr. McClellan: I'll continue at the start of the next day.

Mr. Speaker: If you would move the adjournment of the debate then?

Mr. McClellan moved the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: Mr. Speaker, before I move the adjournment of the House, I would remind the hon. members that tomorrow we will continue with the debate on the Speech from the Throne.

Mr. Reid: Mr. Speaker, before we adjourn could the acting House leader indicate when we might return to this bill?

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: Mr. Speaker, my understanding is that we will be back discussing this bill on Tuesday next.

Mr. Reid: Tuesday afternoon?

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: Tuesday afternoon.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes moved the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to.

The House adjourned at 10:30 p.m.

CONTENTS

Thursday, November 13, 1975

Residential Premises Rent Review Act, Mr. Rhodes, on second reading 541

Motion to adjourn, Mr. Rhodes, agreed to 568

SPEAKERS IN THIS ISSUE

Bernier, Hon. L. Natural Resources (Kenora PC)
Bounsall, E. J. (Windsor-Sandwich NDP)
Campbell, M. (St. George L)
Cassidy, M. (Ottawa Centre NDP)
di Santo, O. (Downsview NDP)
Ferrier, W. (Cochrane South NDP)
Foulds, J. F. (Port Arthur NDP)
Gaunt, M. (Huron-Bruce L)
Givens, P. G. (Armourdale L)
Good, E. R. (Waterloo North L)
Grossman, L. (St. Andrew-St. Patrick PC)
Haggerty, R. (Erie L)
Hodgson, W. (York North PC)
Mancini, R. (Essex South L)
McClellan, R. (Bellwoods NDP)
Meen, Hon. A. K. Revenue (York East PC)
Moffatt, D. (Durham East NDP)
Morrow, D. H. (Ottawa West PC)
Nixon, R. F. (Brant-Oxford-Norfolk L)
Reid, T. P. (Rainy River L)
Rhodes, Hon. J. R. Housing (Sault Ste. Marie PC)
Riddell, J. (Huron-Middlesex L)
Roy, A. J. (Ottawa East L)
Samis, G. (Cornwall NDP)
Shore, M. (London North L)
Singer, V. M. (Wilson Heights L)
Smith, G. E. (Simcoe East PC)
Smith, Hon. J. R. Correctional Services (Hamilton Mountain PC)
Smith, S. (Hamilton West L)
Taylor, Hon. J. A. Minister of Community and Social Services (Prince Edward-Lennox PC)
Warner, D. (Scarborough-Ellesmere NDP)
Welch, Hon. R. Culture and Recreation (Brock PC)
Yakabuski, P. J. (Renfrew South PC)

No. 15

Ontario

Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT — DAILY EDITION

First Session of the Thirtieth Legislature

Friday, November 14, 1975

Speaker: Honourable Russell Daniel Rowe
Clerk: Roderick Lewis, QC

THE QUEEN'S PRINTER
PARLIAMENT BUILDINGS, TORONTO
1975

10

CONTENTS

A list of the speakers taking part in the debates in this issue of Hansard appears, in alphabetical order, at the back of this issue.

Daily contents of proceedings also appears at the back of this issue. Reference to a cumulative index of previous issues can be obtained by calling the Hansard Reporting Service indexing staff. Phone 965-2159.

Hansard subscription price is $15.00 per session, from: Sessional Subscription Service, MGS, 9th Floor, Ferguson Block, Parliament Bldgs., Toronto, M7A 1N3. Phone 965-2238.

LEGISLATURE OF ONTARIO

The House met at 10 a.m.

Prayers.

Mr. Speaker: Statements by the ministry.

Oral questions.

YOUTH EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITIES

Mr. Deans: It's a good job we're not allowed to ask questions of back-benchers, isn't it? I have a question for the Premier. Does the Premier recall on Aug. 20 making a statement that there would be 1,000 jobs created by the government for young people, in co-operation with the youth secretariat and Colleges and Universities?

Can the Premier indicate how many of the jobs have been created, where the jobs are, how many people are currently employed in those jobs and whatever other information he thinks might be appropriate?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I would be delighted to get an update for the hon. member and will try to have it for Monday.

Mr. Deans: That certainly seems a long time. He will have it maybe on Tuesday but he'll try for Monday.

Mr. Reid: Did he cancel today, due to lack of enthusiasm?

SALE OF LAND TO NON-CANADIANS

Mr. Deans: Can the Treasurer indicate whether there is any policy in Ontario with regard to the recent statement of the federal government that it will clear up any constitutional problems with regard to the prohibiting of sale of land to other than Canadian citizens; whether the Province of Ontario intends to have a policy with regard to the sale of land and whether the new statements by the federal government have in any way influenced the existing policy? Does the Treasurer feel that it is likely that the Province of Ontario will follow the recommendations of the select committee on economic and cultural nationalism?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Mr. Speaker, if the Attorney General were here, I'd let him answer the question because it has largely been in his area. I think it is fair to say, however, that Ontario was one of the applicants—is that the right word, I say to my lawyer friend on my right?—in the Prince Edward Island court case. We are reasonably satisfied with the results, if I can put it that way. The Prime Minister of Canada has written to the provinces and, putting it in lay language has backed down somewhat from the lofty position which his government formerly held. I think that in the process of negotiation a more acceptable solution is going to bo found. Obviously those solutions in law have to be found before someone would come to a practical decision as to whether we proceed with the specific recommendations of the select committee.

Mr. Deans: Is it the intention of the government to make a statement in this regard at some point between now and the opening of the next session? Is it the government's intention, in fact, to put into place some regulations or legislation which will meet at least part way, the criteria established by the select committee, if, in fact, that is permissible by law?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: I imagine at some point we will be taking a decision, but I would have to tell the member that it isn't on the front burner at the moment.

INCO/FALCONBRIDGE BUSINESS POLICIES

Mr. Deans: A final question on behalf of my colleagues from Sudbury, who are all in Sudbury at the moment: Would the Premier consider the establishment of an all-party committee of the Legislature to review the actions of the International Nickel Co. and Falconbridge to determine whether or not their actions, with regard to the way in which they conduct business, lay people off, set prices, have their shares of the nickel and copper market, are in the best interests not only of the Sudbury basin but in the best interests of the Province of Ontario?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I don't really think that would be an appropriate subject for

a select committee of this House. I think if the hon. members from that area have concerns and points of view, they are certainly free to express them during the Throne debate or on other occasions, but I couldn't give the deputy leader of the opposition any encouragement that there would be a select committee to consider that.

Mr. Deans: Supplementary: Is the Premier satisfied that the actions of Falconbridge and International Nickel are in the economic best interests of the Sudbury basin; that it is possible, given the uncertainty of the operations, for the Sudbury council and those persons concerned with growth in the Sudbury area, to make reasonable projections and plans for the future; and doesn't he feel that International Nickel and Falconbridge, given the markets that they have, owe it to the province and to the people there to take them into their confidence with regard to the future of the area?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I think it's obvious that the future plans of either International Nickel or Falconbridge are important to the people of that community and important to the people of this province. If, say, the regional council in the area wished to discuss some of these things, I think that to the extent those companies could, they would share some of their thoughts with them. As far as the government is concerned, I don't think it's like so many things today, it is not totally predictable, and I can't really visualize any useful purpose being served by a select committee on this subject.

U.N. ZIONISM RESOLUTION

Mr. Nixon: Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the Premier if he has given any further consideration to the introduction of a resolution that would condemn the stand taken by the United Nations which equates Zionism with racism, as we discussed yesterday? I don't see it on the order paper.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, the intent of the government was to introduce this resolution today. I have it here.

Mr. Nixon: And the Premier is going to do so?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Yes.

SPECIAL OCCASION PERMITS

Mr. Nixon: I would like to put a question to the Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations. Has the policy of the Liquor Licence Board changed recently having to do with applications from communities for special occasion permits where the community itself has not voted "yes" in a referendum?

Hon. Mr. Handleman: Mr. Speaker, a number of applications have been made for sale permits in those areas and it is the view of the Board that if the people in the area wanted to have liquor sold they would have voted "yes" to a referendum. We are reviewing the situation to determine whether or not there has been a practice grown up over the years of granting them despite the "no" votes. However, no-sale permits—special occasion permits—are still available to people who wish to serve liquor at various functions in dry areas.

Mr. Nixon: Supplementary: Is the minister not aware that the custom has built up over many years whereby under the government policy a community could vote "no," and have sale permits or permits that by custom permitted sale, and that probably a lot more sports activities in this province have been financed that way than Wintario has ever touched, or ever will touch? Where did this new policy come from? Surely the old hypocrisy of Conservative policy should be supported by the minister.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. We're debating the question now. Is there a question?

Hon. Mr. Handleman: The hon. leader of the Liberal Party is talking about where sale has grown up by custom.

Mr. Nixon: Under this ministry.

Hon. Mr. Handleman: Not under our ministry. The permits have always designated 'no sale.' There's no question about it.

Mr. Nixon: But the ministry has never interfered with it.

Hon. Mr. Handleman: There's no question that what has grown up is the practice of either charging admission to a no-sale function or selling tickets in advance. I think the board here is trying to remove the hypocrisy which has existed in these areas for some time and is now issuing no-sale permits.

However, as I say, we are reviewing the policy and discussing it with the chairman of the board to determine whether or not, where a practice has grown up and people have become accustomed to it, it shouldn't be continued to be honoured until the new Act comes into effect, at which time the pro-

visions of the new Act will be rigidly enforced.

Mrs. Campbell: Who is the chairman?

Mr. Nixon: Supplementary, if the Speaker will permit me. Did this no-hypocrisy policy, which is a new policy come from the chairman or the minister? Where did it come from?

Hon. Mr. Handleman: Mr. Speaker, the minister does not determine policy for the Liquor Licence Board of Ontario.

Mr. Moffatt: In view of what the minister has said with regard to this kind of permit, is he aware that the LCBO is using a firm called the Ontario Investigation Bureau, to investigate issued permits, particularly in the area of Oshawa and Durham East, with regard to such no-sale permits? And is the minister further aware that such permits have been issued, then sales have followed and now some kind of clamp-down is being investigated by the LCBO in order to prevent further transgressions of that sort? Why this sudden change, and is the minister aware of those particular changes?

Hon. Mr. Handleman: Mr. Speaker, if I was aware of any transgressions of the Act I would certainly want to see that the Act is enforced. This is a law-abiding province.

Mr. Nixon: That's hypocrisy right there.

Hon. Mr. Handleman: When a permit is issued legally under the Act under certain conditions, those conditions should be complied with. The hon. member is asking if I am aware of certain activities of some police organization. No, I'm not aware of that, but I would assume that the job of police organizations is to uphold the law and to ensure that it's being enforced properly, that's all.

Mr. Moffatt: One further supplementary: The organization referred to is not a police organization, it is an outfit called the Ontario Investigation Bureau.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. Is there a question?

SPECIAL OCCASION PERMITS

Mr. Nixon: I'd like to put another question on a similar subject to the Minister of Revenue. Does the minister oversee the revenues of the Liquor Control Board, that is, directly from their sales across the province, and the special application of tax for those products that are going to be dispensed under the jurisdiction of the special occasion permits that I was questioning his colleague about a few moments ago?

Hon. Mr. Meen: Mr. Speaker, the answer in short is no, we do not.

Mr. Nixon: Supplementary. Who does?

Hon. Mr. Meen: I honestly can't answer the question as to who does. The figures come across my desk in terms of the estimates and the actual revenue, but we do not administer the Acts nor the collection of the taxes nor any breakdown of the manner in which the taxes are collected.

Mr. Nixon: Supplementary: Can the minister tell me who has that responsibility?

Hon. Mr. Meen: No, I'm not sure that I can with any confidence, Mr. Speaker. I would think that it would be the Provincial Auditor and possibly the Treasurer who would have access to those figures. But I am simply making that as an assumption since they come through as fiscal figures in some part of the revenue picture of the province. Perhaps the question could be more properly directed to the Treasurer.

SPECIAL OCCASION PERMITS

Mr. Nixon: I would like to pursue this with the Minister of Consumer and Commercial Affairs. Is the minister aware that when the Liquor Licence Board issues these so-called special occasion permits and the holders of the permits go to purchase the liquor for the special occasion, that a special tax is added and that the revenue people of the province are not at all concerned that it is going to be sold for a profit, even in those communities in which the minister has said, in his new anti-hypocrisy move, that they should not be sold?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Mr. Nixon: How can the minister have it both ways? How can he have the revenue and the godliness?

Hon. Mr. Handleman: Mr. Speaker, all liquor and beverages sold in the province are subject to sales tax. The sales tax is collected by the board.

Mr. Nixon: There is a special fee if it is sold for profit.

Hon. Mr. Handleman: It is not a special fee; it's in lieu of the sales tax.
[10:15]

Mr. Nixon: It's a special fee that goes into government revenues.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Hon. Mr. Handleman: If an individual purchases a drink in a licensed establishment, the sales tax is added at that point. When a drink is purchased at a special occasion function the sales tax is not paid at that point. The purchaser of the liquor has paid the sales tax when he purchases his supply.

Mr. Nixon: A supplementary: How can the minister say that he does not permit sales in dry areas and, at the same time, he charges the special fee in lieu of sales tax on liquors purchased on the basis of the special occasion permits? May I make it clearer, Mr. Speaker, to the minister?

Mr. Speaker: I think it's quite clear.

Mr. Nixon: How can he possibly get the special revenue for a sale when he says he doesn't permit the sale?

Hon. Mr. Handleman: Mr. Speaker, there is no public sale in a dry area. That is the local option of the people in those areas.

Mr. Nixon: But the government gets the special revenues.

Hon. Mr. Handleman: When the applicants purchase their supplies, obviously they purchase them from an area outside the dry area. They cannot purchase them in that area.

Mr. Nixon: No, it is on the basis of the permit.

Mr. Gaunt: And that isn't obvious.

GUELPH REFORMATORY ABATTOIR

Mr. Nixon: I would like to ask the Minister of Correctional Services if the operation of the various facilities at Guelph—and at other reformatories—are continuing with the slaughter of cattle and the packing of meats? Are we using the labour from the reformatories for this purpose? Is the policy going to be different because of his predecessor's decision that all of this would be cut out and the prisoners would just sit there and do whatever they do rather than have any constructive employment?

Hon. J. R. Smith: Mr. Speaker, I have been informed as of this morning that the operation at the Guelph correctional centre is in operation as usual and that inmates are being employed in the programme. It is our intention to see that this operation continues. We are developing similar programmes at correctional centres such as Maplehurst.

Mr. Nixon: A supplementary: Does the minister accept any responsibility for seeing that the farmers who provide the livestock for this operation are not going to be in receipt of NSF cheques, as they have been in the last month?

Hon. J. R. Smith: A meeting was arranged today, for next Tuesday, with the receivers and we intend to sit down with him to establish the full ramifications of the two liens which have been placed against the equipment at the abattoir in Guelph. We have let it be known to the receiver that we are very concerned that his first priority is the moral obligation to pay the farmers for this cattle. Representatives of the Ministry of Agriculture and Food will also be at the meeting with the receiver.

Mr. R. S. Smith: Hold that cheque.

Mr. Gaunt: A supplementary to the minister: Is the minister satisfied; or does he consider it in his interest to seek information as to whether the abattoir at Guelph is going to be put on a profit-making basis?

Hon. J. R. Smith: Mr. Speaker, it is a licensing arrangement with Essex Packers. I don't know how one equates it with a profit-making basis. Eventually, if it was going at full capacity, it would be. There has been $60,000 paid, as of September, to the inmates as remuneration. Should Essex Packers opt out through financial difficulties we've already had inquiries from other packing houses who will operate the plant.

Mr. R. S. Smith: It operates itself.

Hon. J. R. Smith: If it is operating at full capacity, through repayment of the licensing agreement, we should regain the full cost of the installation eventually.

SUPPLY OF FISH TO INDIAN RESERVES

Mr. Foulds: Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the Minister of Natural Resources, in the absence of the Minister of Health, because the Ministry of Natural Resources is also involved. How does he reconcile the statement made by his colleague, the Minister of Health,

to the member for Beaches-Woodbine (Mrs. Bryden) during the estimates the other night, that the Indians at the Grassy Narrows and Whitedog reserves were receiving 400 lb of fish a day, give or take, for the last six or eight months?

The statement by Chief Roy McDonald yesterday to us stated this has not been given to them for the last six or eight months, but only since September, and it is only on a hit or miss basis; that in total actual days they have received fish for only one month. How does he reconcile that?

Hon. Mr. Bernier: Mr. Speaker, I cannot reconcile the comments of the Minister of Health. I'm sure he's able and big enough to reconcile his own statements. I want to point out to the hon. member that the Indians have been given the right—and he might check this with Chief Roy McDonald—to fish in the smaller lakes that are not contaminated with mercury.

In fact, we went so far as to provide them with motors, boats and complete fishing gear. They were in there for a specific period of time—but because the lakes were so small we couldn't allow them to continue. They did this on their own. In the interim, we did supply fish purchased from other commercial fishermen. We even bought some from the Fresh Water Fish Marketing Corp.

I have to tell the House that we drew the line at one point in time when they asked us to deliver the fish on a door-to-door basis. We would deposit it at one specific point where they had some interim house freezers established.

But to my knowledge and information the fish was supplied when they wanted it. I believe there was one particular time when they were out of fish—when they felt there was no need—because there was hardly anybody in the village. But to my information they were supplied with the fish they required.

Mr. Foulds: Supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Would the minister not agree that it contributes to what his colleague called "the lack of confidence and distrust" that the Indians on those reserves obviously have for the government, when a minister down here leads us to believe that the fish is delivered regularly on a daily basis over an eight-month period—and, in fact, it is only a very hit and miss affair? Is somebody hijacking this fish?

Hon. Mr. Bernier: No, Mr. Speaker, I can't accept that it's on a hit and miss basis. I have to reiterate that we have been doing our utmost to work very closely with both reserves. I'm sure if the member went up there and met with the local people, he would find that this is correct.

TORONTO PARKWAY BELT

Mr. Stong: Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the Minister of Government Services—the realty service. I understand the parkway belt has been transferred to her authority. I wonder if the minister can give some indication when the parkway belt between Yonge St. and Bayview Ave. in the riding of York Centre will be moved north on to vacant Langstaff property, a matter of a few hundred feet, thereby removing the freeze on the properties affecting 800 jobs, 84 homes and 120 business premises, and likewise freeing these people of the threat of expropriation?

Hon. Mrs. Scrivener: No, Mr. Speaker, I cannot.

Mr. Mancini: When is she going to answer a question?

Mr. Speaker: Order please; is there a supplementary?

Mr. Stong: Yes, I didn't hear the answer. If I've asked the wrong minister, I'd like to direct it to the right ministry.

Mr. Reid: It's the wrong minister.

An hon. member: The wrong minister but the right portfolio.

Hon. Mrs. Scrivener: My reply, Mr. Speaker, is I cannot.

NORTH PICKERING DEVELOPMENT

Mr. Godfrey: A question to the Minister of Housing, Mr. Speaker, with regard to the defunct airport and the appended city site. Is the minister prepared to compensate in a fair manner, that is, provide additional funds to those homeowners in the North Pickering development who sold their holdings to the province under duress, at prices which do not provide replacement accommodation?

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: Mr. Speaker, I cannot accept the hon. member's statement as being fact that the properties were sold under duress. I'm not prepared to make any statement at this time as to how the ministry intends to proceed with this. There will be some discussions carried on as it relates to the whole project, considering the changing attitudes in the area as to what has happened of late. But I think it's unfair for the hon. member to stand up and blatantly state in

this Legislature that those people sold under duress, unless he has positive proof that that did occur.

Mr. Reid: They certainly didn't do it voluntarily.

Mr. Godfrey: Supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Has the minister not been placed in possession of many complaints from the persons who sold out under the threat of expropriation if they did not sell at that particular time? Has he not received literally dozens of letters to that effect, and has he investigated that?

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: Mr. Speaker, I think the hon. member knows full well that the complaints that he refers to have been sent to many members of this Legislature, including the present Minister of Housing and his predecessors.

He also knows that the Attorney General carried out an investigation on just such complaints, and they were discussed in some detail at a meeting of the cabinet held in Oshawa. I do believe that the hon. member, in a former capacity, was present at that meeting.

POSTAL STRIKE

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Speaker, a question to the Premier: Mr. Premier, in view of the fact that the people of Ontario are looking for leadership, and—

Interjections.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. Would the hon. member ask his question?

Mr. Sargent: —in view of the fact that there are many old people who can't eat because they can't get their cheques, and the country is in a mess; 185,000 students are not going to school.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I think the member could ask his question now.

Mr. Sargent: I know the Premier is concerned too—would he consider—is there some way we could suspend the rules of the House next week for an all-party consideration of ways and means; to have the Premier and all of us, take part in this—not politically—but to find some way that he could go to Ottawa and demand from the Prime Minister of this country that we put the postal people back to work? And we'll get this province back on track—because many people are going to go bankrupt in the small business area. And it is time we faced this because—

Hon. Mr. Kerr: That's Trudeau—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The question has been asked, I believe.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: Did the hon. member discuss this in caucus? What does his leader say?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I ran into some difficulty yesterday in perhaps appearing to be in support of the candidacy of the member from Ottawa East in one of his observations. I certainly wouldn't want anyone in that particular party to feel that I am supporting any one of the members, and I would only say to the member from Grey Bruce—

Mr. Sargent: What we are talking about is important. Don't get smart. What's the answer? If this is the way the Premier approaches the public, he is in trouble.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. Order.

Hon. Mr. Davis: I would say to the member that I think perhaps during the Throne debate—where he will be participating in a few moments, I gather, or at some time today—that if he has any suggestions about that—

Mr. Sargent: I hope the Premier will be around.

Hon. Mr. Davis: If I am not, I can assure him that I shall read whatever he has to say —and any suggestions that he feels that a government in this province can make to help resolve the postal situation. I shall be delighted to hear from him.

I would only say that I don't think it would serve any useful purpose to suspend the rules of this House and have a debate as to how the federal government should deal with that particular issue, and I say that very respectfully. I just don't think it would serve a purpose.

Mr. Speaker: The member for St. Andrew-St. Patrick.

SALE OF FIREARMS

Mr. Grossman: A question of the Solicitor General. I have noticed near my home, some extensive advertising by Canadian Tire and other stores on the subject of buying firearms now while there is a sale on. In view of the

pending federal legislation I wonder if the Solicitor General would consider requesting all stores, between now and the time the federal legislation becomes law, to register and record all sales of firearms? And in any event, if he would indicate that such high profile advertising of the sale of firearms in the interim would inadvisable?

Hon. Mr. MacBeth: Mr. Speaker, I will certainly take it under consideration.

I am sorry that some of the stores seem to be trying to unload their firearms at this time in a rush of sales—I don't think there is any need for them to do so—I don't see that firearms will be outlawed.

I am not so sure the suggestion from the member of St. Andrew-St. Patrick is all that practical. I don't know what would be achieved by it, but certainly I will take it under consideration and see whether first of all we think it can be helpful to do so, and secondly whether there is any method on a voluntary basis that it can be accomplished. I don't think there is any legal authority for so doing.

I would just like to add, sir, for the information of the House that I did have a meeting in my office on Monday last with the Hon. Warren Allmand and the Hon. Ronald Basford in connection with gun control. They have some very good proposals to make. They asked that I should keep the nature of those proposals confidential at this time because they have others to take into their consulting programme. But, in any event, they assured me that something would be before the federal House before Christmas.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Welland.

ABITIBI LABOUR NEGOTIATIONS

Mr. Swart: My question is to the Minister of Labour. I would ask her if she recalls her reply to a question about the termination of negotiations between Abitibi and CPU in which she said that there isn't any settlement as yet. At present they are in a recess, as one might call it, because the negotiator for one side is off in another part of Ontario. Then when this was pursued by the member for Nipissing (Mr. R. S. Smith) who questioned the use of the word "recess", she said, I think, that my learned colleague had been somewhat misinformed.

[10:30]

Is she aware that both Mr. Tom Curley, the vice-president of the Canadian Paper Workers Union and Mr. McLenaghen, the vice-president of Abitibi, have both stated that the talks are not recessed, that they have broken off; they have confirmed this in conversation to me?

Mr. Riddell: Question.

Mr. Sweeney: Question.

Mr. Swart: If so, is she willing to correct that statement she made two days ago, or give a further explanation?

Hon. B. Stephenson: As you well know, I have sent a note to you this morning asking for time during the question period to correct the obvious slight misapprehension under which I inadvertently left this House on Wednesday. I have been—

Mr. R. S. Smith: And led this member—

Mr. Foulds: Slight?

Hon. B. Stephenson: It was slight, yes. I obviously had misinterpreted the remarks which were made to me by members of my staff. In fact, what did happen last week was that the mediator from the ministry, after discussions with both sides at the bargaining table, decided that there was little use in further negotiation at that time and he adjourned the meeting.

I would like to tell you that I have instructed the members of the staff of the ministry to bend every effort toward some future—and not too distant future—return to the bargaining table on both sides, because I feel that this is an important issue which must be settled for the welfare of the people, particularly of northern Ontario.

Mr. Swart: Would the Minister of Labour then recommend to the government that they use the considerable clout—that they have in regard to agreements on cutting rights and other matters—to bring Abitibi, the largest paper mill in the world, back to the bargaining table for the benefit of the people of Ontario?

Hon. B. Stephenson: I have just said that we have instructed the staff of the ministry to use every mechanism they can to bring both parties back to the bargaining table.

Mr. R. S. Smith: I accept the indication of the minister that the other day, when she said I was wrong, that actually I was right. I accept that statement.

I would just like to ask her if she is aware that the bargaining position of Abitibi, and

the offer that has been made by Abitibi, is below the guidelines that have been set by the federal government in so far as wage offers are concerned? In light of this, I would follow on the question of the previous speaker and say: is the minister prepared to indicate to the Minister of Natural Resources that Abitibi is not bargaining in good faith and that some use of the government power through that ministry should be used to bring Abitibi back to the bargaining table, to tell them to bargain in good faith?

Hon. B. Stephenson: It depends on whose interpretation of the AIB guidelines you use —whether the Abitibi proposal was below. It certainly was not above, with that I would agree.

Mr. R. S. Smith: Six per cent, as far as I am concerned, is below.

Hon. B. Stephenson: One interpretation of the Abitibi proposal was, in fact, at the level set by the Anti-Inflation Board.

Mr. Nixon: Six per cent?

Hon. B. Stephenson: No, it was not six per cent; it was eight, six, and four per cent.

Mr. R. S. Smith: Over three years.

Hon. B. Stephenson: In the strict interpretation of the AIB guidelines, those are the guidelines. There are mechanisms for moving from those specific guidelines, as well. Whether this could be considered bargaining in bad faith, I am not prepared to say at this point. But if, in fact, the members of our staff believe that it is so, I am sure that action will be taken. The negotiators—

Mr. Deans: The members of your staff have never had to believe that.

Hon. B. Stephenson: —and the mediators—I would say to the deputy leader of the opposition that I would be very happy to talk to the Minister of Natural Resources (Mr. Bernier) about whatever he can possibly do to help us bring both of these parties back to the table, because this is essential.

Mr. Stokes: A supplementary: Does the minister not think it would be much more productive and much more fruitful if we could get bargaining on a company basis rather than on an industry basis, where we have got one intransigent company supposedly setting the pattern? Why don't we insist that they do it on a company basis rather than on an industry-wide basis, using one company?

Hon. B. Stephenson: Mr. Speaker, as the hon. member knows, this has not been the pattern in this industry. I would think that this is one of the things which should be discussed between the union and the companies and I would hope that some agreement would be reached about this.

There has been some leadership in this direction encouraged by the Ministry of Labour in this province—by the ministry and the minister—in the past year. There is some joint bargaining of a very fruitful nature taking place, which I hope is going to continue, and I think this pattern, having been set, will probably be followed by other employers.

EGANVILLE CREAMERY

Mr. Conway: Mr. Speaker, a question for the Minister of Agriculture and Food: Given that minister's newfound passion for the economic health and welfare of the dairy industry in eastern Ontario, I would ask the minister what, if anything, he is prepared to do to protect those jobs threatened at the Eganville Creamery by the take over of Ault Foods?

Hon. W. Newman: Well, Mr. Speaker—

Mr. Nixon: Well?

Mr. Singer: Well?

Mr. Nixon: I thought the minister wanted to help the dairy industry. Yesterday he wanted to help them.

Hon. W. Newman: Let me say this, if it wasn't for the negotiations of the milk marketing board and this ministry, there would be a lot more producers in eastern Ontario who wouldn't have a market today, so don't forget that.

Mr. Nixon: You gave help to Ault's and they are closing down. That is how helpful you are.

Hon. W. Newman: Coming to the immediate question, yes, when Ault took over from Cow & Gate there were some changes. We tried to minimize the jobs that would be lost. We ensured that all the shippers in the area were taken care of, both the cream shippers and the milk shippers. That was one of our concerns. Cow & Gate had some problems and Ault took over, but I think

I can safely say that all the producers in that area were taken care of.

Mr. Conway: Supplementary, Mr. Speaker, to the Minister of Industry and Tourism: Does the minister not—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. That is not a supplementary. A supplementary question is based on the answer given by the minister, and another question may be placed later. The hon. member will take his seat.

TORONTO TEACHERS' NEGOTIATIONS

Mr. Warner: Mr. Speaker, a question to the Minister of Education: At what point in time will the minister personally intervene, meeting with both sides of the dispute that is going on presently with the Metro Toronto secondary teachers? And if a meeting is going to actually take place, would it be possible for it to take place this weekend?

Hon. Mr. Wells: Mr. Speaker, I met with both sides in that dispute on Tuesday, as I think my friend knows.

Mr. Deans: You explained the guidelines.

Hon. Mr. Wells: Certain questions were put to them, particularly the questions asking if either one of them had any suggestion as to how this dispute could be solved at this 11th hour, and no answer that was meaningful and could prevent the dispute was forthcoming. I told them I was ready to meet with them at any time they were ready to meet with me and that offer still stands. If they would like to call me and suggest that they want a meeting, I am ready at any time they would like to meet. The Education Relations Commission has made the same offer and will be assessing the situation as it develops.

Mr. Warner: Supplementary: When will the Minister of Education take the initiative?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The question was asked. We are wasting time by repeating questions and getting into an argumentative session. We are wasting the question period.

Mr. Deans: Supplementary: Will the minister consider, over the weekend, the possibility of calling the parties together at the beginning of next week, recognizing that a settlement can't be reached as long as they are not meeting—

Mr. Nixon: It's the same question.

Mr. Singer: Same question. Out of order.

Mr. Speaker: Is there a supplementary question to the minister?

Mr. Deans: Are you unable to determine the difference between questions?

Mr. Reid: Oh come on! Go and get your hair done.

Mr. Ruston: Are you changing your policy now?

Mr. Singer: He's got no policy.

Mr. Reid: Stephen Lewis you aren't.

An hon. member: He would love to be.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. Question time is just about up.

Mr. Deans: Doesn't the minister feel it makes far more sense, given the possible consequences of a long strike, that the parties be sitting together all the time attempting to find the solution, rather than sitting apart?

Hon. Mr. Wells: Mr. Speaker, I certainly believe the parties have to get together. They have to get together to come to a conclusion and I think they will do that presently. My friend knows how the collective bargaining process operates and he knows that if I were to call those parties together this afternoon, they would probably tell me the same thing they told me at the meeting on Tuesday. I want to see those parties suggest that they get back to the bargaining table when one or the other has some movement to make in the position.

Mr. Deans: You're not willing. You know it and I know it.

Hon. Mr. Wells: If I listen to the deputy leader's questions any longer I'm going to be provoked to reading back some of the comments he made about teachers' strikes two years ago in this Legislature.

Mr. Renwick: The minister is not allowed to be provoked, he knows that.

Mr. Reid: I'm not supporting you for leader.

Mr. Speaker: We had better get on with the questions.

UNION STATION AREA LAND-USE

Mr. Givens: I would like to ask the Premier when he intends to reconvene the inter-

governmental committee of which he is chairman, which committee has been lying dormant for many months, with respect to the land-use aspects and the transportation problems having to do with the railway properties around Union Station, which is of very urgent importance?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I'm having to go by memory here.

Mr. Reid: You're in trouble then.

Hon. Mr. Davis: I recognize it sometimes causes some of the members opposite some difficulty, too.

I would try to recall for the member for Armourdale that at the last meeting, which was in May or June, certain decisions were made and agreed to by the two railways, Metro and the city. The basic decision was to proceed with certain of the transportation aspects—and I think it was really the diamond at Bathurst St.; I think that was the agreement reached.

Partially at the initiative of the city of Toronto, a suggestion was made that a land-use committee be established to deal with the potential development of the area which was, by and large, described as Metro Centre.

I believe these meetings have been going on. The various parties have had representation appointed to this committee. I shall endeavour to get any information about it for the member that would be helpful. I really think it will be a process which will go on for a period of time yet, before there is anything specific to report, I shall get that information for the hon. member.

Mr. Givens: Supplementary: Does the Premier realize that if the corridor is moved this will avail us of 170 acres which will enable the construction of 10,000 residential rental accommodations immediately? If he acts on this soon, we can start construction right away.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: You've got to be kidding.

Hon. Mr. Davis: I can't say whether the hon. member is right or wrong; it depends on which corridor.

Mr. Reid: He's right.

Hon. Mr. Davis: If he's talking about the corridor which relates to the through line which is part of the freight facility of the CN or CP—it doesn't matter—I think there is some doubt as to whether that alignment, as suggested at one point, would be moved.

While there is some debate as to what would be available with the alteration of the corridor there is another very basic decision which has to be made by the city of Toronto and Metro, as to what the land use should be, and whether the people who own that land are prepared to proceed with some form of development in the foreseeable future. I think the parties involved in this are still a piece away from making this determination.

As I say, the province has taken the intiative in terms of trying to resolve the transportation aspect. At the request of the city of Toronto we said the province would assist and we would have people help in the consideration of land use. But the land use question is basically the responsibility of the city of Toronto.

[10:45]

Mr. Speaker: The Minister of Government Services has the answer to a question asked previously.

Mrs. Campbell: Supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. We have about two minutes left and there are many more new questions to be asked.

Mrs. Campbell: Are there different rules for different people?

Mr. Speaker: No, that is no right; that is an unfair statement. The Minister of Government Services may give the answer to a question asked previously.

SPACE FOR GOVERNMENT OFFICES

Hon. Mrs. Scrivener: Mr. Speaker, this is in response to the question asked last Friday by the hon. member for Kitchener (Mr. Breithaupt) concerning the advertisement for space for the Ministry of Revenue. The advertisement for available space in the area of Yonge St. from Eglinton Ave. to Finch Ave. was in response to a request from the Ministry of Revenue on behalf of its sales tax branch.

The present office at 85 Eglinton Ave. E. is no longer adequate for the purposes of that ministry and the location on Yonge St. is considered most appropriate for the Metro sales tax office. There have been discussions between members of my staff and of the Ministry of Revenue regarding the former Ontario Hydro building at 77 Bloor St. W., but I am informed that the Ministry of Revenue does not wish to combine the local office with its head office operations.

I might say the matter is still under review by the two ministries and no decision has as yet been made.

AID TO COSTI

Mr. McClellan: Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask a question of the Minister of Community and Social Services.

The minister was quoted in the Star on Oct. 31 as saying at the annual meeting of COSTI that immigrant aid groups in Metro should increase the number of volunteer workers and depend less on government funding, and he went on to praise COSTI for its use of volunteers. Is the minister aware that COSTI, far from epitomizing the voluntary spirit, as the minister claims, was in fact heavily subsidized by the national government of Italy; and that this was necessary because of the failure of Canadian and Ontario governments to provide settlement services for the Toronto Italian community? When the minister places volunteers, does he—

Mr. Speaker: Order please. A question is asked for information, not to debate a point the member may be particularly interested in. If there is an answer to that question, the minister may give it.

Hon. Mr. Taylor: Mr. Speaker, if you can call it a question—

Mr. Reid: Take it as a question.

Hon. Mr. Taylor: —I will take it as a question certainly and give an answer.

Mr. Reid: That's good.

Hon. Mr. Taylor: Yes, I am aware that COSTI was funded partially by the Italian government, not massively, as the member would infer. The premises that it rents, as the member knows, are owned by the Italian government. I may say that it has substantial funding through the United Appeal; that its programmes, certainly in the rehabilitation area, are funded through my ministry; and that there are a substantial number of volunteer workers, which I mentioned was very heart-warming. The message that I had then, and which I will continue to have, is that it is essential to involve the members of the community in the provision of this type of service as well. We cannot institutionalize everything, and volunteer work is very important. I may say COSTI is a very fine example of volunteers playing a part in a meaningful programme.

Mr. Speaker: The oral question period has expired.

Petitions.

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Speaker, a question of privilege.

Mr. Speaker: Your question of privilege.

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Speaker, I was wondering if you would consider arranging to have an open house so that the public could inspect and view the offices of the cabinet ministers to see the vulgar display of opulence they have compared with what we have to use.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. Will the hon. member take his seat? That is not a point of privilege.

Mr. Sargent: Okay, a supplementary to that then: When are we going to have some decent offices for backbenchers?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Hon. Mr. Handleman: Come over and see me.

Mr. Sargent: —I have seen your office. It is the Taj Mahal.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: Who is that masked man?

Mr. Sargent: I have seen your office and it is beautiful.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: We know who you are. Take off that mask.

Interjections.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. Will the hon. member please take his seat and the hon. minister too?

Presenting reports.

Mr. Edighoffer from the standing estimates committee, presented the following resolution:

Resolved: That supply in the following amounts and to defray the expenses of the Ministry of Labour be granted to Her Majesty for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1976:

MINISTRY OF LABOUR

Ministry administration programme	$5,541,000
Occupational safety programme	5,663,000
Industrial relations programme	2,984,000
Human Rights Commission programme	997,000

Employment services programme	2,847,000
Women's programme	710,000

Mr. Speaker: Presenting reports.

Motions.

U.N. ZIONISM RESOLUTION

Hon. Mr. Davis moved, seconded by Mr. Nixon, that this House associates itself with the resolution passed by the House of Commons of Canada rejecting the resolution of the United Nations General Assembly equating Zionism with racism.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I don't intend to talk on this resolution at great length. I believe one or two other members will have some observations to make. As I mentioned yesterday, it has not been customary for this House to become involved in international matters, but I think the history in this province of lack of discrimination, the posture taken by all members of this House, and I think the great tradition that we have developed in this province is one that should be recalled in situations of this kind and I have no reluctance, Mr. Speaker, in urging the members of this House—I know it will require no urging to support this resolution—to say to the members of Parliament of this country that we concur in the position that they took on this, I think, very fundamental issue.

I would say simply, Mr. Speaker, that it's unfortunate that these situations occur in the international field. And while it may not be our constitutional responsibility, I feel as an individual, certainly, and I think most members of this House do, that the action taken by the United Nations Assembly was regrettable. It does nothing to resolve the problems and tensions that are faced not only in the Middle East but in other parts of the world. As I say, Mr. Speaker, I have no reluctance at all in moving this resolution.

Mr. Speaker: I think it would be appropriate if the seconder of the motion might speak next. The hon. member for Brant-Oxford-Norfolk.

Mr. Nixon: In seconding the motion, I feel very strongly that the resolution of the United Nations equating Zionism with racism is racism itself. One of the most moving things I have seen in many years was the spokesman from the Israeli delegation at the rostrum in the United Nations, saying: "All I can do is consider this a scrap of paper and treat it as such." He tore it in half and threw it on the floor.

In the mind of that man and all of the people in his nation, and the people, I suppose, who know some of the lessons of history over the last century and more, there is the feeling that the old prejudices which have scarred civilization for so long are still just really beneath the surface still. Anyone who has the idea that our level of civilization has done away with the threats of those prejudices simply doesn't know the record of history, or what seems to lie still in the hearts of man.

The fact that internal politics and, I suppose, world politics could move the United Nations to support such a resolution with a majority is almost unthinkable to us in this community.

I commend the Premier for bringing the motion forward. There's nothing much we can do about it except say to anybody who will listen, and who we can make listen, our abhorrence of this motion and our commitment to see that the attitudes which fostered it are buried forever.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Wentworth.

Mr. Deans: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the Leader of the Opposition, I want to say that we most certainly do agree with the resolution put forward by the Premier and seconded by the member for Brant-Oxford-Norfolk. I think there are a lot of people who have had serious reservations about the role United Nations has been playing in the last few years. There have been a lot of questions being asked by nations about the appropriateness of the statements that come from the United Nations. I worry that the action that was taken is going to further deteriorate the useful role that it might have been able to play in the development of world peace.

I, like the leader of the Liberal Party, can't help wondering at what point we begin to show some common sense and understanding and stop allowing racism to become a major force in terms of the relationships between people. I think the leader of the Liberal Party put it well, as did the Premier, that the very action itself fosters and brings about racism, and that the United Nations was certainly ill-advised in adopting the resolution that they adopted. I think that the government of Canada has to be extremely careful in the support that it gives to the United Nations, if it is going to take these kinds of positions with regard to matters of such grave concern to a great number of

people across the country and across the world.

Mr. Grossman: Mr. Speaker, it is with some regret that I rise today. I suppose very few people in this House would have ever foreseen the day when parliaments of this nation and other nations would have to deal with a resolution of the United Nations, no less, as despicable as this resolution is. In fact, the member for Brant-Oxford-Norfolk is absolutely right when he says the resolution itself is racism. That is what makes it appropriate and proper and in order for this House to apply itself to this matter for a moment because racism cannot know any bounds and the fight against racism must cross borders, must not be delineated by any British North America Act, any constitution, or any splits of federal and provincial jurisdiction.

The fight against racism has been spoken of in these halls and in this chamber before; recently with the PLO incident of last spring. This government and this assembly showed some leadership in jumping in at an early stage in the sequence of events that led the United Nations down a despicable road which may well lead the United Nations itself to be merely a scrap of paper. It may well lead the United Nations to be a body which is supported by those who feel one way, but controlled by those who feel another way.

That latter portion of members of the United Nations is indeed successfully using that formerly august body for racist purposes, for political purposes, and for purposes that are frightening to me. I think they are frightening to a lot of people in this country and in a lot of the democracies that are funding that body at the present time.

I hope that the government of Canada will continue to speak up strongly against any moves of the United Nations which would continue down this despicable road, and that the government of Canada would continue to seriously reassess the habitat conference of next year and the fact that conferences such as that, giving a platform to those who would continue to put forward racist resolutions, would perhaps be cancelled.

There is no place in this country, I would hope, under any auspices, under any jurisdiction, under any code laid down by the United Nations or any other body, to continue to give platforms to those who would preach, forward and foster racism. I would join with this House in expressing support of the steps taken by the Parliament of Canada. I express my individual and complete disgust of the resolution of the United Nations.

[11:00]

Mr. Speaker: The member for Wilson Heights.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Speaker, may I commend the Premier, my leader, the acting Leader of the official Opposition and the member for St. Andrew-St. Patrick for what they have said on this matter. It is a most serious matter. This Legislature has had, I think, a pretty good record in being loud and clear and firm about matters of this sort.

Severel years ago, I had the privilege of being able to join the then member for York-Forest Hill, Mr. Dunlop, in a resolution addressed to the federal government concerning hate literature. That received, at that time unanimous approval of this House.

The resolution here today is of great importance. When one reads the papers and reads the comments of the representative of the very small African nation who said: "I wasn't really sure what Zionism meant." I don't know how he eventually voted but there he was—and he was, a world's spokesman on behalf of his nation—voting on a matter such as this.

When one tries to understand the thrust of this resolution and thinks back to the days of the holocaust, the gas ovens and the final solution and that sort of thing, I think it is important that we keep on saying at Queen's Park, in Ottawa and in every Legislature across this country that we Canadians stand violently opposed to this kind of attitude and reaction wherever it might come from. I'm happy to join with those who spoke in favour of this resolution.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Windsor-Sandwich.

Mr. Bounsall: The House, in bringing forward this resolution in support of the stand taken by our federal government, does itself proud in this matter. Zionism is not racism under any Human Rights Code. People who work in this field on a full time basis would never say, looking at the history of the Zionism movement, that it in any way could be called or referred to as racism.

I'm concerned that such a resolution should pass the United Nations. I feel it has the potential to weaken that organization; and the resolution itself does nothing to lessen the tensions which must be lessened in that area of the world if there ever is to be a long-term solution to problems continually arising there.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I'm honoured to add my small contribution to this debate and

commend the people who brought the motion forward. I stand with all the members of this House in condemning the resolution which passed the United Nations; and I'm glad to see that the Ontario House will support the federal House in their stand against it.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. Attorney General.

Hon. Mr. McMurtry: Mr. Speaker, as the chief law officer of the province I am very pleased to have the opportunity of supporting this resolution. In my view, the Zionist movement is simply based on an entirely justifiable struggle for social justice. While international politics may constitutionally lie outside the jurisdiction of this House, the apparent lack of international political morality, as reflected by the United Nations resolution, deserves our protest. At the same time, it is surely appropriate that the elected representatives of the people of Ontario express their despair over the declining usefulness of the United Nations as a forum for the pursuit of peace.

However, most important is that this Legislature express to the world, its support of the integrity and sovereignty of the Jewish national state.

Mr. Givens: Mr. Speaker, as well as being the member for Armourdale, I happen to be the nationally-elected president of all the Zionist organizations in Canada. The tens of thousands of members and their families whom I represent would want me to thank and commend the government for bringing in this resolution, and to thank my leader for bringing up this subject yesterday and today and the acting leader of the NDP for the words he has spoken.

Our community in Ontario and throughout the country has been shaken and shocked to the marrow. I tell the House it has been thrilling for me, as a Canadian by birth, to sit here and to listen to the expressions of opinions which have taken place.

The allegation in the United Nations resolution is unwarranted; it is unjust and it is untrue. Zionism is the antithesis of racism. Zionism is an ideology broadly based on the tenets and principles of the Old Testament.

If a case can be made that Zionism is equivalent to or synonymous with racism, I suggest, with great respect, that case can be made by the Moslem and the Communist countries of the United Nations that Christianity is equivalent to racism.

Zionism fostered the national liberation movement of the Jewish people and it fostered the establishment of the state of Israel as a haven of refuge for our poor and oppressed brethren throughout the world.

It is ironic that about a million people who survived the ovens and incinerators of the concentration camps of Europe and who have stamps, marks, numbers, tattooed on their forearms should now be branded with the stamp of racism both in Israel and in this country. It would be ironic to tell the relatives, the parents and the friends of the six young teenagers who were killed by a bomb yesterday in Zion Square in Jerusalem, and the 40 people who were wounded yesterday, that they are racist. I appeal to members on all sides of this House to support unanimously this motion, as was done in the House of Commons the other day.

Mr. Young: Mr. Speaker, as one who for some years represented a ward in North York made up largely of people of the Jewish faith and as one who still represents a large body of people of that same persuasion, and as one also who has had a great deal to do with the Bund and Histadrut and other Jewish organizations, my feeling is that a condemnation of this magnitude by the United Nations does damage not only to the Zionist as such—because not all people of the Jewish faith are Zionists—but to all people not only in Israel but across the world who have that heritage.

Those of us who are interested in what we have, called "the brotherhood of man," feel this deeply and we realize that here is a blow at the very concept that people around the world have been working for, not only in the Christian religion to which I belong, but in every great religion of this world. There is that deep bond calling for brotherhood everywhere and this is something which strikes at the very roots and the very heart of that concept. Today, I am certain that this House will unanimously agree to support this resolution and I call upon the members to do so.

Mr. Williams: Mr. Speaker, the governments and peoples of the western world have been subjected to great pressures and social unrest in recent times and have found it on occasion difficult to resist some of the onslaught that has been directed toward us. Yet we know, appreciate and understand that these basic principles and freedoms are the things that have established a strong fabric for our communities, our society, and one which will continue to hold true down through the years.

However, it is not without the support of governments in expressing their freedoms and beliefs that we can be assured of this continuing right and freedom of the individual, free of racism, free of bigotry. Indeed, it has been a dark day, with the event that has transpired in the United Nations.

I am afraid that the action taken there has, in fact, set the stage for the demise of the United Nations unless the free governments and countries from around the world take some positive action to reverse this tragic act that was engaged in the other day.

I feel, in fact, that the stage has now been set for the United Nations to go the way of its predecessor, the League of Nations, unless we as provincial governments and federal governments express a true and genuine interest in seeing that this type of racism is eliminated and never again graces the tables in the forum of the United Nations.

It is on this basis I am hopeful that all of the other provincial governments will take the same type of concerted action in expressing support for the government of Canada in its abhorrence of the action taken in the United Nations, and that pressures from this country and others will be brought to bear to make the United Nations aware of the error of its ways.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Windsor-Walkerville.

Mr. B. Newman: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise to endorse the resolution of the Premier, supported by my leader. When I first heard this on the television in my own community I really couldn't believe what I had heard. To think that a body formed essentially in this world for the protection of national and human rights would pass a resolution which in itself was racist. We thought that that body's purpose was to eliminate such concerns or such ideas, yet here we have this august body deciding all of a sudden that one national group and their aims and objectives are racist.

Yesterday it was Dachau, it was Belsen; today it is the UN. Surely we are not looking for a repetition of what we have seen and what one national group has gone through in the last world war. I hope that not only this Legislature but all legislatures across Canada—and all countries in the free world—take this resolution for what it is meant and raise strong objections to the passing of the UN resolution by supporting such a resolution as was presented by the Premier here this morning.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Port Arthur.

Mr. Foulds: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This has been a most moving debate. Because of the serious nature of the subject it has been a debate with very little rhetoric, and because of that it has been most powerful. On certain important occasions men must stand and be counted. On certain important occasions parliaments must stand and be counted. I am proud to have been a member of this Parliament that did so.

Mr. Speaker: Shall this motion carry?

Motion agreed to.

[11:15]

Hon. Mr. Welch moved that Mr. Singer and Mr. Roy be substituted for Mr. Peterson and Mr. Reed (Halton-Burlington) on the select committee appointed to consider Bills 4 and 5.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. Speaker: Motions.

Introduction of bills.

LANDLORD AND TENANT ACT

Hon. Mr. McMurtry moved that leave be given to introduce a bill intituled, An Act to amend the Landlord and Tenant Act.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Mr. Speaker: Does the minister have a statement to make with it?

Hon. Mr. McMurtry: I have nothing to add to the statement that I made last week, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Before the orders of the day, I wish to remind the members that on Wednesday, Oct. 29, the matter of the demonstration at the time of the formal opening of the session and the resulting police action, was raised in this House.

At that time the Premier read a letter which he had addressed to me that day asking that my office undertake a complete investigation of the incident. The requested investigation has been completed and I have tabled my report, copies of which are being supplied to each member and to the Legislative Press Gallery.

Orders of the day.

Clerk of the House: The fifth order, resuming the adjourned debate on the amendment to the motion for an address in reply to the speech of the Honourable the Lieu-

tenant Governor at the opening of the session.

THRONE SPEECH DEBATE
(continued)

Mr. Shore: With your indulgence, Mr. Speaker, I would like to summarize for the few who weren't here last week where we left off. I would have been pleased to see the Treasurer (Mr. McKeough) here but I am sure with the pressure of his office somebody will bring forward some of the items in Hansard to him.

Mr. Nixon: I will drive them to Chatham.

Mr. Shore: In summary, first, I would again repeat that I wish to thank the Treasurer and his office. I will be meeting next week with him and/or his staff to become familiar with the internal workings. As I stated previously, to me it is very important because I believe a person who is informed can better understand the issues and debate them than one who is not informed.

In summary of the items that we started on last week, I would be touching on the subject relating to the matters in the Throne debate addressing themselves to the anti-inflation matters; the hon. minister's statement of Oct. 30 relating to the anti-inflation; his recommended actions; the fiscal position of the province and the accountability and credibility relative to the Treasury.

One of the first things that the hon. Treasurer stated and that our leader agreed on—and so does our party, on which there is unanimity—was that the government believes that inflation is the foremost critical issue in the province and in this country, and appeals to the province to be resolute in its fight.

Certainly, as I have stated, our party totally agrees with this assessment. To me, even greater importance should be on the question that we, as a party, not only feel it; we want to be sure that the government of Ontario truly believes and is resolute in its fight against inflation.

In respect to that matter the provincial Treasurer has reported further to the Legislature that he believes it is grave in the current economic situation. He stated that our consumers have been hard hit in the areas of food, housing and fuel. Again, we agree with that, but as of this date and despite the document put forward on rent controls, I say with the greatest of respect, Mr. Speaker—and I say these things not only as statements—that I hope the Treasurer or the Premier (Mr. Davis) at some time during this Throne Speech debate, will respond to some of the observations we are putting forward here today. I really believe they require attention, not only in reading form but in answer form.

As I stated, my party does not dispute the gravity of the situation, but as of this time I don't know what is being done in relation to the problems of food, I don't know what's being done in relation to the problems of energy and I don't know what is being done in relation to the problems of housing—and these are three major factors.

Our party does not dispute the national importance of this situation. However, before the minister decided or decides—and it isn't too late even at this date—to opt into the federal plan, I suggest to you, sir, that he should take advantage of his position as Treasurer of this great province to address, and to force the federals also to address themselves, not to only the rent controls, not to only the wage controls but to the three other areas that I think are of equal importance in this whole matter of inflation and economic stability. Specifically, they have not addressed the problems of fiscal and monetary policies, government expenditure policies limiting the federal and provincial growth—and I will speak on that in a moment—and the structural policies relating to food, energy and housing.

The government, in the minister's statement, did state in relation to government expenditures that much has been said and much has been done. The Treasurer states that he will be bringing in a new budget early in the year. At the same time he informs us that his plan for the next fiscal year is to adopt a provincial expenditure target of holding expenditures to 10 per cent and showing revenue growth of 12 to 13 per cent.

I submit that if this government appreciated the true gravity of the situation, a budget would have been prepared for this session of the 30th Parliament, clearly demonstrating how it is planning to meet the stated targets and how these plans will affect the people of Ontario.

On this very subject it is interesting on the one hand that the minister has stated that expenditure increases will be held to 10 per cent and revenue growth will be 12 to 13 per cent, but he has not demonstrated how this is going to take place. It is also interesting to note that we should be cognizant that,

just in this fiscal year, the budget has changed three times in eight or nine months.

When we start with a planned deficit of $1.2 billion—in terms of operational expenditures alone, never mind the non-budgetary expenditures—and we keep accumulating that to the point today where I don't even think the minister would object to me suggesting that the operating deficit will be in excess of $2 billion, Mr. Speaker, I submit to you that it is not only questionable to operate in that type of deficit position, but it is even more questionable in terms of credibility and accountability as to what in fact is going to be our fiscal position.

In addition, the Treasurer has stated that the government is determined to bring about the stated results of a 10 per cent increase in expenditures, which incidentally last year was almost 20 per cent—and I challenge just how that's going to happen. But he states: "The government is determined to bring about these results without any loss of efficiency or decline in the level of essential services." Are there perhaps, therefore, millions and millions of dollars lying idle in the coffers of the government? Is there still major fat or waste? Is that the answer? Or should we perhaps insist on a clear definition of what the Treasurer means by essential services?

I don't want to be a prophet but just by coincidence, four or five days after the Treasuer had stated—and I challenged it—that the government is determined to bring about these results without any loss of efficiency or decline in the level of essential services, the Treasurer spoke to the municipal bodies of Ontario where he stated that growth in school and municipal aid will be limited to five per cent.

The first question I ask the minister is how can he make a statement last week that, without any loss of efficiency or decline in the level of essential services, to municipalities and boards of education across this province which received upwards of a 15 to 20 per cent increase in grants, conditional or otherwise, last year, if there's some truth to this statement—and there are quotes in that statement—might be limited to a five per cent increase?

The second question I put to the hon. minister is that we don't know where that five per cent is going to go. Is it going to be all in conditional grants, unconditional grants, or boards of education grants? But the most significant thing that comes out of that is, what is the definition of essential services. The second thing that comes out of that is how does the government do its planning. Further, we constantly hear the Edmonton commitment being voiced. It was stated in the Treasurer's original document of Oct. 30, wherein he stated that the municipalities would be getting the commitment under that Edmonton plan. As I understand it—and I stand to be corrected, though I've tried to get the right information—the definition of the Edmonton commitment is that the province will increase its transfers to local governments and the agencies at the rate of growth of total provincial revenue, which the Treasurer indicated would be 12 to 13 per cent.

Second, it states that the province will pass on to local governments the full benefit of any net gain in new unconditional tax sharing by the federal government and that the province will give municipalities access to funds generated by the Ontario Municipal Employees Retirement System. Assuming my understanding of this document is correct, it therefore means that, on the one hand, he is inferring that the municipalities may get a 12 to 13 per cent increase because that is the Treasurer's projected growth, which incidentally I challenge also, but on the other hand, how can he go to the municipalities and tell them it may be five per cent? I submit that one of the reasons why he's doing that is that last year he gave them 15 to 20 per cent and perhaps bailed out communities and municipalities. I suggest that that perhaps is unfair to municipalities. I served in municipal levels of government and the Santa Claus days that come every so often do not do anything for intelligent planning by political people in municipalities. I've seen it and it doesn't work. Last year was a particular year and every three or four years these things develop. Certainly I would hope that he doesn't mean it's a retroactive suggestion because that is not what this document says—or, as I read it, means.

I suggest in summation that it is time that we truly address ourselves to the real problem. The minister, in giving his report to the Legislature, questioned whether our leader fully appreciated the magnitude and seriousness of the problems we face. I assure you, Mr. Speaker, that our leader does and our caucus does. The question is does the government? I say to you in all sincerity that I'm not a historian. I say to you today that the real issue is how are we now going to come to grips with these fiscal problems? All I want to know is how and when are we going to start planning fiscal responsibility? How and when are we going to start examining the budget from a priority basis? How and when are we going to give the municipalities

themselves the opportunity to plan? They want to and they're begging to.

They can't do it when they're notified three months and four months beforehand that here's their handout for this year. Neither can we in the priorities of the programmes that this government wants to undertake. Surely it is not unreasonable to expect that a government that has been in power for 32 years should at least have the foresight to give the municipalities, the ministries and this Legislature the opportunity to assess what are their desires and plans, albeit they may have to change periodically, for two, three and four years down the road so that intelligent assessments can be made. That's all I'm asking for, and I think we're entitled to it.
[11:30]

Mr. Williams: Mr. Speaker, members of the Legislature have obviously chosen wisely in appointing the member for Northumberland (Mr. Rowe) as the Speaker of this House. The choice has undoubtedly been based on the knowledge of his reputation for fairness, patience and understanding. Accordingly, I extend to the Speaker, without reservations, my congratulations.

Also, I would congratulate the member for Kingston and the Islands (Mr. Norton) and the member for Mississauga North (Mr. Jones) for moving and seconding, respectively, the Speech from the Throne.

Further, I am pleased at the wisdom displayed by the members of the 29th Legislature, by their action in restoring to the government of Ontario one of the most fundamental principles of good democratic government—representation by population. This principle has been substantially eroded in recent years by growing and shifting population statistics that contradicted existing riding boundaries as established by law. The enactment of the new Representation Act in the spring of this year established eight new ridings and re-aligned boundaries in many existing ridings. The statute, in fact, achieved its intended objective to give real meaning to the principle of representation by population.

One of the four new ridings established within the Metropolitan Toronto area was the riding of Oriole of which I am proud to be the representative. Geographically, the riding was carved entirely out of the original and much larger York Mills riding. Its geographic heart is found at the intersection of the Macdonald-Cartier Freeway and the Don Valley Parkway, within the borough of North York.

Historically, Oriole was the name of the small, rural mill community which was located at Leslie St. and Sheppard Ave. In fact, the community was named after Oriole Lodge, the farmhouse of George S. Henry, the Premier of Ontario from 1930 to 1934. It was called Oriole Lodge because of the numerous Baltimore oriole birds that used to migrate to the area each spring in the early part of this century. The Henry home still stands in all its majestic splendour in the modern Henry Farm subdivision located a block away from this member's home.

While still a part of the original York Mills riding, the area was capably and admirably represented by the Hon. Dalton Bales. The Bales family is also part of the history of North York and Mr. Bales served on the then township council of North York before being elected to the provincial government in the 1960s. Mr. Bales was a very popular and effective representative who will, in fact, be most difficult to emulate.

Oriole, the sleepy rural village, has now become the bustling cosmopolitan urban riding of Oriole. The demographics of the riding disclose a population in excess of 75,000 people, the majority of who are Anglo-Saxon, yet infused with a significant number and variety of ethnic groups and cultures.

While the riding is largely one of residential land use, it is not without its institutional, commercial and industrial uses. It is to this type of riding and its constituents that I now wish to relate the programme of the government as enunciated in the Speech from the Throne. While I may direct my remarks in this parochial sense, I am confident that my views will be, in large measure, relevant to the provincial scene as a whole.

During the recent election the Conservative Party promised implementation of a rent review programme to assist people living in rental accommodation who were experiencing the devastating effects of rapidly escalating rents. In conjunction therewith, tenant security was singled out as an essential component to providing overall protection to persons locked into the rental situation. Legislation dealing with both of these critically important issues has now been introduced into the House. I am confident that, with the cooperation of the opposition parties, their enactment will be assured before year end in substantially their present form.

It is my hope, Mr. Speaker, that the regulations under the rent review legislation will incorporate therein the suggestions I raised in the House on Oct. 31 that all landlords be required to post in an appropriate common area in their facility, a schedule of rental

rates as they apply to all rental units within the building or buildings. Any effort by the opposition parties to dilute, or delay, enactment of the legislation will be directly against the interests and well-being of hundreds of thousands of Ontario citizens—including more than 45,000 people living in Oriole riding. The establishment of rental guidelines under the new rent review legislation is an important contribution at the provincial level to the federal wage price restraint programme in the anti-inflation fight. The beneficial effect of the new laws will most certainly be felt in the pocketbooks of thousands of citizens throughout Ontario who are suffering the adverse effects of inflation.

Rent review and tenant security are, in fact, an integral part of the government's top priority anti-inflation programme. I need not elaborate on the recent action taken by the federal government to combat inflation. I point out that on Oct. 30 the hon. Treasurer (Mr. McKeough) outlined in the House the government's anti-inflation programme that endorses and reinforces the federal government programme. This government's posture with regard to this thorny problem is identified in his comment that: "We place highest priority on co-ordinated national action to meet a national problem. Therefore we, the government of Ontario, will co-operate fully with the federal government."

This position recognizes and accepts the federal government's argument that the gravity of the situation represents a national emergency that threatens the peace, order and good government of this nation. In light of this crucial, critical situation, it is distressing and regrettable to hear the leaders of the opposition parties suggest that this government is rejecting its responsibilities by opting into a national anti-inflation programme at the direct invitation of the federal government.

Prior to the dissolution of the last Legislature, the government launched a programme aimed at strengthening one of the basic tenets upon which our democratic system rests—law and order. It's law and order in the sense of seeking new laws, or amendments to laws, that would strengthen society's hand in dealing with the criminal element in our society; tougher bail reform and gun control laws; reassessment of our penal system; stronger endorsation and support for our law enforcement agencies. It's law and order in the sense of putting a check on excessive permissiveness which has emerged in the name of achieving complete freedom of the individual as enunciated in the extreme by well-meaning civil liberties groups. Such permissiveness has had a debilitating effect on our basic values and on the respect heretofore shown for laws that endeavour to protect these values.

Mr. Philip: For example?

Mr. Williams: In regard to law and order in the sense of calling a halt to the current trend toward open civil disobedience, my concern is not so much the radical activist minority groups which openly and defiantly break our laws in a display of total disrespect for our government and society, rather it is disturbing that responsible community leaders are also beginning to engage in acts of civil disobedience.

I am greatly disturbed, as are many of my constituents from all walks of life—professionals, rank-and-file union people, labourers, business leaders, white-collar workers, homemakers—at the present defiance by leaders in the trade unions of governments genuine attempts to combat inflation. It is indeed a sad commentary on our times when a publicly-recognized leader, such as David Archer, president of the Ontario Federation of Labour, openly and even boastfully announces his intention to break the law and to become a martyr by offering to be imprisoned by the state. Such action not only breeds contempt for law, it invites everyone to become a law unto himself. No sector of our society is above the law. If these men believe that they should be elevated to such an exalted position, then they are inviting anarchy.

The dangerous course that has been charted by those who have such convictions must be altered. The political and social stability of this nation must continue and flourish. Respect for law and social order must prevail. No special-interest group or groups must be permitted to intimidate our governments or to make government subservient to their self-serving interests.

However, not only must special-interest groups be brought to task if their actions are not in the public interest, but government itself must be accountable for its actions. In these inflationary times, government at all levels must exercise real restraint in both the economic and administrative sense. Mr. McNeill, deputy chairman of the Bank of Montreal, while addressing a business seminar recently held in Toronto well illustrated the legitimacy of these concerns when he pointed out that the revenues of all governments in Canada taken together, with no double counting, are now equivalent to almost 40 per cent

of the total national output—$2 out of every $5 passes through government hands.

Mr. McNeill further warned that a halt has to be called somewhere if we are not to find ourselves in the position where government is no longer the servant of the people and the roles are reversed. Consider, for example, he noted, the rampant growth in the numbers of public servants. At last count, there were about 1.25 million people employed directly by governments at all levels in Canada. That comes to one person out of every seven working in Canada.

[11:45]

In order to give further emphasis to the absolute need for government to exercise restraint in spending and in expansion, let me for a few moments move the generalities to the specific. The Treasurer (Mr. McKeough), in speaking to the Ontario Hospital Assoc. annual convention last month, pointed out that health care ranks as No. 1 in terms of provincial financing. It is bigger than what we spent on education at all levels.

What is even more disconcerting is the revelation made by the Treasurer that apart from the absolute size of our expenditures on health programmes the rate of increase in these expenditures is unacceptable. Ontario hospital spending will be up by 18 per cent this year and Medicare spending will be up by 15 per cent. In both cases, the rate of cost increase substantially exceeds the rate of growth in the economy as a whole. The Treasurer cited a number of factors contributing to the problem but left the Minister of Health with the responsibility for implementing significant cost-saving measures.

I humbly suggest that one consideration might be the government's re-assessment of its policy with regard to the capitalization, structuring and operating of small community hospitals solely on the initiative of the private sector.

Government involvement and costs would, in that setting, be limited to supervisory personnel who would inspect the hospitals on a regular basis to ensure that any such hospital would operate completely within the high standards imposed by the Ministry of Health. Such facilities would supplement the role of the major public hospitals and minimize the need for the expansion of the public hospital system.

The Throne Speech emphasizes the government's determination to provide the people of Ontario with assured energy supplies at competitive prices and with minimum harm to the environment. A select committee of the House is presently assessing the need for justification for the newly-announced increased Hydro rates to take effect in 1976. As a member of that committee I am mindful of our primary responsibility to formulate a set of recommendations which will provide hydro to the citizens of Ontario at reasonable and not inflated rates through the year 1978.

Any decision by the committee in this regard must be balanced, however, by an awareness of the need to maintain the financial integrity of Ontario Hydro in its short and long-term efforts to not only meet growing consumer needs but to provide capital plant and facilities which will meet the extraordinary needs of our people in the foreseeable future when sources of supply from other conventional energy sources have been severely curtailed if not exhausted.

During the recent election there were three other matters which emerged as central issues in the campaign and which, therefore, I believe deserve comment at this time. One of the major concerns was with regard to the preservation of local autonomy for municipal governments and the need for real dialogue between provincial and municipal officials. This need is emphasized with the introduction of regional government and the two-tier system of local government such as exists within the Metropolitan Toronto area.

As one who has served as an elected official within Metropolitan Toronto over a 12-year period, I have come to appreciate the value of a senior level of government which deals with the regional issues while reserving unto the local municipalities within the region local responsibilities. Only in this way can planning be undertaken with major services being provided in a co-ordinated manner. The concept is easy to appreciate and understand. However, the manner of implementation is crucial.

The planning of new regions with local village and town components has to be brought about through the total involvement, understanding and co-operation of the citizens directly affected by regionalization. Preservation of the local unit as established within the new region is of paramount importance. Also, many people feel that there is too much interference by the provincial authorities in local affairs—whether they be at the regional or local level. Let me cite a perfect example.

Substantial transportation difficulties and hardships have been experienced as a result of provincial government interference with a decision by local elected representatives to build a metropolitan roadway, the Spadina Expressway. This type of blatant interference again surfaced during and since the election when the leader of the Liberal Party and

more recently, with respect, the member for St. Andrew-St. Patrick (Mr. Grossman)—expressed a desire to involve the province in another municipal issue, the completion of a metropolitan park on the Toronto Islands. This type of flagrant intrusion by provincial officials into local affairs is, in my judgement, unwarranted and deserving of repudiation and chastisement. There is no one better equipped to understand and deal with the local or regional problems than the local or regionally elected representatives.

I have to compliment the Premier (Mr. Davis) as the architect who masterfully reorganized the provincial government into a more orderly, cohesive administration. The constant monitoring of the activities of the various ministries, within their policy fields, to ensure a co-ordinated development of government programme is fundamentally sound. However, I feel that there is one notable exception to this success. I firmly believe that elimination of the former Department of Municipal Affairs was a retrograde step. There is no more onerous ministerial responsibility than being accountable for the fiscal integrity and economic stability of the province. Even a person as capable as the hon. Treasurer must find the challenge almost excessive in further assuming responsibility for interprovincial and federal-provincial affairs. I believe it is unreasonable, however to further add to such a heavy ministerial portfolio the responsibility of municipal affairs. Good municipal government is so basic and fundamental to the well-being of this province that it is deserving of the undivided attention that could be accorded it by the establishment of a separate ministry of municipal affairs.

Another major concern of Oriole constituents during the election was that of transportation. The success of the vocal minority in persuading the province, in 1971, to interfere with Metro Toronto's decision to build the Spadina Expressway had far-reaching consequences of disastrous proportions. For example—the Scarborough Expressway was stopped; the Leslie St. extension was shelved; the widening of Bayview Ave. was stopped; the elimination of the Lawrence Avenue diversion was rejected. In other words, road construction in Metropolitan Toronto came to a grinding halt.

It is axiomatic that a large metropolitan area cannot long survive and flourish without a balanced transportation system that gives equal attention to public and private transportation. This concept is fully recognized in Report 19 of the Metropolitan Toronto Transportation Review. The study states as follows:

> A major urban community such as Metropolitan Toronto supports a multitude of business, commercial and cultural activities, many of which rely heavily on an efficient system of facilities for the transportation of persons, goods and services throughout and beyond the metropolitan area.
>
> Railways and waterways carry appreciable amounts of goods to and from the urban area, and rail commuter and rapid transit lines carry significant numbers of passengers in certain corridors. But, as in virtually all urban areas, the roads form the basic system upon which persons, goods and services may be transported to virtually any place at any time. Roads are also an essential adjunct to the public transport system, providing routes for buses, trolley coaches and streetcars.
>
> The road system, therefore, is a community asset and to provide maximum benefit to the community it must operate efficiently with each component fulfilling as closely as possible its intended function in contributing to a fully-integrated system.

This government, and the Premier in particular, are to be given full credit for the initiative they have taken in recent times in placing emphasis on public transportation and on seeking out new modes or methods of transportation that will hopefully improve upon and perhaps eventually replace existing conventional transportation modes.

However, I have to be critical of the fact that this commitment has been so absolute as to totally abandon the private transportation aspects of the overall system. Consequently, I feel an imbalance in the transportation system has been created that has to be remedied at the earliest opportunity.

At the present time, there are twice the number of miles of subway lines in Metropolitan Toronto as there are miles of Metropolitan Toronto expressways. The freeway network proposed for Metropolitan Toronto in the 1964 transportation plan and 1966 metropolitan plan is less than two-thirds completed. As a consequence, existing portions of the freeway systems are already overtaxed by reason of their having to take traffic that would have normally used the as yet uncompleted portions of the expressway system.

For example, the Metropolitan Toronto Transportation Plan Review, to which I have referred, points out that traffic is attracted to the Don Valley Parkway from adjoining corridors which have no freeway access to downtown. Because of this situation, the overload factor on the Don Valley Parkway today is in

excess of 30 per cent. The extension of the Don Valley Parkway to Steeles Ave. will finally be under construction within the coming months. In the meantime, the extreme congestion between the north end of the parkway and Highway 7 continues to exist and to worsen almost daily.

In my judgment, the establishment of a basic expressway grid comprised of two cross-town routes and three north-south routes, as proposed in the 1964 Metropolitan Toronto Transportation Plan, makes good sense. It cannot, by any stretch of the imagination, be deemed an unwarranted proliferation of expressways.

I am hopeful that those members of the Metropolitan Toronto council with vision and strength of character, will have the fortitude and resolution to restore the balanced transportation system that is so desperately needed in Metropolitan Toronto. Of equal importance, I am hopeful that the provincial government will commit itself to a positive posture when asked to support any such municipal undertaking.

[12:00]

The third and most contentious issue that dominated the campaign in my riding, and I understand many other ridings, was the elementary and high school education programme under the Ministry of Education. Parental objections ranged from strong disapproval of professional development days to carpeting on classroom floors. However, the strongest and most persistent objections were related to the fundamental concerns over school curriculum, instructional technique and classroom setting.

Time and time again parents expressed to me their dissatisfaction with regard to basic programmes. Simply stated, the parents are seeking a modification of programme that would involve a stronger core curriculum, with fewer options, taught in a more structured, closed classroom setting. Parents are not satisfied, it would appear, that children in the schools are achieving well on their own initiative with minimal direction or guidance.

The validity of these complaints is borne out by the fact that some, if not all, of the community colleges are finding it necessary to establish remedial courses in mathematics and English language skills for incoming students.

Mr. Foulds: That's one of the reasons they were set up.

Mr. Williams: It was reported earlier this year, in one college, that the number of students required to take a remedial mathematics course has risen steadily from 22 per cent in 1970 to 45 per cent in 1974.

Mr. Philip: Why didn't you run as a Liberal?

Mr. Williams: The same college reported that with regard to English-language skills, approximately 50 per cent of the students were below an acceptable level for readings speed and comprehension, and 29 per cent were below an acceptable level for written language skills.

Another college recently conducted a test for written literacy. For the entire group of incoming students tested, the mean raw score was 49.7, corresponding to a percentage mark of 34. The author of the report stated the obvious when he remarked: "I think most observers would agree that this is a pretty dismal showing."

Throughout the election campaign both the Premier and the hon. Minister of Education (Mr. Wells) were unfairly criticized for a poor educational system. Both men are, in fact, to be commended for the personal contribution they have made to education in Ontario. Both men stressed, with conviction and with pride, throughout the election, that Ontario has one of the best, most comprehensive, educational systems to be found anywhere on the continent. While I agree with those comments—

Mr. Foulds: You applauded too early, fellows.

Mr. Hodgson: You haven't been to any commencements this year have you? Pretty fine bunch of students coming out.

Mr. Foulds: I agree. I am not making the criticisms, he is.

Mr. Philip: It is your Liberal colleague who is making all the criticisms.

Mr. Williams: While I agree with those comments, that answer alone is not good enough for those parents who have experienced personal disillusionment in the educational performance of their children. If there, in fact, appears to be a widespread legitimate criticism or concern expressed with regard to the educational programme, those criticisms and concerns must not go unheeded. I sincerely believe that a reassessment with a view to possible modification of programme should be considered and undertaken by the Ministry of Education.

Such a review should provide a forum for parental and student input. I know that

this government is not insensitive to people's needs and concerns and I believe that the undertaking of such a study by the government would clearly demonstrate the government's responsiveness to the concerns of so many people.

I could well have spoken at great length on the many past achievements of this government, and, indeed I have highlighted the ambitious government programme for the future as outlined in the Speech from the Throne. At the same time, I have felt duty bound to my constituents to convey to the government their concerns and criticisms as expressed to me during the election campaign. My fervent hope is that these concerns and constructive criticism will not fall on deaf ears.

I firmly believe that this government is responsive to the people. Furthermore, this government has represented the people and will continue to represent the people in a responsible manner. I believe that on this basis this government will soon be given a clear mandate by the people to lead them into the 1980s within the framework of a free enterprise system that has clearly made Ontario the province of opportunity.

Mr. Swart: I have not yet taken the opportunity to congratulate the Speaker on his re-election and to congratulate you on being elected Deputy Speaker. I want to do that now. I also want to say to you that I intend to co-operate with the rulings of the Speaker. One thing that has concerned me as a new member in this House is the flouting, at least to some degree, of the admonitions of the Speaker. I would hope that I will not be part of any group that may be doing that.

I want to say that I am happy, obviously, to be part of the team making up the official opposition. This will be recognized by many who know that this was my eighth try to represent the NDP and its predecessor, the CCF, at a provincial or federal level of government and, therefore, my delight at being here in the House is very real. I am particularly happy to have been assigned some duties by my party in the municipal field, and to renew some associations that I have had over the years in municipal government with the Treasurer. I must say that over those years I have found him forthright and formidable. I also must say that I have sometimes found him wrong in his decisions on local government.

I want also—and perhaps this is somewhat out of tradition—to pay a word of tribute to the former member for Welland. I think we can say that he was a very jovial individual and that he was a hard worker for the constituents. Of course, he had to work hard, and perhaps was not very successful, because of the type of legislation that the government enacted, or did not enact, during the 24 years he was here. I have to say to those people who remember the former member for Welland, though, that you won't be hearing anything from me about "the great country of Welland," which were the words that he used a great deal. You won't be hearing me using the expression, "I'll be breaking bread with you." Many of you will remember those expressions. You won't be hearing me singing—

Mr. Hodgson: If you stay around 24 years it might be a good word to use.

Mr. Swart: All right, except that like the rest of the Conservative policy—

Mr. Kennedy: What is wrong with Welland?

Mr. Swart: —there hasn't been a county of Welland for six years. It's now the region of Niagara.

Members won't hear me singing, "Let Me Call You Sweetheart"—I'm not much of a singer—but the loss of those vocal renditions and those old homilies I think we recognize is more than balanced by the fact that the Welland member now sits on this side, on the opposition side of the House, rather than with the government of this province, the temporary government of this province.

I'm not going to take my time in this Throne Speech debate today in talking about the great riding of Welland which may have been the habit previously. I say that is self-evident. Really what I want to talk about today is the preservation of those values and the characteristics and the environment we have in the Niagara Peninsula. We have a very real multicultural area, perhaps almost more so than any other part of this province and I'm anxious that that be maintained. My colleague from Oakwood (Mr. Grande) was articulate the other day in saying what needed to be done in the education field in the education of our ethnic groups in their own tongues, if we are going to preserve the multiculturalism of this province. I subscribe to all those points he made.

We have in the Welland area a large industrial complex which has provided a great deal of employment and I am interested in maintaining that full employment which the government of this province, along with the

government of Canada, has failed to do. I'm interested in preserving good agricultural land of which there is none better than that in the Niagara Peninsula and in part of my riding. I'm interested in maintaining good government and accountable government; in having a large degree of home ownership as we have always had in that area, and adequate housing. I'm interested in equitable taxation.

I want to say that in my opinion the government has simply failed to cope with the changing conditions to provide for the preservation of these things. The Conservatives have failed to face up to the hard decisions which have to be made and, instead, very often they have established a facade or a screen or even a barrier to prevent the changes from coming about which would preserve these things.

The first area I want to mention in the refusal of the government of this province to deal with a real problem is in the matter of hydro rates. We have heard something in this House and will hear a lot more about hydro rates generally. I'm not going to deal with those today; rather, I want to deal with the actions of this government in freezing the hydro commissions in the regional municipality of Niagara in the year 1970 and its failure to do anything about it since that time.

Let me tell the House the freeze was complete. When the 26 municipalities in the Niagara Peninsula were formed into 12 municipalities in 1970, the people there were told that one of the benefits of being taken into an urban area or of two urban areas being amalgamated, was they would have uniform hydro rates. But a freeze took place which was complete. The boundaries of the hydro commissions were frozen and the personnel of the hydro commissions was frozen at that time. As I say, that was somewhat annoying to the public there and, of course, this has happened not only in the Niagara Peninsula but in other regional governments formed later.

[12:15]

The people were somewhat annoyed, but back on March 30, 1971, Task Force Hydro was appointed; among other things, it was to look into the structure of hydro commissions in the regions throughout this province and to bring in recommendations. They brought in recommendations somewhat later and recommended basically a one-tier hydro commission for the Niagara Peninsula.

Of course, this was a controversial matter, so what did the government of the province do? They appointed a review committee on structure, composed of government officials, Hydro personnel and the OMEA representatives. That was in 1973, almost four years after the commissions had been frozen. That committee reported in 1974 and left the question open about what should be done about the structuring of the hydro commissions. Because they didn't want to deal with it then, nothing was done about it and a great deal of discussion took place in regional council.

This year in particular the howls really started. Of course, this being an election year, the province had to do something about this or make some gesture; so, during the election campaign they appointed another committee. This was composed of the representatives from each of the municipalities in the Niagara region.

I was talking to one of those representatives just last week, and they think that they may be able to report by December, 1976—seven years since the hydro commissions were frozen. Do the government members know what this means? It means, first, that there is not now a single member of the hydro commission in the city of Thorold who has been elected—not a single member.

Do the government members know that in the city of Thorold, and it is true to a lesser degree in quantity in the city of Welland, the people who were brought in—and there is a large urban area that had rural hydro—have continued to pay rates in the urban-rural district, which I believe is the terminology that is used, over the six years, that are 33 per cent higher than in the old town of Thorold, as it was at that time? In the rural part of the city of Thorold, they pay rates 48 per cent higher than in the city of Thorold.

This government has perpetuated those inequities because it was was afraid to face up to the problem that confronted it. I tell you, Mr. Speaker, the people are justified in being annoyed; it's almost anger they have now with regard to this situation.

The second thing I want to mention specifically is the matter of good government and accountability, and in this respect I want to say a word or two about regional government. I have no doubt that the members sitting across the House, perhaps everyone here, would agree that perhaps 80 or 90 per cent of the people in areas which are covered by regional government, and perhaps those areas which aren't covered by regional government also, are opposed to regional government as we have it now.

I'm aware that in any jurisdiction there is no political mileage in the reform of local government; the benefits, by and large, if there are any, are long-term. I also recognize that the old county system was outdated and something had to be done. But I also say that this government seems to have done everything it could to make regional government more unpalatable to the people in the areas where it has been imposed.

Look, for instance, at the matter of the appointment of the chairman of the regional council. He is not directly accountable to the people he represents. In Niagara region, and I am sure elsewhere, he is the single most important municipal person in the whole area. Niagara region spends something like $50 million, and his influence is greater than anyone else.

I should give you an example of the lack of the accountability of the regional chairman in Niagara. He is a very nice fellow. I have nothing against him. Of course it is a Conservative appoinment and he is a Conservative, but I have nothing against him personally. He doesn't even have a telephone listed, where the public can call him. Oh, of course he does in his office, but not at his home. I wonder how long any of us would last if we didn't have telephones where people could reach us or other elected municipal officials?

The hon. member for St. Andrew-St. Patrick put it in perspective the other day when he was taking a crack at Metro chairman in Toronto. He called him "my non-elected friend." And it points out that they do not have the support that they should have, and would have, if they were either elected at large or at least represented a constituency.

I say to the members across the House, that this is one reason that regional government has not been accepted by the public. Surely, if there is a reason to say that the chairman of a regional council should not be elected, the same sort of reasoning exists that the mayor of a municipality should not be elected. And then, of course, we might as well go on from there.

Every regional government in this province should be elected, either at large or from a constituency of that region and should be accountable to the people of that region.

I briefly want to mention planning, too, as an area in which the government—and this is conneced with regional governmet—has put up this screen between the people and their elected representatives. In a speech that the Treasurer (Mr. McKeough) gave to the Sierra Club on Oct. 25, he made these comments about the escarpment commission which has some powers in the planning field:

> The members of the commission should be clearly aware that the public reaction in the county of Gray has been one of frustration, deep concern, and in some cases overt hostility, to what the commission is attempting to do. The content of this brief can really not properly convey the scale of the objection which is being voiced by many land owners—he is talking about a brief which had been presented relative to the Escarpment commission—and individuals who are involved in business associated with development.

We will come back to that development a bit later. But I suggest that the hon. minister is missing, to a large extent, the reason for the objection by the public to much of the planning throughout this province. We have so many levels of bureaucracy that the public just can't get through it. Of course, with the institution of regional government, we have one more.

What should be done? I mentioned this previously on the debate on the estimates of urban and rural planning: What should be done, of course, is that the province should evolve a master plan with a very real set of guidelines. It should accept the responsibility for this.

I heard the member for Oriole (Mr. Williams) speaking in glowing terms about the regions and the municipalities which should be left to make these decisions. Of course, they should make the decisions primarily in their own area. But somebody has to take responsibility for planning this province and setting out the general guidelines. If the province took this responsibility to set out the general guidelines in a fairly firm way, and then left all the rest of it to the local municipalities, we could do away with two-thirds of the bureaucracy, do away with a substantial amount of cost, and have the people of this province a whole lot happier about their planning.

I say "in general" because this bureaucracy applies to more than just planning. We are going to have to downgrade regional governments, have stronger guidelines from the province and give more authority to local municipalities. I make these suggestions to the Treasurer, who is not here, that in all earnestness this would do a lot to improve the feeling toward regional government and planning in this province.

All of who are newly elected to this Legislature, I suppose, are surprised by the number of constituency cases which are brought to

our attention and the workload that we have in this regard, a workload which I am very pleased to accept. Let me say that the second largest number of people that have brought problems to me are people who have problems with regard to housing. I suppose compensation cases, as everyone else finds, are No. 1 but housing is No. 2.

In my own area a 104-unit senior citizen housing plan has been held up twice. There has been a long lengthy delay which should have been resolved long ago. There are 150 couples waiting to get into senior citizen housing and this 104-unit has been held up now for almost two years longer than would normally have been the case. I can tell you, Mr. Speaker, of a woman, who didn't want me to use her name for obvious reasons, who called me and wanted to see me. I went around to see her in a fairly large apartment house in Welland. She is a very bright woman, 80 years of age, who told me that her income, and I guess it was under GAINS, was $255 a month and she was paying $165 a month for that apartment which was the best that she could get where she would want to live, where any resident would want to live. This left her $90 for everything else.

The significant part to me was that when I knocked at the door and started to talk to her she said: "Mr. Swart, will you please come into my apartment and we will talk inside where we can't possibly be overheard by the landlord? If he thought I was complaining he might fail to renew my lease for this property."

I can tell you also, Mr. Speaker, and this just occurred, there was almost a page of coverage in the issue of the Welland Tribune last Thursday, Nov. 6. In the centre of that page was a picture of a dead rat. The story told about a woman, Mrs. Ralph Young, who had applied for public housing some five months before because of the deplorable condition in which she was living. She is a woman whose husband has a serious heart condition and is in hopsital. She lives at 42 Riverside Dr. She and her husband live on the Canada Pension and veterans' allowance. They have four children—14, 12 10 and eight years old. The rats had started to come in the house and they had killed seven of them two days before this picture was in the paper, yet there is no possibility of getting her in Ontario Housing because it isn't there. There is no place for these people even though they live in conditions such as that.

This is the fault of this government; let's make no mistake about it. They have the power to remedy these types of situations. Housing starts for this year, as we know, won't be more than 55 per cent or 60 per cent of what they were two years ago. Nothing shows the distorted priorities of this government more than the Speech from the Throne. We discussed a bill just yesterday in which we are willing to give subsidies to industrial parks, where there isn't anything like the shortage that there is of housing, and yet we are not prepared to do a thing for housing. This government is not prepared to do a thing for residential parks and residential land development, so we can get the housing that we need within this province.

[12:30]

This province has failed to move at all to deal with the housing crisis, and particularly the land development part of it.

I am convinced that those sitting on the other side of the House still think that competition still exists in the land development field. We know now that something in excess of over half of the developable land around the city of Toronto is owned by four major corporations, and it is the same throughout the whole province. We have got to look at some new ways. The old system just isn't working in providing this developable land. The answer to it, of course, is a large massive degree of public land development.

We have the machinery. The Ontario Housing Corp. has a HOME programme, and is doing this in a minor way—but doing it inside of regulations and laws that just simply don't permit the benefits of it to be passed on to the public. For instance, where the house and lot are sold, the lot must be sold at market value, not at what it cost. Compare that practice to what has been done in other places within this country where they have public land development. In places such as Regina, Saskatoon and Winnipeg—Winnipeg to a lesser degree—fully-serviced lots are selling between $5,000 and $7,000.

Just two years ago I presented a brief to the Comay housing committee, and I think sitting as one of the committee at that time was the hon. member for St. David (Mrs. Scrivener). I took the time to look up that brief and found that I had stated in that brief in April, 1973, that lot prices in the Niagara region and in the greater St. Catharines area, were between $8,000 and $10,000—up from $1,950 in 1955. I made quite an issue about that. Do the members know what the price of lots is now in the Niagara Peninsula and in the greater St. Catharines area? In less than three years from that time, the minimum price is now $20,000. It is just unrealistic to think that people can afford to buy their own home with those kind of prices for lots.

I say to you that we have to go public land development. It is not good enough to say that all the developable land is bought up. We have the powers of expropriation to take that land—reimburse, of course, the people who own it—and develop it and put it on the market. We can do this at a substantially lower price than what it is now being placed on the market. In addition to those benefits, public land development would also assist planning as well. No longer would it be the developers making the primary decisions about planning; it would be the municipalities and the government—and development would be going to the places where it should go.

I also want to say something about property taxation. It too, of course, has had a real effect on housing. I pointed out a week or two ago, when we were discussing unconditional grants, that the municipalities in Ontario have the country's second highest per capita municipal tax rate and the second highest debt per capita, based on 1974 figures. If we added in the increases in 1975, I would suggest that we would probably find that they were the highest.

The minister's reply to me at that time was that the people in Ontario have a high income. I suggest that if we are a prosperous province, and we are, although we are losing some of the advantage we have had in this province, then this is all the more reason why we should have greater equality, not less. I also say that the income of the bottom quarter of the income earners in this province is nearly as low as that in any other province in this country.

I think we all know that the property tax is a most regressive tax. As I said the other day, and I admit this again quite frankly, in the last four years there has been a real move toward lessening the impact of the property tax and making it more fair, but I suggest that there has to be a greater relief and we should be moving toward that in this province. The Throne Speech gave no relief to that, and the statement by the minister to the PMLC, which is the Provincial-Municipal Liaison Committee, a week ago indicates that there is going to be a move backward. In fact —and I wrote it down—the chairman of that committee made the comment when the announcement was made by the minister that it would be a fairly devastating effect; it would be a big step backward.

I suggest that the government should take a look at what is being done in Manitoba in this regard. I am sure they are familiar with it. What I am really saying is that they should adopt some such similar programme here to what they have in effect there now or will be putting in effect this year. They are moving away from the property tax to the personal income tax and the corporation tax. This coming year two points of the provincial income tax and one per cent of the corporation tax will be released to the municipalities for their use.

The minister will say, and with some justification, that the unconditional grants given by this province are substantially greater than the amount which will be transferred by this income tax and property tax to the property taxpayers in Manitoba. But I suggest when he says that, as he did say it in a speech to the regional government of Sudbury, that he is missing the real point. What the Province of Manitoba has made clear is that this is just a start in the very substantial movement away from the property tax as a method of financing local government. They say in their budget of this past year:

> Our government believes that this tax-sharing proposal represents the basis for major and fundamental reform of local government financing. It will provide Manitoba's municipalities with the means of introducing greater equity in their own tax structure, while at the same time maintaining their autonomy and ensuring their accountability to their taxpayers.

This accountability is done by showing this on the income tax bill. To me, this is a really significant thing. It says that if the municipalities wish to raise their rates in 1976 or in future years, or if they wish to levy other taxes, they would be free to do so under the consensus arrangements I outlined earlier.

Talking to an official of that department out there just the day before yesterday, he said to me that if the majority of the municipalities get together and want that tax raised —for example, to five per cent and three per cent—the provincial government is willing to do it. Here perhaps is the first real move that has been made in this regard in Canada, and I commend it to the minister to consider it here. The steps he took a week ago today to cut back on the increase to municipalities, I say, are going to be as devastating as the chairman of that committee indicated.

I think this House should know, if it doesn't already know, what in fact was proposed by municipal governments. Members here will likely be aware that the Provincial-Municipal Liaison Committee is a joint committee, composed of the municipal associations in this province, who meet with the

minister responsible for municipal affairs to express their views to him, and through which he negotiates with them. They suggested, first: "The Provincial-Municipal Liaison Committee, composed of municipal people, is of the opinion that the public sector must become a provincial responsibility insofar as the application of the federal guidelines apply to local authorities." I think that is exactly what this party has been saying that the government should do.

Second, they were willing that a 10 per cent guideline should be established for the expenditure growth of local authorities, and they were willing to have the provincial government impose that guideline, with the same sort of recourse for appeal as there is to the federal guidelines. Instead of that, the Treasurer announced to that Provincial-Municipal Liaison Committee that in the coming year the increase in grants would be cut, as the member for London (Mr. Shore) said, to five or six per cent.

The Provincial-Municipal Liaison Committee made it clear—and I think I am right in saying that this was accepted by the minister—that in no way could municipalities get by with an increase of less than 10 per cent in their total revenues. This would be impossible; because of commitments made in terms of wage increases, and with the price of materials going up on everything they have to buy, it would more likely be 15 per cent than 10 per cent. What does this mean if they only get an increase of five per cent in grants from the Province of Ontario? It means that they are going to have to levy at least a 15 per cent increase on the property taxes.

The minister has made a great deal in recent years about lessening the impact of the property taxes. This year the increase was something like 14 to 15 per cent in municipal taxes levied. Next year it will be at least 15 per cent and probably closer to 20 per cent. All the benefits that have been achieved in the past four years are going to be wiped out, while other jurisdictions in Canada are carrying on a progressive policy of lowering these taxes.

I say in all sincerity to the minister that he simply has to review this. It is not just the municipalities that are at stake, it is the individuals of this province who are seeing a higher levy placed on them by a regressive tax so that the progressive tax, which falls upon ability to pay, will not be as heavy as it otherwise would. It is, in every respect, a retrograde step.

[12:45]

The final item I want to mention is the matter of preservation of good agricultural land, and I will not repeat what I said on this subject under urban and regional planning.

One of the main reasons for establishing regional government was that there could be a meaningful land-use plan—that we would preserve the good agricultural land of this province. I mentioned last week, during the discussion on urban and regional planning, the shift of growth to good farm land. In the last 10 years, something like 82 per cent of all the urban growth in this province has taken place on class I and class II agricultural land.

There were some of us who were on a regional council who were concerned that this preservation of the good agricultural land couldn't be done unless there was strong guidance from the province in this regard. And so we wrote a letter to Mr. White—who was then the minister of almost everything—posing some questions to him about what we should incorporate in the regional plan for Niagara.

We wrote that letter early in the spring. Numerous telephone conversations followed with his ministry, because we didn't get an answer to our letter. Inevitably, the officials told us: "Well, you go ahead and prepare your plan and then we'll take a look at it". Eventually, after much pressure, we did get some answers from Mr. White. I would just like the House to hear those answers—the tremendously firm attitude of the government on some really pretty important matters.

> [Question:] Should the region be a growth area of the province?
>
> [Answer:] It is unlikely that the region will be designated as a growth area in terms of any extraordinary provincial effort or expenditures. Rather a trends rate of growth would be supported. However, the province would approve and support efforts by the region to stimulate growth in specific areas or centres as a means of structuring the overall growth of the region.

Not a word about what centres; not a word there about good agricultural land. Then another question posed:

> [Question:] Should the intensely-productive agricultural lands be preserved? Closely related to the conservation of highly productive farm land, is the question of directing future urban growth above the escarpment.

> [Answer:] The preservation of agricultural lands, particularly fruit land, would seem a very important goal. The region, in directing growth away from such areas, would be playing an important part in achieving this. The other levels of government also have roles to play and the region should attempt to identify these

Isn't that a forthright statement to deal with that need? There was no statement by the government saying: "Yes, you must preserve good agricultural land: class I, class II agricultural land. You must preserve the fruitland; we only allow exceptions to that if you make application for those exceptions." No; instead we got a vague statement.

Regional council wanted direction from the government. I can tell you that the chairman of that committee is a very fine gentleman, even if he and I may not agree on many things. His name is Bob Bell. I'm sure he wouldn't mind me saying in this House—it's true—that he said that he wanted guidelines. And when the minister wrote this fall, when the election was on, and said our region would have to pull back its urban boundaries, he said that we should have had direction from them some time ago to do so.

By and large, the municipalities are willing to abide by provincial guidelines. But the province just simply refused to provide those guidelines.

Do you know what happened after the regional council had approved the expanded boundaries?

I'm not going to go past the time of adjournment; I'll be finished by then, Mr. Speaker.

The first thing that happened after those boundaries had been established by the region destroyed totally any preservation of good agricultural land. The first thing that happened was that we had applications to extend them further and they were approved.

I say that this is all done by this province, with such ringing statements as that of the former Minister of Agriculture and Food (Mr. Stewart), who said in 1974:

> If we lose this province's fruit and vegetable industry we will be subject to the unchallenged price and volume decisions of other countries. Without a local peach industry we would be at the mercy of outside prices. Compound the problem of sweet and sour cherries, plums, pears and a complete line of processed fruit and vegetables, and within a matter of years about the only thing we could afford to consume would be humble pie and that might be hard to take for some of us.

I say to our friends across the floor that they had a bit of that humble pie on Sept. 18, and I say most sincerely that unless they change their attitude toward the preservation of agricultural lands they are going to get a much bigger dose of it in the next election when it comes up.

That ends the comments I want to make at this time, except to say this in summary, that the people of this province expect that this new government is going to take action to deal with these very real issues that are confronting them, whether it be housing, which is so serious, whether it be the preservation of good agricultural land, whether it be the matter of the expansion of Hydro at tremendous cost to the public. They are looking for these solutions, and if they are not provided by the government that is in power at this time, there is no doubt in my mind that the deterioration which has set in in its popular support will continue and will, in fact, overthrow them when the next provincial election rolls around.

Mr. Sweeney moved the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to.

Hon. Mr. Welch: Mr. Speaker, before moving the adjournment of the House, may I indicate the order of business for next week? Monday afternoon we will go into committee of supply until 5, at which time we will take private members' business into consideration between 5 and 6.

On Tuesday, it will be a combination of legislation and estimates. We will carry on, on Tuesday afternoon, with the second reading of Bill 20; and if in fact we reach second reading stage we will then go into committee of supply.

Wednesday, of course, is committee day.

May I have some flexibility for Thursday, being a combination of legislation and estimates, depending on the circumstances of that day? But certainly I would serve notice that we might have legislation Thursday, followed by estimates as well. On Friday, we will continue with this debate. Evening sessions next week will be on Tuesday and Thursday.

Hon. Mr. Welch moved the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to.

The House adjourned at 12:55 p.m.

CONTENTS

Friday, November 14, 1975

Youth employment opportunities, question of Mr. Davis: Mr. Deans 573

Sale of land to non-Canadians, question of Mr. McKeough: Mr. Deans 573

Inco/Falconbridge business policies, question of Mr. Davis: Mr. Deans 573

UN Zionism resolution, question of Mr. Davis: Mr. Nixon 574

Special occasion permits, questions of Mr. Handleman: Mr. Nixon, Mr. Moffatt 574

Special occasion permits, question of Mr. Meen: Mr. Nixon 575

Special occasion permits, question of Mr. Handleman: Mr. Nixon 575

Guelph reformatory abattoir, questions of Mr. J. R. Smith: Mr. Nixon, Mr. Gaunt 576

Supply of fish to Indian reserves, question to Mr. Bernier: Mr. Foulds 576

Toronto parkway belt, question of Mrs. Scrivener: Mr. Stong 577

North Pickering development, question of Mr. Rhodes: Mr. Godfrey 577

Postal strike, question of Mr. Davis: Mr. Sargent 578

Sale of firearms question of Mr. MacBeth: Mr. Grossman 578

Abitibi labour negotiations, questions of B. Stephenson: Mr. Swart, Mr. R. S. Smith, Mr. Stokes 579

Eganville Creamery, question of Mr. W. Newman: Mr. Conway 580

Toronto teachers' negotiations, questions of Mr. Wells: Mr. Warner, Mr. Deans 581

Union Station area land-use, question of Mr. Davis: Mr. Givens 581

Space for government offices, question of Mrs. Scrivener: Mr. Breithaupt 582

Aid to COSTI, question of Mr. Taylor: Mr. McClellan 583

Resolution re Ministry of Labour 583

UN Zionism resolution, Mr. Davis 584

Landlord and Tenant Act, Mr. McMurtry, first reading 587

Motion re select committee to consider Bills 4 and 5, Mr. Welch, agreed to 587

Tabling of report re incident on Oct. 28, concerning injured workers, Mr. Speaker 587

Resumption of the debate on the Speech from the Throne, Mr. Shore, Mr. Williams, Mr. Swart 588

Motion to adjourn debate, Mr. Sweeney, agreed to 601

Motion to adjourn, Mr. Welch, agreed to 601

SPEAKERS IN THIS ISSUE

Bernier, Hon. L. Natural Resources (Kenora PC)
Bounsall, E. J. (Windsor-Sandwich NDP)
Campbell, M. (St. George L)
Conway, S. (Renfrew North L)
Davis, Hon. W. G. Premier (Brampton PC)
Deans, I. (Wentworth NDP)
Foulds, J. F. (Port Arthur NDP)
Gaunt, M. (Huron-Bruce L)
Givens, P. G. (Armourdale L)
Godfrey, C. (Durham West NDP)
Grossman, L. (St. Andrew-St. Patrick PC)
Handleman, Hon. S. B. Consumer and Commercial Relations (Carleton PC)
Hodgson, W. (York North PC)
Kennedy, R. D. (Mississauga South PC)
MacBeth, Hon. J. P. Provincial Secretary for Justice and Solicitor General (Humber PC)
Mancini, R. (Essex South L)
McClellan, R. (Bellwoods NDP)
McKeough, Hon. W. D. Treasurer, Minister of Economics and Intergovernmental Affairs (Chatham-Kent PC)
McMurtry, Hon. R. Attorney General (Eglinton PC)
Meen, Hon. A. K. Revenue (York East PC)
Moffatt, D. (Durham East NDP)
Newman, Hon. W. Agriculture and Food (Durham North PC)
Nixon, R. F. (Brant-Oxford-Norfolk L)
Philip, E. (Etobicoke NDP)
Reid, T. P. (Rainy River L)
Renwick, J. A. (Riverdale NDP)
Rhodes, Hon. J. R. Housing (Sault Ste. Marie PC)
Riddell, J. (Huron-Middlesex L)
Ruston, R. F. (Essex North L)
Sargent, E. (Grey-Bruce L)
Scrivener, Hon. M. Government Services (St. David PC)
Shore, M. (London North L)
Singer, V. M. (Wilson Heights L)
Smith, Hon. J. R. Correctional Services (Hamilton Mountain PC)
Smith, R. S. (Nipissing L)
Stokes, J. E. (Lake Nipigon NDP)
Stong, A. (York Centre L)
Swart, M. (Welland NDP)
Sweeney, J. (Kitchener-Wilmot L)
Taylor, Hon. J. A. Minister of Community and Social Services (Prince Edward-Lennox PC)
Warner, D. (Scarborough-Ellesmere NDP)
Welch, Hon. R. Culture and Recreation (Brock PC)
Wells, Hon. T. L. Education (Scarborough North PC)
Williams, J. (Oriole PC)
Young, F. (Yorkview NDP)

No. 16



Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT — DAILY EDITION

First Session of the Thirtieth Legislature

Monday, November 17, 1975

Speaker: Honourable Russell Daniel Rowe
Clerk: Roderick Lewis, QC

THE QUEEN'S PRINTER
PARLIAMENT BUILDINGS, TORONTO
1975

CONTENTS

A list of the speakers taking part in the debates in this issue of Hansard appears, in alphabetical order, at the back of this issue.

Daily contents of proceedings also appears at the back of this issue. Reference to a cumulative index of previous issues can be obtained by calling the Hansard Reporting Service indexing staff. Phone 965-2159.

Hansard subscription price is $15.00 per session, from: Sessional Subscription Service, MGS, 9th Floor, Ferguson Block, Parliament Bldgs., Toronto, M7A 1N3. Phone 965-2238.

LEGISLATURE OF ONTARIO

MONDAY, NOVEMBER 17, 1975

The House met at 2 p.m.

Prayers.

Mr. Lawlor: Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to ask the House to welcome to the east gallery today, 28 students under the charge of Miss M. Doyle from St. Felix Separate School in my riding. Thank you.

Mr. Godfrey: Mr. Speaker, I would like to present to the House, through you, students from Whitby, Ajax and Pickering who attend the Denis O'Connor School and who are under the direction of their teacher, Mr. Joe Modeste, in the east gallery.

Mr. Warner: Mr. Speaker, I wish to introduce to the House 30 students from St. Richard's Separate School in Scarborough with their teacher, Mrs. Storr.

Mr. Speaker: Statements by the ministry.

Oral questions.

Mr. Lewis: First of all, Mr. Speaker, may I ask the House leader if either the Premier (Mr. Davis) or the Minister of Education (Mr. Wells) is scheduled to come in for this question period?

Hon. Mr. Welch: I expect they will be here.

OIL AND GAS PRICES

Mr. Lewis: May I ask the Minister of Energy what steps he is taking to monitor scrupulously the increases in prices which the various companies and dealerships imposed on gasoline and home heating fuel, where, in some instances, those who imposed it on Saturday did so prior to the midnight deadline or the midnight entry, and the increase went beyond the amount the minister indicated?

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: Mr. Speaker, the monitoring at the retail end is being carried out by the Ministry of Consumer and Commercial Relations.

Mr. Nixon: That minister is not with us today.

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: I am not sure whether he is joining us later or not.

Over the last few weeks I Telexed all of the oil companies and repeated to them my statement of Oct. 24, making very clear the government's intentions about pricing. All of the companies—I believe we have heard from them all now—have indicated they would follow the government's wishes and not increase tank wagon postings more than the 5.4 cents maximum indicated in my Oct. 24 statement.

As I mentioned, the retail part of it is being monitored by my colleague's ministry. I would only say this, that last night I was contacted by the Toronto Daily Star and they indicated that in their activities on the weekend they found one or two stations—I have asked them, and I ask anyone who knows of specific locations, to let us know, because I suspect that in most of those cases, if not all, it would be stations where the retailers have been, or were, involved in pricing wars and that they were, as has happened over the last 140 days, adjusting their prices toward the prices which they were charging on June 24.

Mr. Nixon: Supplementary on that, Mr. Speaker: In the event the minister is informed of retail outlets that increase their prices beyond the limits of the freeze or the increase suggested by the minister, has he the power to roll them back? Without legislation, what can he do about it?

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: Mr. Speaker, as the hon. member for Brant-Oxford-Norfolk knows, the legislation which effected the freeze up until midnight Saturday is no longer operative. We can, either directly through the retail operators or through their companies, bring pressure to bear to adhere to the 5.4 cent gasoline.

Mr. Nixon: What pressures?

Mr. Makarchuk: Supplementary question to the same minister: Will the motorists who were forced into paying the inflated price prior to Saturday midnight be entitled to a rebate on the amount they spent?

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: Mr. Speaker, first of all I repeat again I suspect that in any case

where that occurred, where there was an increase between some point in the middle of last week and Saturday, that it was an increase within the legislation, that is not exceeding the price that had been charged on June 24. If they were breaking the law, that is charging more than the June 24 price before midnight, then again if members would let me know we can take steps to try to assist those who have proof of purchase, gallonage and price paid.

Mr. Bullbrook: By way of one supplementary, if I may: With respect to the response to my leader, what pressures does the minister have in mind? Would he close them down, would he tell them they have been bad boys; or would he do something in between?

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: Mr. Speaker, I think it is clear to everyone in the industry, be they distributors or retailers, what the government wishes. It is also very clear that the government has indicated that if the wishes of the government are not met, and not met on a widespread basis, we are prepared to freeze the price again.

Based on the fact that the Ministry of Consumer and Commercial Relations in the whole 4½-month duration of the freeze had no more than I think about 20 or 24 complaints from the whole of the province, I have every reason to expect full co-operation from retailers and the industry based on the Telexes which they have sent to me. I also feel we can rely on the fact that the forces of competition will not allow them to do that.

Mr. Lewis: Competition; of course.

Mr. Bullbrook: The minister has no pressure he can bring to bear; that is the deficiency.

TORONTO TEACHERS' NEGOTIATIONS

Mr. Lewis: I would like to ask the Premier, if I may Mr. Speaker, would he join with me, or would he permit me to join with him depending on how the hierarchy of this minority government is observed, in bringing to the bargaining table the Metropolitan Toronto secondary school teachers and the boards, so that we may sit with them in a prolonged and determined fashion to attempt to achieve a settlement?

Mr. Breithaupt: The odd couple.

Mr. Haggerty: Has the Leader of the Opposition talked to Barrett?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I, of course, am impressed by the enthusiastic response from the members opposite to that proposal. I would have to confess that I have not studied the protocol of such a suggestion as to who should join whom. My only thought at this moment, as far as the government is concerned—

Mr. Reid: They are in the same bed.

Mr. Breithaupt: They are both joined together.

Hon. Mr. Davis: No, I think it's fair to state the two of us would not join together.

Mr. Nixon: Somebody is going to get in.

Mr. Singer: It's holy deadlock.

Hon. Mr. Davis: My only observation would be that I have complete confidence in the ability of the Minister of Education (Mr. Wells) for this government to deal with the situation. He said to the House on Thursday, and I believe again on Friday, that from his standpoint he was more than prepared to meet with and dicuss with the two parties any suggestions they might have toward the solution of this problem. As far as the government is concerned, we are completely confident of the minister's ability to deal with this situation.

Mr. Lewis: I am sure that the minister has.

Hon. Mr. Davis: While I respect the suggestion made by the Leader of the Opposition, it is my view at this moment at least that that suggestion would not serve any practical or useful purpose.

Mr. Lewis: How does the Premier know that it won't?

Hon. Mr. Davis: I reiterate that I have confidence in the capacity of the Minister of Education that, if intervention by a member of this government would be helpful, he is prepared to do so but I think it has to be within the context of one or both of the parties being anxious to see some resolution or potential resolution to this problem where the government could be involved.

I will certainly keep the suggestion of the Leader of the Opposition in mind but at this moment it probably would not servie a useful purpose.

Mr. Lewis: I want to press with this because I don't understand why this goes on and on. Why is it necessary to await the

invitation of one of the two parties, both of whose positions now seem to be intransigent, rather than exercising the leadership role of government, either through the Minister of Education or the Premier, and asking the parties in to attempt to effect a settlement? Why must he ever await an invitation?

Hon. Mr. Davis: The minister has been in touch with both parties over the past three or four weeks and probably longer than that in an attempt to head off the strike that has taken place. He met with them, as I'm sure the Leader of the Opposition was informed, the day prior to the strike actually starting.

Mr. Lewis: For 20 minutes—and two weeks too late.

Hon. Mr. Davis: The Leader of the Opposition can say it's two weeks too late.

Mr. Lewis: The government is allowing the strike to be prolonged.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Hon. Mr. Davis: It's great to sit there as a person who voted in this House and who actively campaigned for the right to strike on the behalf of the teachers—

Mr. Bullbrook: The Premier is right.

Mr. Lewis: That's right, and the Premier said that the government should attempt to see a settlement.

Hon. Mr. Davis: —who helped establish the Education Relations Commission—

Interjections.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Hon. Mr. Davis: —and then to come in here and say the government should sit down and with heavy hand resolve this problem.

Mr. Lewis: No, not with a heavy hand, but yes, if necessary.

Hon. Mr. Davis: I say this is one of the things the members of this House must have anticipated when the decision was made in Bill—whatever the number was—to give the teaching profession of this province the right to strike. They can't have it both ways.

Mr. Lewis: You can have it both ways.

Hon. Mr. Davis: You cannot.

Mr. Lewis: The Premier is just allowing the strike to last for his own purposes.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Mr. Lewis: Why doesn't the government bring it to an end?

Mr. Speaker: This is not the place for a debate at this time.

Hon. Mr. Davis: What purposes?

Mr. Lewis: I don't know.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Then don't say we are allowing the strike to continue for our own purposes.

Mr. Nixon: A supplementary: I would like to ask the Premier if he feels the fact that his government brought forward legislation giving the teachers the right to strike precludes him from taking the action that has been put forward by the Leader of the Opposition and others in this House for the last two weeks? Surely, it's not a question of having a—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The question has been asked.

Mr. Nixon: It's a question of assuming responsibility.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Of course the legislation does not preclude that. The legislation brought by this government before the House was very enthusiastically supported by the third party in this House, who really would have extended some sections of that legislation. This is something the member forgets about on occasion and one on which he took a position some 1½ years before this government made that determination.

Mr. Nixon: The Premier is feeling badly today, isn't he? He must be more vulnerable than he usually is.

Hon. Mr. Davis: That legislation was supported by all parties in this House. For the leader of the Liberal Party to say that by the waving of some magic wand, by the intervention of this government—

Mr. Nixon: There is no legislation precluding the Premier from involving himself.

Hon. Mr. Davis: —we can solve a situation which the leader of that party helped, in terms of legislation, to create, to me is a bit of hypocrisy in the process.

[2:15]

Mr. Nixon: Then you are trying to have it both ways.

Hon. Mr. Davis: You are trying to have it both ways.

Mr. Foulds: Supplementary: Does the Premier not think that this is the time for his government to take some initiative in bringing the parties together rather than merely sitting back and waiting passively for initiative from them?

Mr. Speaker: Order please, that's the same question as the hon. Leader of the Opposition asked. Does the hon. Leader of the Opposition have further questions?

Mr. Lewis: It was, in fact, a perfect extension of the question that I asked.

Mr. Speaker: It seems to me it required the same answer.

Mr. Lewis: I'll try to rephrase it: Is the Premier not aware—I'm sure he is; he manufactured the system—that the position is deteriorating in public terms and that the opposing forces in this dispute have locked themselves in, which can only have serious ultimate damage? Does he not think, therefore, that early on in the strike, just as he failed to do toward the end of the negotiating period, the Premier should personally take an initiative? Does he not think—I'm putting it to the Premier directly—that it is now time to take a political initiative and bring the sides back to the bargaining table?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I think these matters are a question of judgement. I should feel complimented, but I really think the Leader of the Opposition is using a slight bit of exaggeration when I am being given credit for manufacturing the system.

Mr. Lewis: I know the system, because I suffered under it.

Hon. Mr. Davis: With great respect, while I recognize the Leader of the Opposition is somewhat younger than I am, I had no responsibility for the system when he was a part of it, or what was produced as a result of it.

Mr. Lewis: So the Premier is defaming either Frost or Robarts.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I will not take responsibility for the Leader of the Opposition, not too many years ago, being one of those individuals who was, and with some success, exciting students at that time to take a very aggressive posture on certain matters that we will not refer to in this question period. Please do not give me that responsibility. He has to assume that entirely unto himself.

Mr. Lewis: Once you would have said inciting, not exciting.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Well, both.

Mr. Nixon: Go ahead and refer to them, it is all out of order anyway.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, to answer the question—now that I have replied to the observation that was part of the question, because I want to conform to the rules like the hon. member—it is not the time, in my judgement, for the Premier of this province to intervene personally. I would like to see a solution—we would all like to see a solution—to this problem, but I go back to some of the observations that were made prior to the introduction and the passage of that legislation, and it's great for members opposite to come in here now and say the government should intervene and find a political solution to the problem.

Mr. Lewis: You never did.

Hon. Mr. Davis: The gentlemen opposite should be aware of the fact that before the legislation was even contemplated they advocated the right to strike on the part of the teaching profession, which this government accepted and introduced, so they must accept the fact of what has happened as being potentially there when that legislation was passed.

Mr. Lewis: Of course, in the application of your responsibilities.

Hon. Mr. Davis: There is no point coming here today and suggesting that we can, by some unknown procedure, bring a resolution to a very difficult problem.

Mr. Lewis: What do you mean, "unknown procedure"?—

Hon. Mr. Davis: The Leader of the Opposition says "bring them together." They've been together, they've discussed this issue.

Mr. Lewis: You have known for weeks now.

Hon. Mr. Davis: I just say as a matter of policy, at this moment, Mr. Speaker, I don't see any real practical result coming from such a meeting.

Mr. Lewis: Then the strike is on your conscience.

MISSISSAUGA INQUIRY

Mr. Singer: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Attorney General. In view of the fact that the Hon. Mr. Justice Donnelly adjourned four motions before him on consent, relating to, as the docket of the weekly court showed this morning, re Murray and Stortini, and relating to the municipality of Mississauga, could the Attorney General tell us what action, if any, he or his officials propose to take in relation to these matters, bearing in mind that one of the motions that was adjourned sine die to the divisional court relates to the possible punishment and imprisonment of a county court judge?

Hon. Mr. McMurtry: Mr. Speaker, we are aware of these motions which are returnable this morning. I was not aware of their disposition. I've discussed the matter with the senior county court judge and have been advised that Judge Stortini has very adequate legal counsel and that is where the matter stands at the present time.

Mr. Singer: By way of supplementary, could the Attorney General advise us whether he is prepared to intervene by himself or by his advisers as he did when the original motion was brought before the divsional court consisting of Chief Justice Estey, Mr. Justice Reid, and Mr. Justice Galligan, by using his counsel, Mr. Manning, and another solicitor from his office to argue that the inquiry had been improperly ordered?

Hon. Mr. McMurtry: No, Mr. Speaker, it is my view that it would be not proper for the Attorney General or his counsel to intervene at this point in time.

Mr. Nixon: Intervene again.

Mr. Singer: By way of further supplementary or a new question—and I have a number of questions along this line, Mr. Speaker—does the Attorney General intend to provide financial assistance for Judge Stortini, who is called upon now to defend himself "by very able counsel" because Judge Stortini was acting in what he at least thought was pursuance of his duty as a judge of the county court instructed to conduct the public inquiry?

Hon. Mr. McMurtry: It is a matter that is presently being considered. I am unable to give the member any more definite answer than that at this time but it is under consideration.

Mr. Singer: By way of further question, Mr. Speaker: Does the Attorney General intend to take action, as Judge Stortini suggested in his letter addressed to the council of the city of Mississauga, and order or recommend to the Lieutenant Governor in Council that an inquiry take place under the provisions of the Public Inquiries Act and use part 3 of that statute?

Hon. Mr. McMurtry: The counsel for Judge Stortini at the inquiry, Mr. Bates, has been invited on a number of occasions to submit material or particulars to my department to justify the extending of these rather extraordinary powers under the Act my friend refers to. As of this moment, counsel for the inquiry either has been unable or is reluctant to provide any such particulars which would warrant any further investigation at this time.

Mr. Singer: By way of further question: Would the Attorney General not agree that it is unfair to put that burden on either Judge Stortini's counsel or Judge Stortini and that there has been enough issue raised in the public mind that there has to be a public presence started or initiated by the Attorney General under the provisions of the Public Inquiries Act so that the people of Ontario can find out what really happened in Mississauga, if anything?

Hon. Mr. McMurtry: As I indicated to this House, I believe last week, a complete police investigation has been made. Certainly from the information I have, no material or no evidence has been made available which would justify any further inquiry. I make this statement: Because some persons—I am not talking about Judge Stortini—other people may have some interest in sort of creating a giant smokescreen, it is not my view, as Attorney General of this province, to waste the taxpayers' money in Mississauga or in any other area unless we have some more solid information to go on.

Mr. Singer: Would the Attorney General not agree that it is a most unusual thing that a suggestion be made in the Supreme Court of Ontario that a judge should be imprisoned for contempt when he appears, at least, to have been carrying on his public duty as assigned to him? Wouldn't he agree, in view of that fact, that all of the circumstances surrounding this deserve a full and complete public airing so the public can make up its mind whether the judge has acted properly or improperly?

Mr. Nixon: That is not a smokescreen.

Hon. Mr. McMurtry: I am, of course, concerned any time I hear of any such proceed-

ings similar to those brought relating to Judge Stortini. I think it is most regrettable and it is certainly a matter that we intend to look into—

Mr. Singer: In a public way?

Hon. Mr. McMurtry: —as completely as we can with respect to Judge Stortini's involvement; and whether or not judges in the future can be or should be protected from this type of proceedings if they are, in fact, only carrying out their judicial responsibilities as given to them under the Act. In this case it was under, I think, section 250 of the Municipal Act. I am very concerned about this and I can assure my hon. friend that we will continue to look into the matter to ensure that no judge is unfairly harassed if that is what is happening in this case.

FLOOD DAMAGE

Mr. Singer: A question for the Minister of Natural Resources: Could he tell us what steps, if any, the government is prepared to take in relation to damage caused to a number of properties along the Great Lakes as a result of the rather unusual and severe windstorm that took place last week?

Hon. Mr. Bernier: I am sure the hon. member is aware this question was asked of me in the House last week. I indicated at that time that my senior staff were meeting with the municipal officials along that particular area. There are three specific programmes they could apply for. We asked them to go back to their respective communities to assess collectively what the total damage would be. They estimated between $1 million and $2 million; our people said $200,000 to $300,000 so there was a wide discrepancy as to the amount of damage actually done. We are waiting for their response to that further survey and we will give it further consideration.

Mr. G. I. Miller: Has the minister made a direct survey of the area of Port Maitland, Port Dover, Long Point, Turkey Point, Low Bank and the general area of the Haldimand-Norfolk riding? Have his people done a survey and has he investigated it himself?

Hon. Mr. Bernier: Yes, I understand my senior staff were in the area for a full day looking at all the damage which occurred.

Mr. G. I. Miller: A further question: I had many telephone calls over the weekend—

Mr. Speaker: All right; that is not a question. Question?

Mr. G. I. Miller: Is the minister aware there are many people in the Port Maitland area who haven't been contacted at this point in time; old age pensioners who haven't been visited by his people?

Hon. Mr. Bernier: I don't believe the staff intended to contact each individual individually. They looked at the general damage.

Mr. Haggerty: I would like to direct a supplementary question to the minister. Will he now initiate a study or inquiry into the high levels of water on Lake Erie?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. That is not supplementary to the original question having to do with the storm damage last week. That's a new question.

Mr. Haggerty: It is dealing with the high levels—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The member for Wilson Heights, does he have further questions?

SPADINA EXTENSION SUBSIDY

Mr. Singer: Yes, I have a question for the Minister of Transportation and Communications. Now that he has had an opportunity to speak to Mr. Godfrey, the chairman of Metropolitan Toronto council, has he, in writing, given to Metropolitan Toronto council advice that the province will pay the subsidy on the construction of that portion of the Spadina extension running from Lawrence to Eglinton Ave.?

Mr. Cunningham: On a point of information, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: There has been a question asked and about to be answered.

Hon. Mr. Snow: No, not as of this date.

Mr. Singer: By way of supplementary, does he intend to do that?

Hon. Mr. Snow: Yes.

Mr. Singer: When?

Hon. Mr. Snow: Very soon.

VIOLENCE IN HOCKEY

Mr. Eaton: A question of the Attorney General: Would the Attorney General inform us what investigation is taking place and if any

charges will be laid following the violence at the London hockey game in which St. Catharines' players entered the stands to fight with the crowd?

Hon. Mr. Henderson: The member for London North (Mr. Shore) was there; he refereed it.

Mr. Riddell: What position are you looking for, Bob?

Hon. Mr. McMurtry: I am advised that a complete investigation is under way in relation to this incident. There may very well be charges laid as a result of this investigation but it will not be completed for a few days.

Mr. Eaton: Would the Attorney General also consider asking for a meeting with officials of that league to see if something couldn't be done to set regulations preventing players from entering the stands? Perhaps there could also be some regulation regarding fighting, such as ejecting players from the game at that point, because certainly that takes place in football and basketball.

Mr. Lewis: If only we could make hockey as civilized as football.

Mr. Lawlor: Ban them for life.

Hon. Mr. McMurtry: The local crown Attorney in London is arranging to discuss this matter with league officials in order to ensure that more adequate security be provided at future games.

[2:30]

Mr. Shore: Has the Attorney General received a report from the Crown attorney of London yet; and, if so, does he intend to lay any charges on this matter? Secondly, could the Attorney General advise this House if there is anything in the Criminal Code relating to hockey players and their coaches leaving the ice surface during a hockey game? If there isn't, would he suggest that if the league itself is not going to take disciplinary action in this matter—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. Much of that question was asked. Part of it may be a new supplementary. Does the hon. Attorney General wish to answer?

Mr. Shore: The supplementary specifically has not been answered, Mr. Speaker, as to whether he intends to take any action.

Mr. Speaker: All right. The hon. Attorney General will have the opportunity to answer the questions which have not been asked before.

Hon. Mr. McMurtry: Mr. Speaker, I have received a preliminary report from the local Crown attorney in London. It is not complete, but on the basis of the report, I think it is safe to say that there is a strong likelihood of some charges being laid. With respect to my friend's questions in relation to the Criminal Code, our position is simply that the Criminal Code will be applied equally to all citizens whether they are on the ice or not.

DARLINGTON GENERATING STATION

Mr. Moffatt: A question of the Premier: Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that the provincial government and Ontario Hydro are building the world's largest nuclear generating station, in the Darlington area of the town of Newcastle, the town council of Newcastle wrote to the Premier on Aug. 20 and again in October asking for funds to prepare an environmental impact study with regard to that particular plant. They have received no reply. When does the Premier propose to reply to that council and what will the reply consist of?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I think to set the record straight, there have been meetings with that municipality since that communication. I think the question as to what will be the ongoing procedure should properly be directed to the Minister of Energy. I understand there are further meetings yet to be held.

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: Mr. Speaker, there will be a meeting tomorrow afternoon with his worship the mayor, and I believe some members of council and staff of the town of Newcastle to discuss this project.

RONDEAU PROVINCIAL PARK HOME LEASES

Mr. Spence: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Natural Resources. Is the minister aware that some of the 21-year leases on cottages and homes in Rondeau Provincial Park will expire by the first of the year? The minister has stated that these leases will not be renewed, but the minister is well aware that there is a shortage of housing in this province and some of these leases are owned by senior citizens. Would the minister give consideration to extending some of those leases for those senior citizens whose leases will expire the first of the year?

Hon. Mr. Bernier: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member has clearly stated what the policy is and the policy was announced and formulated back in 1954 as it relates to 21-year leases in Rondeau Provincial Park and Algonquin Provincial Park. Now, these are fixed. They have been repeated on a number of occasions, but in view of the fact that some of these particular homes—as the member has pointed out—are held by senior citizens, I am prepared to meet with the Minister of Housing (Mr. Rhodes) to get his views on it and to consider your suggestions.

Mr. Good: Supplementary: Will the minister inform the House why no permanent resident within the park was included in the advisory committee when he was dealing with the long-term phasing-out of buildings in the park?

Hon. Mr. Bernier: Mr. Speaker, when the advisory committee was established on Rondeau park, I want to inform the House that a great deal of thought and effort and time went into picking the members of that particular committee. We have an excellent chairman from Chatham and with his assistance we went across the entire part of southwestern Ontario to select an excellent committee. I believe their report is scheduled to be in my hands very shortly.

METRO TORONTO HIGHWAY SIGNING

Mr. Williams: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Transportation and Communications. We are all aware of the large sums of money spent through our Ministry of Industry and Tourism to bring hundreds of thousands of visitors to Toronto every year. Is the minister aware of the frustrations being experienced by thousands of these visitors by reason of the fact that there is inadequate signing of our major interchanges to direct the visitors into the central part of our city?

Hon. Mr. Snow: No, Mr. Speaker, I wasn't aware of that.

Interjections.

Mr. Nixon: Are you aware now?

Mr. Williams: Supplementary question, Mr. Speaker: Could the minister, through his good offices, work with his senior department heads—

Interjections.

Mr. Williams: —and the Metropolitan Toronto transportation people to find ways and means of improving this situation?

Interjections.

An hon. member: Come on over and sit with the opposition! Sit right here.

Hon. Mr. Snow: I will certainly look into that matter. I really am at somewhat of a loss to understand why someone would have trouble finding this great city with the signs that we have on our expressways at this time.

Interjection.

Hon. Mr. Snow: The only problem that I am aware of is one that was evident during the construction period of Highway 401 at Malton airport, where there was some confusion as to where one left the main thoroughfare to go south on Highway 427. But that construction has been completed and the signage there has been completed, and that's the only problem area I was aware of. I will look into it.

Mr. Williams: A further supplementary, Mr. Speaker—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I wonder if in the questions and the supplementaries we could have questions rather than suggestions. That's not really the purpose of a question period.

Mr. Bullbrook: I think that's a good suggestion.

Mr. Gaunt: Just write him a note.

Mr. Speaker: I think we'll go on with the next question.

MINIMUM WAGE

Mr. Samis: A question of the Minister of Labour, Mr. Speaker. In view of the announcement on the weekend by her Quebec counterpart increasing the minimum wage to $2.80 an hour within the next two weeks, what definite assurance can the minister give the working poor of Ontario that the minimum wage in this province will be increased this year?

Hon. B. Stephenson: As I have said before publicly, the minimum wage in this province is under review at the moment. There will be an announcement made about it before the end of this year.

Mr. Samis: Supplementary, Mr. Speaker: Can the minister assure the working poor of

Ontario that the minimum wage in this province will at least be equal to that of Quebec?

Hon. B. Stephenson: I think that we can probably assure the working poor of this province that the minimum wage will be adequate for the Province of Ontario. It may equal or surpass that of some other provinces.

Mr. Speaker: It seems to me that again was a further suggestion rather than a true question.

WINTARIO FUNDS

Mr. Kerrio: I will direct my question to the Minister of Culture and Recreation, my immediate neighbour from Brock. Can he justify the continued expenditure of millions of dollars of Wintario funds in the easy come, easy go manner of the policy that exists in his ministry in the face of a deficit budget, a need for restraint and a need for funds for tax relief?

Mr. Speaker: I think that question has been asked. Editorial comment during a question is really out of order and wastes the time of the House. The question has been asked.

Mr. Singer: Does that apply to the Premier (Mr. Davis), too?

Hon. Mr. Welch: Mr. Speaker, once you take the editorial content out of the question there's nothing left to be answered, is there? Except that—

Mr. Lewis: Except that you should choose your neighbours with more care.

Interjections.

An hon. member: You can count on that.

Mr. Speaker: Does the hon. member have a supplementary which is a question?

Mr. Kerrio: Yes, it has to do with the question. I would certainly like to know if wine stomping and four-part barbershop harmony is the kind of thing we're going to pursue with the money we collect from this particular area.

Hon. Mr. Welch: Certainly both those activities are very important in Niagara Falls.

Mr. Nixon: You people grow a lot of grapes now.

Mr. Breithaupt: But surely not both activities at the same time.

Hon. Mr. Davis: The two go together.

Hon. Mr. Welch: Yes, I think you're right.

Mr. Nixon: The Premier's always right. The minister knows that.

Hon. Mr. Davis: The member should know that.

Hon. Mr. Welch: I hate to interfere here and interrupt.

Secondly, Mr. Speaker, this Legislature unanimously decided, by section 9 of the Act creating the Ontario Lottery Corp., that these particular funds were to be spent in these ways over and above tax-supported programmes, and I think that's important.

Mr. Singer: There is not one word about wine stomping in the statute. Not one word.

MORTGAGE INTEREST TAX CREDIT

Mr. Leluk: Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the Treasurer and Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs. Can the provincial Treasurer assure the members of this House that the mortgage interest tax credit proposed during the last provincial election will be introduced this session?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Mr. Speaker, that is a matter which is still being assessed in terms of the announcements made by Mr. Danson a couple of weeks ago and our study of just what those announcements mean.

HEALTH STUDY OF ASBESTOS WORKERS

Mrs. Sandeman: A question of the Minister of Health: Could the minister tell me when he is going to institute a thorough study of the present and former long-term employees of Raybestos-Manhattan in Peterborough, and the families of those employees, for health symptoms related to asbestos?

Hon. F. S. Miller: Mr. Speaker, I can't without checking to see what is being done in the ministry. I think it would be wise for me to finish the one study started in the Scarborough area before instituting another, to make sure that the study is relevant.

Mrs. Sandeman: Supplementary, Mr. Speaker: In view of the minister's recent announcement that studies are to be done for former employees of the Reeves mine, does the minister not think it would be appropriate for all employees in this province who have been at risk to be tested as soon as humanly possible?

Hon. F. S. Miller: There are varying degrees of risk and I think I should look at those highest degrees of risk first.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Erie wanted to ask a question. He was on his feet a few minutes ago so I have had him in mind.

GREAT LAKES WATER LEVELS

Mr. Haggerty: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would like to direct my question again to the Minister of Natural Resources. Due to the high levels of water on Lake Erie will the minister now initiate a public inquiry as to the reasons the water hasn't receded at all on Lake Erie?

Hon. Mr. Bernier: I am sure, Mr. Speaker, that the hon. member is very much aware that a few years ago we had a select committee of this Legislature looking at the low levels of the Great Lakes basin.

Interjections.

Hon. Mr. Bernier: A tremendous amount of information was gathered at that particular time and during the course of the last couple of years. We are working very closely with the federal government.

Interjections.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. We can't hear the answer.

Hon. Mr. Bernier: I really don't see any need at this point in time for a committee or an inquiry to which the member refers.

Mr. Haggerty: Supplementary: Is the minister aware that one can see that the waters have receded in Lake Ontario? Why have they not in Lake Erie?

Hon. Mr. Bernier: It takes time. I don't have the answers at my fingertips but I am sure the waters will recede in due course.

YOUTH EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITIES

Hon. Mr. Davis: The member for Wentworth (Mr. Deans) asked a question on Friday, I believe, and was anxious to have the response today although he suggested he didn't expect it until tomorrow. It was to do with the Ontario careers action programme and it was announced during a certain contest that the government would be providing 1,000 jobs—in fact, it will be 1,050—for unemployed young people, to give them useful and relevant work experience in ministries and agencies of the government throughout the province.

The ground rules are simply these: The programme will accept as trainees young people aged 16 to 24. They can be high school dropouts or people from high school as well as university graduates. The applicants must register with Canada Manpower centres. Trainees will be paid $100 a week for a maximum of 52 weeks and will work under special contracts. They will have not have status as civil servants and will not be eligible for employee benefits. They will be hired in at least two stages and the aim is to have the first pilot group under way by Jan. 12.

From the outset, the trainees will be encouraged to seek outside employment and to this end there has been close operation between the Ministry of Colleges and Universities, which is in charge of the programme, and Canada Manpower.

Mr. Ahrens, of the adult education section of the ministry's industrial training branch, has been appointed manager of the Ontario career action programme. The budget has been determined and the advertising has been prepared. The contracts, which will be between the trainees and the Civil Service Commission, have also been prepared. Application forms will be available in English and French.

The programme offices will be at 880 Bay St. Each ministry will name a member of staff as co-ordinator to administer its part of the programme working in co-operation with the programme managers. Perhaps the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Lewis) might convey this to the member for Wentworth so he will have that relevant information.

DAYCARE BUDGET

Mr. McClellan: Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask a question of the Minister of Community and Social Services. Since the need for day care in Ontario has been estimated by the Ministry of Labour to be in the vicinity of 400,000 places, as opposed to the 40,000 supervised places this ministry is responsible for would the minister advise the House why the daycare capital expansion budget was reduced from $5.75 million to $3.35 million in the revised estimates? Secondly, would he give the House a projection of the number of new supervised daycare placements that will be created by his ministry during the current fiscal year?

[2:45]

Hon. Mr. Taylor: I'll take that question as notice and get the member the information he has requested.

GRIFFITH ISLAND HUNTING LODGE

Mr. B. Newman: Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the Minister of Natural Resources. Is the minister aware of the articles recently in the Windsor Daily Star concerning the exclusive hunting club on Griffith Island, and is he aware of the great public disgust over the wanton disregard for the hunting laws of the Province of Ontario by this select group? What action does the minister plan on taking so that Ontario hunting laws are not flouted by anyone?

Hon. Mr. Bernier: Mr. Speaker, I'm very much aware of the article to which the member refers. I can't agree with some of the comments he made as to the type of hunting that goes on on that particular island because I've been there myself. Just last week I asked for a full report from my conservation officers. They visited Griffith Island and laid three charges. I also indicated to the conservation officers of my ministry that they are to visit all other such private hunting areas and apply the same laws that apply to everybody else in this province.

CORPORATIONS TAX ACT

Mrs. Bryden: I have a question for the Minister of Revenue. Recently the director-general of audit for the Department of National Revenue in Ottawa is reported to have said that Canada was losing hundreds of millions of dollars in tax revenue because the multinational corporations were shuffling their profits out of the tax man's reach to their foreign parents and to tax havens. He said the department was having difficulty checking this tax evasion because of a lack of staff and the high cost of pursuing such sophisticated tax evasion. I'd like to ask the minister if he's having similar difficulties in administering the Ontario Corporations Tax Act and if he has recently, since this statement, consulted with the Ottawa officials as to methods of preventing this kind of sophisticated tax evasion, which puts a heavier burden on small business and ordinary tax payers.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Hon. Mr. Meen: If that is indeed the case, I would suppose that we would be experiencing the same sort of provincial corporations tax loss. I've not had a chance yet either to explore that problem or question my staff. I have intended to do so and I shall do so. I have also not had a chance as yet to discuss it with my counterpart in Ottawa which I also intend to do.

INTERN STUDENT PAYMENTS

Mr. S. Smith: A question, Mr. Speaker, of the Minister of Health: In view of the concerns that are being expressed by students in physio- and occupational therapy and dietetics that the interning stipend for students in those fields will be cut off in the same way they were cut off about three years ago, can the Minister of Health issue a statement clearly stating the government position on this matter so that students, universiies and hospitals can plan accordingly?

Hon. F. S. Miller: I can't make a statement myself. I think probably when one comes it will come from the Minister of Colleges and Universities (Mr. Parrott). I think the method of reimbursing some of these particular people is being reviewed at the moment and is subject to reconsideration.

Mr. S. Smith: Supplementary: In view of the fact that from the health manpower section of the ministry there has come confirmation that these stipends will be phased out, and in view of the tremendous—

Mr. Speaker: Ask your supplementary question.

Mr. S. Smith: —can there not be a statement made by the ministry sooner so that planning can take place?

Hon. F. S. Miller: I'll do my best to make sure there is one. I think the position is that they're not going to lose a source of revenue, but it may be from a different source and in a different way.

Mr. Speaker: The oral question period has expired.

Petitions.

Presenting reports.

Motions.

Introduction of bills.

Orders of the day.

Clerk of the House: The 114th order, House in committee of supply.

ESTIMATES, MINISTRY OF HEALTH
(concluded)

Mr. Chairman: A little order, please. When we were last in committee of supply we were dealing with vote 2901, item 3. Any further comment on item 3? Carried. Item 4, finance and information services. Carried.

Vote 2901 agreed to.

On vote 2902:

Mr. Chairman: Item 1, health protection and disease prevention services.

Mrs. Sandeman: Mr. Chairman, I have always felt that in a time of restraint and cutting back of budgets, one cuts back on the thing in one's budget which is the least important.

Mr. Chairman: Order, please. There are too many private conversations going on.

Mrs. Sandeman: I was particularly interested to notice in the estimates of the Ministry of Health, under the promotion and protection programme, that the vote for last year was 1.9 per cent of the total moneys voted. For this year, the amount under promotion and protection has been cut back to 1.8 per cent. I'm wondering if the Ministry of Health really feels that the necessity for preventive health services in this province is declining. I'm wondering why, in a total ministry vote of nearly $3 billion, the ministry is busy cutting back expenditures, as indeed it probably feels it has to, in every possible area of health care; and yet at the same time the government cuts back on preventive health care, in a period when it would seem to most people it would make more sense to recognize the importance of primary prevention, which in many cases would make those expensive secondary treatments unnecessary. I think it would make more sense to save money, not by cutting the quality or quantity of care to the already sick but by preventing, in very many cases, sicknesses from developing and thus improving the health standards in the community and saving money at one and the same time. I would like, briefly if I may, to give three examples or three areas in which I believe preventive services are not properly used or funded in this province, areas in which I believe Ontario's health care falls behind other jurisdictions, areas of preventive care which if they were given more attention, and if necessary more funding, would, I believe, result in our being able to cut back, as obviously the minister wishes to do, on expensive in-hospital services and things of that kind.

The three areas of prevention to which I wish to address myself are the areas of birth control and family planning services, the use of nurse-midwives in this province, and the whole field of care for pregnant women, particularly the nutritional needs of poor, pregnant women in this province. My colleague, the member for Parkdale (Mr. Dukszta) pointed out in his introductory remarks on these estimates that only $1.7 million has been allocated for birth control services, while the now Minister of Energy (Mr. Timbrell) estimated that in the 1974-1975 fiscal year it cost the province $45.5 million for medical services, family benefits allowances and homes for unwed mothers for the 8,500 children born out of wedlock. I wonder, Mr. Chairman, if Mr. Timbrell realizes that there are many children born in wedlock who are, in fact, unplanned children? The Minister of Health's (Mr. F. S. Miller) statement in December of last year stressed the importance of providing comprehensive birth control education and services across the province, and he promised we would see this programme in full operation in this fiscal year, starting in April, 1975. However, the experience so far raises some doubts that these services will be as readily available as the minister hopes.

The minister seems to be pinning very high hopes on the provision of clinics. He tells us that 25 clinics are now in operation and more are to come. Most of the developmental work in the family planning field seems to be going toward providing further clinics.

I would have to agree that a good clinic in an urban area cannot be bettered if it is truly accessible to all those who need its services, and especially those most at risk; within our community that is normally the young, the undereducated, native people and so forth. For the outlying areas and for those most at risk in the metropolitan areas, I think the minister must realize that we must develop outreach services, the clinics are not enough.

The outreach services must be in both education and the provision of birth control techniques and materials. If necessary we must send mobile clinics around the province. We must make sure there are enough public health nurses hired to do this very important work. We must make sure all maternity units in this country, as one of the services provided to women who have just been delivered of babies, give an opportunity for consultation and advice from an expert in the birth control field.

The second concern I have in this whole area of birth control in the province at the moment is that in the past planned parenthood, sex education and birth control have normally been not a government but a voluntary sector undertaking. The voluntary sector was the innovator and the initiator in this field.

The minister's statement last winter assured us that services through the voluntary sector would continue; that the voluntary sector—groups like Planned Parenthood of Ontario—would continue to be funded through local health agencies. I feel this is not happening. Planned Parenthood of Ontario, which for so many years has given excellent service in this field and for some years has felt itself to be alone in this very important preventative area, has real fears that the voluntary sector may be pushed out by what it sees as a government takeover in the birth control field. Planned Parenthood of Ontario recently has been getting what can only be described as a runaround from the ministry.

The member associations of Planned Parenthood are told they must go to the medical offices of health for funding, but when they do go to the medical offices of health for funding they discover that no funds are being disbursed to voluntary groups in that manner.

Planned Parenthood of Ontario met with the interministerial committee on family planning in July. Its members explained their problems about lack of funding. They reminded the interministerial committee of the service they are providing across this province in workshops, in educational activities in schools and for Children's Aid Societies and so on. The committee listened and told them they could submit a budget to the committee. The Planned Parenthood people were pleased to hear this. They submitted a budget and were turned down.

It's no wonder the voluntary sector feels it's being abandoned. I find it particularly worrying when we remember that it was pressure from the voluntary sector and its in-depth knowledge and experience after 43 active years in this field which was one of the major causes of the minister's policy statement last year.

I find it particularly worrying, at a time when we know more and more young people are enjoying sexual relations, that the government feels it must cut out part of the services, part of the contribution from people who could speak to these young people in terms they understand, bring them services in the places where they are and continue to help in this very important preventive area of our medical services in Ontario.

The second area in which I believe the Ministry of Health is missing a real chance to do some exciting new work in preventive care and to improve the existing service and to save money is in the use of nurse-midwives. The present use of nurse-midwives in this province represents a vast misuse and underuse of our resources.

[3:00]

The trained nurse-midwives we have are only used in situations commensurate with their specialized training in remote northern areas. In metropolitan areas, nurses with that special training, nurses who are also midwives, are used hardly differently from other nurses. It is becoming more and more recognized that prenatal care for a healthy woman should be concentrated on the prevention of possible complications and on education. Both these functions a midwife is admirably suited for.

At present, far too much of the care in pregnancy is based on the medical, physical, doctor-centred approach. When a woman suspects that she might be pregnant, she goes to a doctor's office. The whole of her care around pregnancy is centred in that doctor's office. The baby is delivered in hospital and very often her perception of the whole process of pregnancy is one that is associated with places of sickness, the doctor's office and the hospital.

It seems to me there are three major advantage of using nurse-midwives in this province. The first, and perhaps the one that is most important to the minister at this time, is the potential cost saving. The Ontario Committee on the Healing Arts presented a report in 1970, and Mr. Fraser's study of obstetrical care in that report concluded that a trained midwife can relieve a physician of nearly 80 per cent of his responsibilities in terms of hours of work for a normal pregnancy. The report outlined methods by which midwives and physicians could combine in an obstetrical team. If I may read from the report, it concludes:

> If a government actually takes seriously its responsibilities under a universal medical care plan to provide a proper given level of obstetrical care to all mothers, it must surely be in the position of not being able to train the requisite number of obstetricians. More positively, it must be in the position of having to train midwives and to combine them in an obstetrical care team with an obstetrician.

Even if it's only as a cost-saving device, then I think in this province we should surely be

training and using more midwives; but I don't feel that the cost-saving argument is a sufficient argument for using nurse-midwives. There are to me equally important human reasons for using trained nurse-midwives.

Secondly, if you use a nurse-midwife, the doctor can be freed to do the work for which he or she was trained, namely the care of sickness.

This is closely connected, of course, with the third advantage of using a nurse-midwife: That the perspective of the midwife is that pregnancy is a natural, healthy process, it is not a sickness-oriented process, except in unfortunate rare and unavoidable cases. The emphasis of the nurse-midwife is on education and on support, and much of her work can and must be done in the home—not in the doctor's office, not in the hospital but in the home with the mother and with the rest of the family.

A good nurse-midwife can teach the mother about the enormous physiological changes she's undergoing. Most doctors don't have time to do that. A good nurse-midwife can prepare the mother for her delivery, prepare her thoroughly; prepare her psychologically and prepare her in a way which the woman understands and feels able to trust.

A good nurse-midwife will, of course, be with her patient during the birth process. She will also help the parents to cope with the changes in their psychological, their social and their economic environment that a new baby in the family inevitably produces. All these services for pregnant women come under the broad heading of prevention and we have ignored their importance in this province for far too long.

The third area of preventive health care I would like to speak to very briefly—and another which is almost non-existent in Ontario—is tied in closely with the services which I believe a nurse-midwife would provide. That is, the provision of proper and adequate nutrition during pregnancy.

At the moment we have doctors advising their patients to eat properly; doctors giving their pregnant patients diet sheets. That is fine for women who can afford to buy the foods—milk, oranges, the vitamin supplements—suggested on the diet sheets. It is not so good for poor women who cannot afford the kind of food they should properly be eating.

The documentation of the damage done to malnourished or undernourished children, both before and after birth, is being collected across the world. We have had a good report here in Canada. The report of the National Council of Welfare on Nutrition and the Children of the Poor, which was produced in 1973—members will probably remember it; the report was titled "One Child, One Chance"—gave evidence on how physical and mental development of the fetus can be affected by the adequacy or inadequacy of the mother's diet during pregnancy. The report pointed out in very cogent terms how such an adequate diet was often beyond the reach of poor mothers.

There was a very recent and very frightening report from the United States, and its implication for Canadians is very clear. A team of scientists in California has estimated that 1,000,000 infants in the United States have either already suffered stunting of their brains or risk that kind of damage because of malnutrition. When you add to that number the malnourished, pregnant women, there is probably another 1,000,000 unborn babies in the United States to be added to the total in jeopardy.

Of course, the number in Canada would be smaller than that and the number in Ontario would be even smaller, but we cannot afford to overlook the damage which is documented as being done to unborn children and to young children by inadequacies in their diet. We can't afford to overlook it, partly because we spend millions of dollars trying to rectify that damage through special educational programmes — programmes for the disabled and special remedial programmes, all of them expensive programmes—during the lives of those children.

We can't afford to ignore it on humane terms. It would be quite possible for the Minister of Health to prevent the problems caused by poor diet during pregnancy by a very simple and very obvious means, which does not involve handing out diet sheets indiscriminately to mothers, but envisages actually supplementing the diets of poor, pregnant women.

The experience at the Montreal diet dispensary is instructive. By supplementing the diets of poor mothers during pregnancy the diet dispensary had virtually been able to eliminate differences in birth weight and differences in peri-natal mortality between infants of the poor and the non-poor by a method as simple as handing out milk and oranges and vitamin supplements to poor women. The preventive value of such a relatively cheap and easy programme cannot be overestimated.

May I remind members of the conclusions of the Department of National Health and

Welfare in its submissions to the senate committee on poverty. The conclusion was that there is universal recognition that nutrition is a critical factor in poverty. Dietary inadequacies and undernutrition, combined with the other deprivations attendant on poverty, cause health deterioration. This sets up the cycle of decreased performance of all activities, mental apathy and incapacity for initiative or self-help. Medical research has linked malnutrition to anemia, low resistence to infectious diseases, mental retardation and mental illness.

Undernourishment may reduce the ability to acquire the education necessary for escape from the poverty cycle. Quite apart from impairment of mental development arising from deficiencies of nutrition during fetal life and early infancy, the complex of mental and physical latitude attendant on undernourishment, the distraction of attention caused by the distress of nagging hunger and unfitness because of recurring illness, all can stultify the education of a child of even normal mental endowment. I wonder if we're ignoring such simple programmes as diet supplements because they are so simple and apparently so unsophisticated.

In conclusion, I would like to ask the minister to consider whether the provision of diet supplement, starting immediately, to poor, pregnant women in Ontario might not be one of the most useful weapons in his preventative medical care armoury? He's waging a double battle; we all realize that. His double battle is against high costs and poor health in this province. I repeat that it's shortsighted, it's cruel and it's ultimately prohibitively expensive to refuse such help.

Mr. Chairman, I want you to know that I've been guided in my remarks and in my thinking by the Treasurer's (Mr. McKeough) remarks to the Ontario Hospital Association convention. The Treasurer spoke to the Ontario Hospital convention and concluded by, as he said, "giving a word to the wise and a warning too". He said:

> Do not expect a return to the free-wheeling days of massively growing public expenditures. Do not expect that we shall be able to finance those expensive innovations and enrichments and expansions that are merely desirable. For the near future at least, we shall be able to afford only the necessary. This principle, I suspect, may have to apply to a number of existing services as well as to proposals for something new.

We on this side of the House firmly believe that the programmes which come under the heading of promotion and prevention in today's vote are necessary, must be provided and must not be cut back. Among these services I would include the improvement of birth control services, the provision of a proper and effective network of nurse-midwives and the immediate introduction of a diet supplement programme for poor, pregnant women.

Hon. F. S. Miller: I am philosophically not at much odds with the last speaker. I certainly do believe we should be spending as much money as we can put into the preventive programmes, and that's never enough I have to say. Unlike the treatment programmes, they're more discretionary and one discovers that discretionary decisions are amongst the few that are open to any management in the system. Those are the hard facts of life rather than the way we would like to see it.

I can only say that when I was faced with some of the decisions I'm going to be making in the next few weeks, I elected to take money out of some of the so-called open-ended treatment programmes and protect the programmes that I believe in, such as VD control, birth control programmes and so on. I feel it is important that we continue. You and I perhaps, though, would disagree in some of the methods of treatment.

As far as the birth control programme goes, we did get a fair amount of credit rather than criticism in the last year for the very fact we tried to implement a programme. I believe we've done reasonably well with the health units of Ontario, which we charged with the responsibility for actually producing and delivering the programme. In some areas they are actually financing the volunteer agencies you referred to.

I believe that two cities that were mentioned to me just now are North Bay and Hamilton, where the volunteer agencies either carry out the programme on behalf of the health unit or receive some funds from it. I stressed in the many times I was asked questions about this programme around the province that I am extremely anxious to make sure volunteer agencies remain within this field. I don't want government to take them over, nor do I want us to become the only financial source for their moneys, because this, in most instances, stops volunteer organizations from being volunteer. In that very essence of being volunteer, they must retain certain distinct parts to their programmes that perhaps aren't acceptable to the public at large. It's for this reason that they're best left as volunteer and best left financed to some degree by those people who believe in them.

[3:15]

The nurse-midwives proposal is one I profess quite a bit of interest in. I've talked on a number of occasions to those people who are considering expanding the European role of the nurse-midwife to Canada. If I recall some of the statistics I saw a long time ago I believe they are favourable; in other words, when births are looked after by nurse-midwives we have better rates of success than we do with births in hospitals under normal conditions. I'm not about to argue the validity of the points you have brought up. The member for Durham West doesn't agree?

Mr. Godfrey: I'd like to see the figures.

Hon. F. S. Miller: I'm trying to recall some discussions I had a long while back. You may disagree but I think you may find that I am right.

Mr. Godfrey: In 1850.

Hon. F. S. Miller: In 1850? You may know more.

I'm pleased, though, with the overall progress we've had in Ontario in terms of the overall survival rate of mothers and babies over the last 10 years. I look back to 1965 and I think the death rate then for mothers was 3.1 per 1,000 births; it was down to 1.1 by 1973. The infant deaths were 20.5 per 1,000 births and it's 14.1 now. I think in a relatively short time frame, that was eight years, significant improvements have been evidenced in those statistics. That's not to say we've done all we should, but looking over world-wide statistics, I believe Canada and Ontario rank pretty well in this category.

We rank pretty poorly in some other categories, so I think there are some other things, let's say, which are more deserving of management and management dollars on a priority basis in the future. We've achieved a pretty good level; we don't want to see it slip—we'd like to improve it—but if I had a choice of dollars in A or B, I think I could find there are a number of areas which deserve dollars perhaps more currently.

On nutrition—I guess the chairman one day was listening to me extol my past and my upbringing; I suppose I should tell the little anecdote about him. I explained haw I was born of a working-class family, grew up with a widowed mother on mother's allowance and became a Conservative. His question was where did I go wrong along the way? That's a fact, but it makes me particularly sensitive to some of the comments which always seem to indicate that all of our programmes are aimed at the well-to-do. I just have to say I don't agree with this.

The hon. member talked about nutrition, about the poor mother not being able to afford the food; yes, but the sad thing is good food isn't necessarily expensive food. People who are suffering from malnutrition are not necessarily poor. In fact, malnutrition is a national disease, I think, of affluence, not necessarily of poverty. We live in a nation, as far as I am concerned, which can afford too many things that taste good and do nothing for you.

Therefore, I'm not totally sold on the programmes in which we go into food supplements for people. Education of people to know what they should be feeding themselves and their children is perhaps more critical than the doling out of food which makes people forever dependent upon the state. People have to take responsibility for their own state of health, and that to my mind involves fairly wide-ranging education programmes which only have a—

Mrs. Sandeman: You can't educate the baby in the womb.

Hon. F. S. Miller: I am not worried about educating the baby in the womb; I hope I'll be able to educate the mother who has the baby in the womb. That, to me, is the critical issue, is it not? Later on, I'm going to get a crack at the baby.

Mrs. Sandeman: It may be too late by then.

Hon. F. S. Miller: I must say I took some exception to one phrase you used; you said young teenagers were enjoying sex more now. I just hope you'll look at the phraseology there.

Mr. Moffat: More than you.

Mrs. Sandeman: I should have said more young teenagers.

Hon. F. S. Miller: Hansard should be corrected; I'm sure you didn't mean to imply what was said.

However, as far as the value of a nutrition education programme is concerned, you and I would not have any disagreement at all. I have talked to dietitians, and I have told them I think their work is exceptionally important. I have never promised, but I have implied, that we were very willing to consider them to be included in the Health Disciplines Act, something that up to date has not occurred, because of the critical importance of nutrition in the overall health of the people in this country.

I'm going back by memory, but I suppose that during the war when we would do almost anything we were ordered to do, we were at our healthiest. We were at our healthiest because they rationed a lot of the things that made us not too healthy—excess sugar, excess coffee, fats. All of these things were the very commodities that were very hard to get; as a result we stuck with a number of staples that made, I am told, pretty good sound, nutritional sense. Therefore, the health of our people in Canada and in Great Britain was pretty good, I am told, from that point of view.

As I say, there is no argument on the need for better nutrition and education. It is a slow, painstaking, frustrating job, one which our ministry, in conjunction with others and other agencies, is willing to keep on trying to do.

Mr. Chairman: Item 1, of vote 2902 carried? Carried.

On item 2, development of health resources. Carried.

Vote 2902 agreed to.

On vote 2903:

Mr. Philip: Mr. Chairman, I would like to bring up a problem that is more than an irritant, I think it is a problem that perhaps should be seriously considered, and that is the problem of those people over 65 who are moving into this province. They are not eligible for premium-free insurance until they have completed 12 months residence, but my understanding is that temporary assistance is available to them on application. However, it has been brought to my attention by a number of people in my riding that they have discovered that their parents were not covered. The parents, on seeing the cost of paying their own way for a year's time, had actually decided to opt out. I wonder if you have spent any time trying to co-ordinate with the other Ministers of Health a more simple transfer of senior citizens' insurance from one province to another.

Hon. F. S. Miller: Mr. Chairman, I think that wherever a programme is free, and services are not equal in the different jurisdictions, there is some need for a time factor to apply before automatic coverage is granted. I would say that if all the Canadian provinces offered the same kinds of programmes in health care, your arguments would be completely valid. But there are a couple of complicating factors.

Number one, we offer nursing home care in Ontario as an insured benefit. This is not offered in other provinces, or at least not in all other provinces. It is not federally-financed, I am sure you know that. The main clients are people over 65, the majority of them. We do have problems with people moving to Ontario from other jurisdictions to be basically qualified for that service after having lived and worked for many years in other jurisdictions; even other countries—as Canadian citizens in many instances.

I think as long as we have these differences in programmes we have some need to put in a time deterrent. The federal government doesn't automatically give the old age pension to people who have lived in Canada for a year—I am sure you are aware of that—for the same basic reason.

OHIP is a pretty generous programme; it covers you no matter where you go in the world. Many other health programmes do not. I feel, currently speaking, that the time deterrent can be justified. If the time arrives when all of Canada has the same basic insured services available so there wouldn't be any reason for a person to skip from one place to another, I think I could safely say the need for a time deterrent would disappear.

Mr. Philip: Surely though, Mr. Minister, you are not talking about great numbers of people. What you are talking about are small numbers of people who are moving into the province, people to whom it doesn't occur, since they are Canadians, that they are not covered. People who are at a certain age, then, go into a hospital and receive this letter from the hospital saying they are going to be financially responsible. It comes as a traumatic experience to many of them. Could there not be some way of covering them?

Hon. F. S. Miller: That assumes that, of course, we leave the entire responsibility upon the person to enrol before some disaster strikes.

I am keenly aware of the problem you are describing. My in-laws moved here from Quebec just last month and they are both over 65. This was their first question: "What do I have to do to have coverage?" At least they asked it.

I can only say that my experience with our health insurance group has been that we have bent over backwards to do one of two things: Cover the person who pays his premium retroactively if, through honest mistake, he forgot to do it; or, secondly, we have been very willing to work with them if they didn't have enough income to justify paying the premium on an income basis.

Mr. S. Smith: If I could just pick up the minister on this point: With regard to registering for OHIP, it certainly has been a problem in my medical experience, particularly with people who have passed the age of 19 and are no longer covered through their family, that many of these people simply do not make the premium payments necessary for OHIP.

What has tended to happen is they have received these rather staggering bills while they are being treated on the ward, which hasn't contributed very much to their rehabilitation and recovery. In each instance, after a bit of paper work and six or seven phone calls, the cost has been absorbed by the government indirectly and things have been settled, but it did strike me an awful lot of bureaucracy was unnecessarily involved in forcing each and every person to register himself under the OHIP plan.

As long as you are going to have premiums I suppose it's possible you need to have some type of registration mechanism, but I wonder if the minister wouldn't agree this is just an awful lot of bureaucracy that accomplishes very little. This has happened at least five or six times a year on my own unit.

While I am speaking on the subject of OHIP, I wonder also if I might ask the minister what plans he has for OHIP to recover from automobile insurance companies automobile accident health costs. It seems to me that in law the province has every right to go after the perpetrator, the person who has caused an automobile accident, and demand the cost from that person via his insurance company.

I would like to know whether in point of fact the minister can give us a percentage of how many of these automobile accidents they have successfully prosecuted in this manner and successfully managed to get money back from the insurance companies. My understanding from someone within the insurance industry is that they have been able to obtain a very small percentage. I would like to stand corrected on that and I look forward to hearing about that percentage.

I also wonder if the minister would like to take this occasion to tell us what his plans are with regard to deterrent fees as related to OHIP premiums. I want him to know that the position of our party is absolutely dead set against these fees and I would like to have a statement from him—

Hon. F. S. Miller: Finally I have found a difference between a Liberal and a Conservative.

Mr. S. Smith: You will discover, to your disappointment Mr. Minister, that there are a great many differences, which you will find out about in the next few months.

Mr. Lewis: That's true. You are much more right wing than they are.

An hon. member: Look at the halo.

Mr. Lewis: That is one of the most pronounced differences.

Mr. Ruston: Where did you get that tan, Stephen?

Mr. S. Smith: It is nice to see the Leader of the Opposition back participating in the—

Mr. Moffatt: He's the only leader who is here right now.

Interjections.

Mr. S. Smith: We missed him.

Hon. F. S. Miller: We even noticed him.

Mr. S. Smith: I thought momentarily he had had his hair curled in an Afro hairdo and I didn't realize he actually wasn't here.

I wonder though if the minister could in fact reassure the population of Ontario about the question of deterrent fees, and I look forward to hearing his answer in this regard. [3:30]

Mr. Lewis: Well you can put all the premiums on the income tax without telling the people where the initial money is coming from —more Liberal policy.

Hon. F. S. Miller: The alternative to your suggestion is that in effect everyone should be automatically enrolled and that there should be no premiums. That's the way I would read your comment about the 19-year-old entering the scheme. Is that what you're saying?

Mr. S. Smith: You can have everyone automatically enrolled, despite the age question; and if you're going to waive premiums—as you frequently do in the case of those who are unemployed, waive them retroactively—there's no great problem. As it happens, all you do now is create work for an awful lot of people who have to check into whether these premiums have been paid when in fact they virtually never pay the premiums anyhow.

Hon. F. S. Miller: That part isn't the issue. Of course, we do help people, even though we have no obligation to help them if they have forgotten to enrol or did not enrol in

OHIP when they stop being a dependant of the family. I think, technically, 21 is the age at which they must stop being a dependant, that's the maximum age they can stay in the family under any circumstances; if they are working it's earlier. By 21 they are dropped out of the scheme as a dependant and have to enrol as a student or have some other means OHIP support. Surely, the issue isn't how many we have to enrol retroactively, but how many did enrol and contribute toward those who did become ill, and who themselves didn't draw upon the system. Unless there is some reason and effort to get them in, everybody could wait until the first accident. Every one could simply say: "Why should I enrol in the OHIP Programme?" If it became that simple, I think that tendency would grow.

I have some reservations about always covering somebody retroactively. I think that far too many people profess ignorance at the time of an accident, whether it be an automobile accident or a health accident. They simply say, "Well I thought I was covered when I did so and so."

Now our subrogated rights in the case of the automobile accident causing injury to the third party or other party—the second party found guiltless—have, of course, always applied. We collect, I'm told, between $6 million and $7 million dollars a year from insurance companies right now—that's a guess. We also collect from Workmen's Compensation Board. But interestingly enough, at the present time we don't pro-rate our costs or our subrogated amounts if the sum total of the charges levied against the guilty driver exceed the amount of insurance available.

Awards may be given to the person, to the individual. By law, it's normal to take the total amount in the insurance package. Let's say a driver had $100,000 insurance and there was $200,000 worth of damage caused; that may be ranked something like this: an amount of $125,000 damages to the person injured for personal problems, $75,000 for OHIP. Instead of us both getting a share of the $100,000 available, I agree last year that the individuals involved should get their money before we get ours.

You may or may not agree with that, but I think when a person's been injured in an automobile accident and had health insurance, the least we can do is see that they have the right to this money before we have our share of it. That, of course, tends to cut down the amount of money we collect on behalf of OHIP, but we do collect from Workmen's Compensation Board.

Now on deterrents, I'm not going to fall into the trap of making any comments about what government policy will be on deterrents in the future, because that is not determined. Most certainly I am going to have to review that area before long, because it is obvious to me the increase in the cost of the present system, allowing for inflation for 1976-1977, will exceed the moneys that will be allotted to run the Ministry of Health. For that reason I am going to have to look at ways of cutting, fairly dramatically, the costs of the present system.

In other words, the costs of running our hospitals and the costs of our present programmes next year are going to exceed the amount of money I am going to be given to run the Ministry of Health. Therefore, I have to look for ways to put the brakes on the open-ended programmes. Those are the alternatives open to me as I see it.

I haven't as yet finalized that evaluation. It has been both painful and time-consuming. I am getting close to that point. Somewhere in that picture we will automatically look at the question of deterrents and probably pass them by, as we have in every other instance when we have looked at them.

Mr. Lewis: I should hope so.

Hon. F. S. Miller: I am not saying we will or we won't. I am saying you don't just discard it without reviewing it in the light of the other thing you have to do. I can't really—

Mr. Lewis: You don't create an election issue, either.

Hon. F. S. Miller: Strangely enough, it certainly wouldn't be popular with either of the opposition parties. Now that I have established the fact I can tell a Conservative from a Liberal, but not a Liberal from an NDP—

Mr. Moffatt: Just keep watching; you'll find out.

Mr. Chairman: Order, please. The minister has the floor.

Hon. F. S. Miller: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman: Stay on the vote.

Hon. F. S. Miller: Please don't show your biases.

We will get around to looking at it and probably discarding it. What I was going to say is, strangely enough, as I go round the

province hundreds of people—not all of them doctors—have come to me and said: "It is about time you brought in a deterrent." This is intriguing; hundreds of people—

Mr. Lewis: Hundreds of people? Hundreds of people don't even talk to me.

Hon. F. S. Miller: That is understandable.

Mr. Lewis: Hundreds of people talk to you about deterrents?

Mr. Moffatt: Those are the voices you hear.

Hon. F. S. Miller: Yes, the voices from the back.

Mr. Lewis: They say, "Frank, bring in a deterrent." My goodness, what a man can conjure up.

Hon. F. S. Miller: No, they say "Mr. Minister, bring in a deterrent."

Mr. Moffatt: Or "exalted minister"?

Hon. F. S. Miller: I am sorry, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman: Is the minister finished?

Hon. F. S. Miller: This minister is only finished in one sense; which is I have stopped talking.

Mr. Angus: Mr. Minister, I would like to use a family reference, as you have, in terms of discussing your ministry. Coming from the north and having, by circumstance, been involved with the Hospital for Sick Children in Toronto, and going through a series of travel situations over a period of about a year and a half, I learned some of the frustrations that people from my riding and the riding of Port Arthur, for that matter all the ridings in northwestern Ontario, go through. It is uneconomical, and I admit that, to have identical services in every part of the province—and when I say identical I mean the specialist services in terms of those highly expensive or high expertise services found in Toronto or Winnipeg, Montreal or the major centres of Canada.

Mr. Chairman: I am advised that comes under item 2 of vote 2903, general hospitals and related activities.

Mr. Angus: It is considered under related activities, is it? It does not relate to transportation and OHIP?

Hon. F. S. Miller: If I can clarify it for the member, if I'm not wrong, I think under OHIP, the health insurance scheme, we are talking about the medical fees, the chiropractic fees and so on. In the next vote, for $1.552 billion, general hospitals and related activities, we will talk about the availability of services in institutions.

Mr. Angus: Yes, I was just using that as a preamble. My comment is in terms of getting the people to those services which are available. Would you consider that under this vote?

Hon. F. S. Miller: Okay, carry on.

Mr. Angus: The situation is that because we don't have those services in our areas people are required to come to the major centres, that is Toronto or Winnipeg, to get those services. Unless it is a hospital-to-hospital transfer—in other words, such as in the case of an emergency—OHIP does not provide the funding.

For instance, I met a family on the plane today which was coming down for a yearly checkup on their son. They had to come down here because the expertise wasn't available and they had to pay the whole shot out of their pocket to get their child here for a 15-minute interview with the doctor. They are among the lucky people in terms of travel.

I have had personal situations where my wife has had to stay down here as long as three weeks with our daughter while she was in Sick Children's. She had to pay for her own accommodation and her own transportation down, because it was important in terms of the welfare of our child and the healing process for the mother to be available. I think any physician will agree to that kind of concept. Whether it is a child or an adult, you still have to have that communication link to home.

What I am trying to tell the hon. minister is that it is important that money be made available through OHIP to provide transportation, because some families have to come down here every three weeks for an appointment for special medication or special services that they can't get in Thunder Bay, Sioux Lookout or what have you.

I would really impress upon the hon. minister that if we are talking about a province of opportunity and talking about a province of equal opportunity in terms of medical care, then we have to begin to consider these kinds of realities when we talk about spending our OHIP premiums, of spending our tax dollars. I would implore the hon. minister to take a really new look at the whole consideration of transportation costs, and where necessary accommodation costs for the parents or

spouses of those people who are so critically ill that they must come to Toronto for medical aid.

Hon. F. S. Miller: The hon. member for Cochrane North, I think, wrote me within the last couple of days about this very topic and I can appreciate the problem. I don't have an easy solution to it or answer to it. Yes, I think almost all of us who live somewhere outside Metropolitan Toronto, at some time or other either are involved in or have a family relative who requires some of the specialized services of a major city hospital; not always Toronto, but the odds are very good if you live north of this area this is where you will head.

I guess we have only made inroads in one or two areas for some people who have a steady need to come to hospital and who otherwise would be patients. I am thinking now of those people with kidney problems. We have made a small attempt at keeping their transportation costs covered.

Of course you mentioned, at the other end, the emergency or the transfer of a person who requires an ambulance. It has been covered for a long time, and it is growing perhaps more than any other segment of my overall budget as a percentage.

Mr. Angus: If I could just interject for a second: One of the ironies about the hon. minister's statement is that to get the transportation paid down they have to pay their own way back home under the present situation.

Hon. F. S. Miller: I can only say this; as long as the comments made by the hon. member for Peterborough (Mrs. Sandeman) are valid, that I am not doing all I should in say preventive care, or that I am not doing all I should in children's mental health services—if you don't get after me on that today I will be surprised—then I have to say I rank the problem you discussed lower than that. I have the job of deciding which items I will spend money on first. Much as I would like to spend it on them all, those two would rank ahead of transportation, simply because in my opinion they are of greater need.

Mr. Sweeney: A question of the hon. minister, through you Mr. Chairman; a question of clarification on his explanation perhaps.

Hon. F. S. Miller: If anybody asks questions the hon. member can make statements.

Mr. Sweeney: My questions refer to two constituents who have brought them to my attention, and I have had some difficulty getting the answers. I am referring to OHIP coverage for Ontario residents who live outside of Ontario part-time; particularly those over 65 who probably go south. My understanding is that if they are out of the country for less than six months per year they continue to be covered. Let me just point out my understanding and then if the hon. minister would please clarify it, because there is probably an error somewhere. That is what they understood, that they were still covered.

In one particular case they received medical treatment outside the country but were only partially reimbursed for that. In the other case, the couple are outside the country for more than six months but are still Ontario residents. They still pay property taxes in Ontario because they have a home here. They still pay sales tax and other types of taxes when they're here. Their understanding is that they don't get any coverage at all, even when they come back to Ontario and need medical attention. Could the minister explain just what is happening here?

[3:45]

Hon. F. S. Miller: Yes, I can. Your general principles are right, but your details aren't. I stand to be corrected by my staff if I'm wrong in my reply. Our requirements for Ontario health insurance coverage for persons outside of Canada, or in fact outside of the province I believe, is that they must reside in the province four consecutive months a year to retain eligibility. Therefore, they can be out of Ontario eight months a year and qualify for coverage.

The second thing, a person who is outside of Ontario and who requires emergency hospital treatment—I don't mean through an accident necessarily, but the kind of treatment that is not at the patient's decision, not elective—will have all of his hospital costs paid for and his doctor's costs will be paid for up to the Ontario tariff but not exceeding the actual dollars laid out. Have you got that?

Mr. Sweeney: Yes.

Hon. F. S. Miller: The only caveat I put in there is, don't get sick in Florida.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Windsor-Walkerville.

Mr. Good: Don't die in Florida.

Mr. B. Newman: I wanted to raise two issues with the minister. One concerns the OHIP number. Senior citizens are very confused with the series of numbers they receive.

They have a Social Insurance number, an OHIP number and a drug number. Isn't there some way of rationalizing all of that so the individual would have one and only one number rather than the conglomeration of numbers he has today?

Hon. F. S. Miller: Mr. Chairman, the speaker is touching a topic near and dear to my heart. I'm sure the general manager of OHIP is sitting here shivering now because he knows what I think.

When Dr. Potter got me foisted upon him as his parliamentary assistant I went in with exactly that philosophy. I really haven't changed my mind. Some people say I never do.

The fact remains that I think the simplification of numbers would be a great step forward in terms of making life a little easier for any of us. It is not just a question of an OHIP number and a drug number—I think the drug number is your SIN number as a matter of fact, if you have one—it's the multiplicity of numbers for all the special purpose requirements we have.

I can safely tell you it has been studied in such depth that no study is needed any more. The conclusion probably is that sooner or later it will happen. The reason for not implementing it isn't, I would say, lack of belief that it's the right thing to do; it is. It's a combination of the practical problems involved in actually getting these numbers out in the time-frame therein, and the resulting co-operation required between all of those agencies which currently give numbers, federal, provincial, municipal and so forth. I think all those things can be overcome. It will just take a concerted effort and attempt to do so.

Of more importance has been the reaction of those people who look at the civil rights of the individual and who feel that by giving a person a single personal identifier, as we have chosen to call it, we will make possible access to too much personal information and in the process perhaps destroy the individual's privacy. That really is the issue, not the technical issues involved.

Mr. B. Newman: I know the minister as a private member is aware of the problems you run into when a constituent tries to relay a series of numbers to you. He'll give you the number of his cheque, he'll give you any number that is on the cheque—he doesn't know whether it's his old age security number, his social insurance number, his old age assistance number or his family benefits number; he quite often hasn't a clue at all. My thought is that if you can convince your own officials and possibly the government to come down with one number, you could resolve a lot of the problems. I agree with you re the concern of the civil libertarians that we are going to come along and be put into Orwell's "1984" a little earlier than we want to be, but for the sake of a lot of the elderly people, I think it would resolve some of the problems.

Hon. F. S. Miller: Mr. Chairman, first of all, I am firmly on your side. I think the question as to whether it happens or doesn't happen depends not so much on the government side of the House, although I'm sure there would be a disagreement of opinion within our ranks, but general feelings on all sides of the House as to the feasibility and acceptability of that kind of a programme. But the one thing that was clear to me is that it doesn't relate to my ministry alone. It relates to all of government, all at once.

Mr. B. Newman: Another point that I wanted to raise with the minister, Mr. Chairman, is that of the individual reaching the age of 19. May I suggest to the minister that when that does happen, in addition to sending a notice to the individual, or to the parent of that individual if it happens to be a son or a daughter, there also be attached an invoice for the individual to pay in case he is going to be required to pay his own OHIP premiums, because quite often the parent gets the notice and disregards it, whereas if there were an invoice he wouldn't disregard it as quickly at least. He may not wish to pay, but at least he would have been forewarned by the notice.

Hon. F. S. Miller: That presupposes something that isn't so. That presupposes we know who is 19. You see, we don't enrol the children in a family by any formal mechanism. I don't know whether you are aware of that or not.

Mr. B. Newman: No, not at all.

Hon. F. S. Miller: If we went back to your first proposal and gave each person a unique personal identifier, which, as I see it, would be given at birth in place of the birth identification number, then, in fact, we would have a record of the age and birth of everybody at our central offices here in Toronto, on the assumption that in fact they stayed within the province. Obviously the records will not always be 100 per cent accurate, but they'd be pretty good because, in the same thinking, the number would be used to iden-

tify those who die and for a change we'd have an in and out department, if you want to put it that way.

Mr. Ruston: That will make a good headline.

Hon. F. S. Miller: Anyway, we'd have an inventory. I had better stop.

Mr. Moffat: Quit while you're behind.

Hon. F. S. Miller: Where was I?

Mr. Chairman: You're off course.

Hon. F. S. Miller: Not really, I'm on course, Mr. Chairman. Currently, though, we give an OHIP number to the person who registers for the family unit or registers as an individual, and automatically, if somebody uses that number in the doctor's office, such as a child or spouse, they're added to our list. That explains to some degree why we have more people enrolled than there are in Ontario.

Mr. B. Newman: Another problem that I want to raise with the minister is the situation where the husband and wife don't get along, so the husband decides that he is no longer going to carry his wife on his OHIP. All of a sudden she is dropped but he, in the meantime, finds someone else whom he would prefer to pay OHIP for.

Hon. F. S. Miller: That's the in and out.

Mr. B. Newman: How does the wife find out that she is no longer covered? There is no way for her to find out at all, except when she goes to a doctor. She gives her old OHIP number there, and all of a sudden finds out she is not covered because her husband now is paying the OHIP for some other lady.

Hon. F. S. Miller: You have put a very sexist approach on all this. It is not the man who makes the determination, it is the person in whose name the policy is written. A woman can discard her husband just as easily as a man can discard his wife. The fact is, the person who registers to hold the policy decides who will be covered—wife A, B, or C.

Mr. B. Newman: I don't disagree there, Mr. Minister, but how then does wife A find out that she is no longer covered if the husband will not tell her?

Hon. F. S. Miller: A simple letter to the OHIP office will tell her—or him.

Mr. B. Newman: It wasn't that simple in the case that I had.

Hon. F. S. Miller: I recognize that it isn't always.

Mr. Chairman: Shall item 1 carry? Item 1 agreed to.

On item 2—general hospitals and related activities.

Mr. Godfrey: I would like to speak to this vote and, unfortunately, if I may crave your indulgence, it may spread over into rehabilitation services. I view them as continuing from general hospitals, so with your permission I may be able to get a correct catharsis here.

I read the estimates which have been presented and I am struck immediately with the urgency of the situation of medical care in Ontario today. We see before us a ministry which is clearly out of control, incapable of doing business in the normally accepted manner and which basically lacks leadership. Indeed, having listened to the estimates for the Ministry of Education, I am struck by some of the amazing similarities between that department and this. They simply don't know what is going on and have lost control of their ministries.

Let me cite some examples of this: We are told we are spending too much on health. Our Ministry of Health has accepted the strictures of the federal government—with some mini-screams, but without question of their basic validity. In doing so, this government has surrendered to the federal government basic decisions as to the quality of medical care which would be given to the citizens of Ontario. This resignation of leadership is not new—it is current. It may be seen more vividly in the current negotiations with regard to ceilings which have been put on the wages of those same workers who pay the taxes for our medical scheme.

In the words of our provincial Treasurer (Mr. McKeough), the record with the hospital insurance programme has been replete with rigidity and confusion. He has stated that the federal government has shown a lack of imagination in dealing with the real problems of health financing. All this sounds very brave and forthright but where are we at present? We are in the middle of a medical morass where one thing comes through clearly—the quality of medical care in this province is suffering and more is to come.

Our government, which has remained in office many years through having exploited the high quality of the educational and medical assistance which developed outside the government, has made the same basic mistake in both areas. In the school system,

the brick-and-mortar ethic has prevailed, with the result that we see throughout the land, palaces of learning which house an inadequate number of staff who are restrained from bringing the best education to our citizens.

Similarly in the field of medicine, we see an over-construction of acute hospital beds with government approval. The result is the government is now involved in closing down these beds and pointing out that we need to open convalescent and chronic beds in their place. Surely, here is a giant system run by pygmies. There is nothing here but bureaucratic bed-doggling. But, let's get back for a moment to the basic concept that the health dollar is taking too large a proportion of our budget.

[4:00]

How much money should be spent on health? As I said the other day, in commenting on the education budget when the minister was here, I think there are two budgets which should have priority in spending; these are education and health. Since 1960 there has been an escalation of costs in the hospital system which reached a peak last year. Therefore, a much smaller hospital dollar has been expected to meet vastly increased costs and the provincial government has been imposing a tighter and tighter squeeze on hospital budgets, with the result that budget increases allowed in all cases are less than the actual increase in the cost of hospital living. In stricturing the budget of a hospital, the Ministry of Health is, in effect, controlling the quality of medical care using the dollar input rather than a basis which is founded on the need of the patient.

This restriction of dollars is felt in an industry which is labour-intensive. Only within the last year has the level of hospital wages been brought up to an approximate level of that in comparative industries and the catch-up has not been completed in some areas. The result of putting the lid on the hospital budget is obvious. Those catch-up wages will never arrive, and it will not be possible for the worker in the hospital industry to maintain his equity with those in a companion industry.

The Ministry of Health continues to think it can control medical care in this country simply by turning off the money tap. It sets the impossible task, which could be compared to a fireman asked to put out a forest blaze and told he had 392 gal. to do the job. Of course the medical system can be constrained, but at what a sacrifice? These attempts at rationing by freezing capital expenditures, limiting the number of beds, limiting the number and kinds of doctors and allowing a buildup of waiting lists can have one result: the demoralization of the system, uncertainty regarding objectives and serious inequities. And who will feel the inequities most? The weak, the less privileged, and the poor, according to Dr. Deutsch. Thus we have the ironic paradox of a minister who presides over the most prestigious and well-heeled system of our time, allowing that system to bring back the very social evils which universally-available health control was supposed to overcome. But let's come back to how many dollars should be spent. It is fashionable to state, and I've just heard it stated by the hon. minister in this House, that health care is an open-ended system which gobbles up an unjust portion of the GNP, or the GPP.

Hon. F. S. Miller: Just a second. I didn't say those things.

Mr. Godfrey: I retract what I just said. The hon. minister implied them. However, if we look at the GPP over the past few years, we can see that the total health care expenditures and their major components, cost of physician's services and the total cost of hospital insurance, have a stable trend if measured as a percentage of the GPP and actually the percentage is down over the last two years. I would quote: "In 1971 the Ministry of Health expenditure of the percentage of the GPP was 4.8 per cent. In 1972, 4.6; in 1973, 4.3; in 1974-5, 4.5; and 1975-1976, projected 4.5 per cent."

I would point out too, that in stricturing as he is, the hon. minister is going directly in the face of the recommendations of the Science Council of Canada report number 22 of October 1974, which states:

> So long as waste is eliminated, increasing operating costs should not be regarded with alarm. The objective of publicly supported health services has been to make good health care available to those who were deprived of it. Additional costs required to meet this objective are obviously justified where necessary.

Let us look at the estimates and we see a preponderance of funds which are to be put into the acute care area. The ministry has for years encouraged doctors to close down their practices in the neighbourhood and to move them into the hospital department. Family practice units have sprung up in all hospitals throughout the country. Yet, suddenly, the ministry finds that this has caused a great increase in the hospital budget. Surprise. Suddenly the hon. minister has found that if you give a doctor unlimited facilities, he will use them in the interest of his patients.

Now the ministry is balking at footing the bill for that proposition by reducing budgets.

We can see clearly, already, the results of this inaction in terms of patient care. St. Joseph's Hospital in Toronto has already indicated it will be requiring everyone to take off 48 hours work without pay over the remainder of the year, which amounts to some 3,000 hospital days of care. Positions in various institutions have not been filled because of budget problems. Indeed, the hospitals have made a magnificent effort to restrain their budgets over the past few years.

Given the problem of remaining within the lower annual increment to the budget, the hospital system of Ontario has responded magnificently, I say again, to the challenge and has been able to reduce capital and operating costs to a significant degree in its attempt to stay within government guidelines. Yet this must now come to an end. It is impossible for these self-same hospitals, which have been built as a result of magnificent effort by Canadian medical teams, to further tighten their operations. If the ministry officials would take part in hospital budget meetings, they would know what I am talking about.

Recently I was invited to sit in with the medical advisory committee of Wellesley Hospital in Toronto. For three hours, this group of doctors and administrators wrestled with a need for $1.2 million of new equipment for the coming year in order to reduce it to an allowable $300,000. Time after time the statements were made as significant items of capital expense were turned down: "We will just have to manage another year even if it means reducing the service." "The equipment is dangerous and should be replaced." "A coroner's jury in Sudbury has strongly recommended this item be placed on all gas machines." "It is impossible to continue our level of service and quality in this service with this piece of equipment."

This group was honestly trying to reduce costs in the same manner they have been attempting to do so over the past few years. This attempt has led to the formation of cost control committees and other sincere efforts on the part of all staff, medical administrative and support services, to save a buck. It has been successful but this is the end of the line. These hospitals simply cannot function any longer on this type of budgeting. The Ministry of Health must realize there is little blood left in the stone walls. The main criterion which guides the decision to purchase new machinery is: Does it replace an old piece which is now worn out? There is no scope for new ideas, new programmes or new presentations. The hospital system is just managing to carry on on what it has done in the past.

One of the areas where we see a paradox in ministerial operations has been in the field of physiotherapy. There is a large core of well-trained physiotherapists in this province who treat patients on prescription from their physicians. At the initiation of the insurance scheme, a certain number of these were permitted to operate private clinics outside the hospital on a fee-for-service basis from the province. This has resulted in incalculable good. In the first place, it relieves the hospital of providing expensive facilities which do not justify the costs of treatment which has been given to the patient. In addition, it enables the spotting around the community of areas where patients can receive the care given by the physiotherapist without having to travel great distances or in many instances wait in queues in the hospital.

Yet the government has seen fit to hold down the number of insured practices. The amount of service has been limited by refusing to insure the applicants who have asked that their practice be put on an insured basis. This is not a licensing on the part of the government. It amounts to a licence to practise privately. Many of the patients who are seen in these clinics have disabilities which give them difficulty in getting around and can come to a community clinic which can be closer to their home. There is no doubt that physiotherapy care can be given on an outpatient basis in a private area to a greater cost advantage than it can be given in the hospital.

I am aware of the argument that the federals put so much money into it and therefore we don't have to put it in, but that type of cost accounting is fallacious. Yet in spite of the fact that physiotherapy can be obtained at private practitioners' offices, the government recently saw fit to authorize the opening of a hospital out-patient clinic at Flemingdon Park in Toronto, which included a provision for physiotherapy services. This physiotherapy outlet was located half a mile from two pre-existing physiotherapy clinics. Here we have an example of the inability of the government to do reasonable planning inasmuch as they have duplicated services which were already available, and the duplication is at a much higher cost.

While it is politic for the Ministry of Health to state there are too many acute beds in Toronto, it is wise to look at the waiting

list for patients who require that type of care. There are still waiting lists for urgent medical and surgical admissions at all hospitals. On many occasions acute conditions cannot be admitted to hospitals because of bed shortages. The minister fails to realize that an acute hospital system must be geared to take care of the greatest demands in order to protect the health and welfare of the insured. It is not possible to put off sickness or disastrous injury.

However, it is fashionable for him to say there are too many acute beds. Now we have several standing in this and other cities as monuments to that type of ministerial thinking. The Orthopaedic and Arthritic Hospital still has a wing in Toronto which remains unopened. The new Mount Sinai Hospital still cannot open beds. The hospitals in Scarborough still have boxed-in areas and I heard earlier from my colleague, the member for Grey-Bruce (Mr. Sargent) about the Hanover-Hilton.

This type of planning does indeed indicate some loss of direction. There is no point in telling me that we didn't know this was going to happen. Surely, a Ministry of Health should be able to plan what is going on a few years in advance.

At the same time, the minister continues to permit massive building in other areas in other hospitals in the same area as those hospitals I just mentioned where beds cannot be opened. Sunnybrook Hospital continues a massive expansion as money is poured in, even though the hospital is barely rated at 300 beds. Not half a mile away, Lyndhurst Hospital, a world-famous centre for the care of spinal cord injuries, still cannot open 50 badly-needed beds because of a lack of money. The result of this is that patients with spinal cord injuries, paraplegic and quadriplegic, cannot be serviced at this excellent centre and are shunted off to chronic homes or convalescent centres where the quality of care is not as good.

Let us now look at the convalescent and chronic bed situation. A survey in Toronto hospitals in 1974 showed hundreds of patients were inappropriately placed in acute beds, rather than chronic or convalescent beds which were required. I note with some pleasure that further chronic and extended care beds have been opened. I believe the total works out to 693 in the province over the past year. But, there is still a four-week waiting period for admission to Queen Elizabeth or Riverdale hospitals—two of the major centres for convalescent care. This may be even longer, depending upon the type of illness. Medical science is keeping patients alive for a longer period of time, but this science has not been matched by administrative science which could produce beds in which to nurse these patients.

If you are a patient in a convalescent home, and show improvement, then you are discharged to a nursing home. Nursing home beds are paid for by extended care to the amount of $18.50 a day, but the patient or his family, in some proud Ontario community, is responsible for $5.90 per day for a standard bed, $9.40 for a semi-private, or an additional $12.90 to pay for a private bed.

Thus, if a patient in a chronic centre makes the terrible mistake of showing improvement, then he is discharged to a nursing home with a great financial burden being placed upon his ability or his family's ability to pay. In this topsy-turvy world of medicare, to show improvement is to be penalized.

In addition to the cost of beds, there are many problems associated with the placement of the patient. Many families are pressed to accept a second or third choice which is far removed from the home and produces subsequent transportation problems—particularly for the mother of a young family.

But, more than that, there is no real provision in our medical scheme for a man to die with his family. There is an impropriety to a man dying in a chronic nursing care centre. Surely, in our society it would be possible to fund adequately those families who will agree to take the father home and die with the family. Oddly enough, this would constitute a saving if this were done properly. In addition, there are many ethnic groups where it is unconscionable for the family not to be present when a member passes on.

It seems strange that dignity and dying is not matched by the financial considerations which would make it possible. And I am not referring to Extendicare, the home visiting service, to the homemaker service—I am talking about real help in the family which may simply involve a simple homemaker. This cannot be had—and if it is had, there are financial strictures on it. You cannot have more than a certain amount of money. The budget is concentrated on acute care, yet has given lip service only to prevention and rehabilitation.

I was really uplifted when I read previous reports as to the emphasis which was going to be put on prevention and rehabilitation in our medical scheme. Let us look at the preventive aspects of our medical scheme.

It is obvious that the health horrors of the industrial revolution of the early 19th century, which were conquered and put into proper perspective by a medical care system of that day, are being revisited on us in the 20th century. Everywhere we see the results of the new industrialization, the contamination of atmosphere, the contamination of our food and drinking water and the breakdown of our psyche by the pressures of modern industrialism. Yet where is our Ministry of Health in the prevention of these problems?

[4:15]

I can tell you this, it's still in the 19th century. I do not see in the Ministry of Health the employment of any epidemiologist who can look at the basic-core, distinctive knowledge which can be brought to bear in order to put into the practice the principles of preventive medicine. Nowhere is this more apparent than in the failure to prevent adolescent psychological breakdowns which we see in our school system.

This epidemiological approach is an area which the Ministry of Health has studiously ignored. Even the simple matter of gathering basic data or the vectors of disease is ignored. We still do not have occupations registered on a death certificate. There is still no coding of various employment type diseases on our death certificates. What we need is a life-long employment history so that we can look at the epidemiological facts and bring something to bear. In preventive medicine we have a clinical model where there is a doctor-patient relationship, and the art of medicine is applied to this. But there is a certain emphasis here which is not the practice of epidemiology.

The usual direction to the patient in such a situation is to "think clean." Instead the emphasis should be "disease should never occur". Epidemiological knowledge can apply to preventive medicine. It should look at each person as a bag-full of possibilities of development of different diseases. That is, to look at the job which has a high or a low risk of contact with this or that disease vector. Having determined that these factors are present, it is then possible for the epidemiologist to recommend the various measures necessary to prevent the disease from occuring. This happy state of affairs does not exist in our government. Instead, we allow, for example, the asbestos fibre matter to continue; we fail to sell and convince of the tenets of good health. We allow the stultification of the production-line worker to continue, with loss of motivation and subsequent breakdown of mental health.

You will recall, I mentioned earlier that there was to be an emphasis on prevention and rehabilitation. I've already pointed out where prevention is inadequate; rehabilitation is equally bad. The same dismal record prevails. There is no prospect for betterment. With the advances in medical care, a shift in the patterns of morbidity has occurred with a pre-eminence of chronic degenerative-state diseases, frequently in older citizens. What has been done to help these citizens return to normal life, to rehabilitate them? I invite the minister to visit chronic centres with me to see the problems. We won't talk about cute little remarks made by nursing sisters who sold beds to clear out the corridors.

Let us walk hand in hand through the corridors, looking chronic illness in the eyes, and you tell me that enough is being done to rehabilitate these people. Lack of privacy, lack of care, lack of pride. How dare you reduce budgets to those areas? Oh, you can show me Baycrest in Toronto, an excellent example of the way things could be done in this province. But for every Baycrest, I can show you six homes or chronic institutions where patients are four or five to a room, crowded, degraded, bed-sored, smelly, distant from their friends, homes and families, spending their time in God's waiting room with 200 or 300 other fellow sufferers.

Is this leadership in rehabilitation? Has the government freed funds to encourage young medical workers to go to these areas? Are those funds sufficient to do the job, or are they sufficient to paint a pleasant facade on these happy houses? And what is the status of the report of the project team on rehabilitation?

As you know, earlier this year it was recommended that the government of Ontario place new emphasis on the planned provision of comprehensive rehabilitation programmes, recognizing the rights of all residents of Ontario to achieve their maximum capacity for living, regardless of their economic potential. It went on to state that comprehensive rehabilitation programmes be organized so as to effectively include health, education, vocational and social aspects. These are gray words, especially in view of the fact that there has been a call, loud and clear, from the hospital industry for such programmes for many years.

The royal commission on health services stated more than 10 years ago that there was a lack of data regarding the number and characteristics of people who can profit from modern rehabilitation procedures. The Tunbridge report on rehabilitation, in England

and Wales some years ago, noted the same lack. The Percy committee in Ottawa made a mention of this 16 years ago.

Let us remain in Ottawa for a moment. You have told us of the happy times, Mr. Chairman; the Minister of Health too has told us of the happy times he had when he was there last week. Let us look at a survey carried out in the Ottawa-Carleton area two years ago. At that time it was noted that there had been 7,674 new cases of hemiplegia, or stroke, per year. Of these, 542 survived for more than 30 days, which usually indicates they'll survive for several years.

From this group of survivors, some 2,638 persons were seen and assessed as to their need for rehabilitation: 264 were working or able to work, 1,055 were able to cary on with a disability, and an almost similar number needed rehabilitation. At the other end of the scale some 200 needed institutional care.

These figures are not secret. They were presented at a meeting of physiatrists in the region some three years ago. This happened in the midst of the planning for the Ottawa Rehabilitation Centre which has now been on paper five years. Yet those 1,050 patients needing rehabilitation have been denied their natural rights under our government-supported insurance scheme because they've not been given the first-class level of care to which they are entitled. Similarly the patients admitted to the excellent section for rheumatoid disease in Ottawa are denied their basic right for proper treatment. There isn't a therapeutic pool in all of Ottawa.

There is a catchment area of 300,000 people in Ottawa plus our friends from Hull who are welcomed not only to the primary care unit but also to the secondary, tertiary and quarternary care units. Has there been any progress in the provision of rehabilitation facilities for these patients? Can St. Vincent's take more outpatients? No. Can the present rehab centre with 32 beds accept more patients? No. Or the 18 beds at Perley—which is really a chronically ill hospital and not well suited to rehabilitation? No. Actually we are offering one-third to one-half of the service which is needed for Ottawa in rehabilitation.

I know there is a task force working there, and I know it will be five years before there is a building put up in order to correct these problems, and I know you have been working on it for the past five years. It is understandable the Ministry of Health is not aware of this situation. There is no specialist in rehabilitation medicine attached to the ministry who can visit the area. When the ministry wished to evaluate the Hamilton programme of rehabilitation it was necessary to second an analyst without previous experience of the problems in studying rehabilitation. There is still no on-staff physiatrist with the Ministry of Health.

Let us move from Ottawa. How about Toronto? Why are the badly needed beds for paraplegic and quadriplegic patients at Lyndhurst which are built, standing and ready, still closed—still denied to patients who need that type of care? Obviously the paraplegic patient must be shipped out of the acute care hospital. Obviously he cannot go to the world's eminent paraplegic centre, which spread Canada's fame throughout the world under the direction of Dr. Jousse. So that patient ends up in a chronic bed, or so-called convalescent rehabilitation bed, at an institution where although care may be standard, it is not what that patient is entitled to from the fact that he has paid his premiums to OHIP.

I point out to my colleagues from the north that yes, your riding is denied first-class medical care which is available in Toronto south of Bloor St. Yet at the same time many patients in Toronto are denied this self-same medical care because they are shipped off to an institution which simply does not provide it.

I would be happy to see the details of the plan which the ministry has made to accommodate this type of reasonable demand. I wish to see and hear of the plans which have been made up to study the special problem for the epidemiologist in studying the needs for rehabilitation.

I wish to be assured that you are aware of the fact that rehabilitation is not a one-shot deal. It is not a simple admission to a hospital or rehab centre and then, with discharge, the books are closed. It is rather a continuing programme of support such as is given by Wellesley Hospital to a group of hemiplegic patients by a group of paid and volunteer staff who work in the evenings to provide ongoing support for these patients and their families.

I wish to be reassured by the ministry that it does not subscribe to the simplistic ideas of Mr. Heward Grafftey, Progressive Conservative MP for Brome Missiquoi. Writing in Canadian Business, September 1975, he urges a major programme to construct community clinics, health care rehabilitation and convalescent centres—in order to free up expensive beds. I can assure the Ministry of Health the rehabilitation is not cheap—there are no dollars to be saved by that type of construction. One of the most expensive acts

that can be done is to put a patient in a room with a physiotherapist or other member of an allied health team.

I want to know from the minister what efforts are being made to provide alternative, less expensive staff for rehabilitation. Where are the medical auxiliaries who will do the mechanical activities associated with rehabilitation which do not require the highly professional skills of university graduates?

When will the ministry provide homemakers as a medical need to help the family help the patient in the home not graded on the patients' possessions but rather on his medical needs? When will the Ministry of Health pay for the artificial limbs and braces recommended by the royal commission on health services in 1965 and still a desperate need for many patients?

I could go on. The Lakehead has no funding for itinerant allied health teams to do rehabilitation; there are many other things. I do appreciate the affability of the Minister of Health and his ability to spread sweetness and light. But somehow in speaking with him I get an unearthly feeling.

Mr. Reid: A spiritual feeling.

Mr. Godfrey: I am fresh from the steerage section of this great medical ship of health. His walk is several decks above my beat. I have detailed many areas where the policy holders of the Ontario Health Insurance Plan are being bilked of their premiums.

There is lack of leadership by the government to deliver health care. There is poor leadership by the government to raise the level of health care awareness in the people of this province and if you can't sell it, give it up, because there are other people who can sell it. There is bad leadership by the government in dealing with the major deliverers of its health care.

Look at the way the minister proposes to reduce health care costs by stating, "The Ontario government is prepared to close hospitals". What a blustering statement. Look at the way the ministry negotiates with the hospital system. It suspends a Damoclean sword, a continuous threat overhanging future planning, present morale and past sincere efforts at reduction of cost.

The minister is justly proud of the few incidents in which, after effective and meaningful consultation with local deliveries of health care, a solution to a problem has emerged. Would it not be more fitting if the minister, fully aware of the magnificent efforts which have been made to control cost during the past few years in spite of inflation, in spite of the catch-up wages which have been paid out to chronically underpaid work forces, would present to the hospitals and their staffs the problems of delivering health care and invite their full participation in what should be done? If the conclusion is that more not less money should be put into the system, will he accept it?

Sure, many hospital beds may have to be closed or there may be duplications or it may be necessary to combine certain activities but not in the classical government sense of "Do this because . . ." but rather in the new minority government sense of "Let's discuss the problem; let us listen to each other's ideas and arrive at an equitable solution."

I call on the ministry to develop a leadership which will allow the health industry to continue its magnificent job rather than permit the acute disease of growth in the hospital system to be treated by reducing the lifeblood, money. Can we not rehabilitate this system by using those who know their business?

Hon. F. S. Miller: I guess the first thing I'd say is, I have listened to a very learned presentation by a doctor, based on his point of view of the medical system. It doesn't agree with the views given by the official critic of the NDP in any sense at all.

Mr. Reid: That's not unusual.

Hon. F. S. Miller: It doesn't agree with the statements made by the leader of the party on a number of important points.

Mr. Dukszta: I think you are quite wrong. It does agree.

Hon. F. S Miller: You believe in fee for service?

An hon. member: What has that got to do with it?

Mr. Dukszta: You listened to one aspect of what he says; listen to all of the aspects of it, for heaven's sake.

Hon. F. S. Miller: I listened to quite a few aspects of it.

Mr. Godfrey: I hope you paid attention.

Hon. F. S Miller: I paid attention. I don't agree with some things; I agree with others. The fact remains it is a great joy to be a critic in life and a heck of a lot harder to have the job of trying to do something about things.

Mr. Reid: And with that little bit of wisdom—

Hon. F. S. Miller: The obvious answer may, sadly or gladly, become the fact and then I will be pleased to be in your shoes and do to you what you are doing to me. Okay? That really doesn't worry me too much because I don't think of myself as a politician.

Mr. Reid: What are you doing here then?

Hon. F. S. Miller: I am working.

Mr. Reid: We are all working. What did you run for if you are not a politician?

Hon. F. S. Miller: My life.

Mr. Reid: You are a politician and a good one.

Hon. F. S. Miller: Thank you, and I can't—

Mr. Reid: A lousy Minister of Health. No, you are a pretty good Minister of Health.

Mr. Chairman: Order, please.

Hon. F. S. Miller: I will try to be in Atikokan on Dec. 12.

Mr. Reid: I am going to thank you publicly for that if we ever get finished here.
[4:30]

Mr. Chairman: Order, please. Will the hon. minister return to the estimates, please?

Hon. F. S. Miller: If you'll let me talk I'll give you a new hospital, too.

Mr. Chairman: Carry on.

Hon. F. S. Miller: I really am not going to try to make any long, learned reply. I don't pretend to approach the Ministry of Health with the same degree of technical knowledge that the last speaker did or the critics of either of the parties do. I think there's a certain degree of risk when you are as learned as the three of you.

That risk is that you show one of the problems which I think is characteristic of all of us who are professionals—in our own fields we seldom listen to other points of view. We really are very inclined to stick to those things we believe in. I don't say that's wrong. I'm just saying it happens to be a fact in the medical field, perhaps more than in some others because of the very individualistic nature of physicians and the responsibility they personally have toward their own patients.

It shows up, though, in the analysis of the faults of the system. Getting an agreement among a series of doctors, as I'm sure you know, on any given issue, on any given solution to that problem, is one of the most difficult things any of you face yourselves, let alone government in dealing with the problem. That's not a criticism of medicine. It's a statement of fact.

I don't know how much should be spent on health. I would say that we realize we cover about 75 per cent, we think, in the government field, of the costs of health care. We think that currently we're spending, from all points of view, about seven per cent of the gross provincial product on health care and you're quite right when you say it has stabilized in the past two or three years.

There are real indications that in this year it's not stable any more. In the last eight to 10 months the condition of stability which was brought about by action of this government in stabilizing the budgets and in taking the measures it had to, a curve has taken off again and may be accelerating quite quickly. I see us projecting figures of health care cost growth of some 35 per cent to 40 per cent in excess of the growth of the gross provincial product over the next few years—even higher in some instances—unless something is done about it. You can't keep on spending more and more on any programme of government unless the economy can afford to bear it.

I have an interesting problem. Unlike the other minister to whom you referred, the Minister of Education (Mr. Wells), it's safe to say that the public is not unhappy at the costs of health care. That makes my job of constraint doubly difficult. Every time the Minister of Education wants to cut dollars he's got about 98 per cent of the population on his side; the other two per cent are teachers. I used to be a teacher. I want to make that admission of sin to those of you who are new in the NDP. A lot of you don't know that I was a teacher but for five years I was.

Mr. Shore: I knew. We could tell.

Hon. F. S. Miller: You knew? You could tell by the objective case after the pronoun, I know. The truth is I taught chemistry.

Mr. Reid: It's the way you never come to the point that gives you away.

Hon. F. S. Miller: I learned that since I got here.

The public is sold on fancy health care procedures and appears to be willing to pay for them. One of the problems I've pointed out many times to physicians is that the true costs of health care aren't visible to the average person. He sees 38 per cent of the

education budget on a mill rate and stands up in wrath and says it's too much.

He sees his OHIP premium and says "I deserve more," when, in fact the OHIP premium is somewhere between 15 per cent and 20 per cent of the cost of the health care service. We have this rather strange public reaction against education costs on one hand and for health services on the other hand. I could be the most popular minister in history, I guess, if I just kept spending more money. That would be by far the easiest way out for this government and for me.

But you've made the assumption that spending more dollars in health care has made people healthier. It has not and I think you know it. I think the two critics in their initial statements basically said that to me. I'm not sure the member for Parkdale (Mr. Dukszta) did, but I'm pretty sure that the member for Hamilton West (Mr. S. Smith) did.

In fact, spending more dollars past a certain point has not improved the health of Canadians. Therefore, I feel I was exhorted by both of you to look at better ways of spending our money, and I'm trying to do that. That does involve a cutback in some of those high cost facilities we have become so prone to use as status symbols in each of the communities of this province.

Sure, there are hospitals around this province with unopened wings and floors. In some cases, like Etobicoke I would say, it was good planning because the structure was built in advance of the projected growth of population, so that the total cost would be lower. I believe that also applied to Scarborough, in the beginning, when we planned the buildings there. In other cases, it does not.

In the case of orthopaedic, I guess you could argue that we planned to open all the beds and did not. This was because between the time the approval was given and the time the construction was finished—as you know that was quite a few years—the bed needs had been lowered in the province on a planning basis.

We still are planning for four beds per thousand and have 4.8. We have far more, as I'm sure you know, than many other jurisdictions that have better records than we do in terms of overall health. Therefore I have to reject your assumption that more beds means healthier people.

I think I would accept the comments of the member for Peterborough (Mrs. Sandeman) that I need to close more of those beds. I know you didn't say that—I don't mean to misquote you—but I said I had to find the money elsewhere if I were to put it into the kinds of programmes you believed in. You follow me? Preventive care—the things that would stop us from getting to the hospital first—whether it be dietary, or better—

Mrs. Sandeman: You could save some money by using paramedics as midwives.

Hon. F. S. Miller: No argument there. This was suggested by the last speaker too—that we needed to use more paramedical personnel. And I would agree with that. I'd point out that my basic problem today is that I have too many physicians. There is no use having paramedical personnel to replace physicians when the physicians are already there and going to earn a living.

Mr. Reid: Send them to northern Ontario.

Hon. F. S. Miller: We are gradually doing that. As you know, our present immigration policy makes sure they go there if they want to come to Canada.

Mr. Reid: And if they don't want to come—

Hon. F. S. Miller: You referred to Sunnybrook Hospital as getting a lot of money. But you realize that we allotted a certain amount of money to increase the output of physicians under the Health Resources Development Plan. That was one of the four hospitals that are currently rated as receiving some of the moneys so that we can improve their facilities, so that we could have better teaching output in Toronto of Canadian physicians for our own market—the rest of Ontario too.

Mr. Godfrey: More physicians.

Hon. F. S. Miller: More physicians.

Mr. Godfrey: You just told us we don't need any more.

Hon. F. S. Miller: Yes, but I want our physicians to be Canadian-trained. As long as we are turning down kids who want to get into our medical schools and at the same time allowing physicians to immigrate into Ontario, something is wrong. I think it's my duty to make sure that if we need the 670 output we have—and we need about 750 in total as I recall—then we should be training them in Canada.

Frankly we should be training a surplus so we can send them somewhere else, so we can be paying some of our obligations to other parts of the world, rather than importing them all too often from countries that have

one physician per hundred thousand people, or some horrendous ratio like that.

In the chronic and rehab area, it's only recently that it's started to get the attention it deserves and of course the system hasn't changed around. There is a whole bunch of reasons it hasn't been fast enough.

1. Many hospitals have been extremely reluctant to accept any role that implied taking any part in the geriatric care process. I think you know that.

2. We had a great lack of trained people. I think you mentioned that in your speech. So we have had a hospital sitting empty down here on University Ave. for some time. Hopefully, we will have it open in January. It will be a combined chronic-rehab hospital for treatment and teaching, and hopefully we will start to give some emphasis to the programmes you are talking about.

At the same time, I am impressed with some of the newer hospitals around the province. St. Mary's of the Lake, Kingston, is a great example, in my opinion. I can't evaluate how effectively they are dealing with patients, but I was very impressed with their physicial layout and their approach to the rehabilitation treatment, and you will find more of them as you go round.

You mentioned that co-payments applied to nursing homes and didn't apply to chronic patients; that is true, and it is one of those anomalies I am determined to eliminate, but I think the co-payments should apply to the people in chronic hospitals, not the other way around. I think there is no reason why we should have an incentive to stay in a high-cost facility, because nearly all of the people currently in a chronic hospital are receiving full old age security pension and not contributing toward their upkeep one bit. I think you are aware of that. It is going strictly to the families, in most instances.

We have documented cases, and I am sure you have seen them, where the only visit a chronic patient gets each month is on the day that the cheque comes in from the federal government, when the family comes in and takes it and cashes it. I don't think that is the purpose of an old age pension cheque. I think, in fact, if the moneys are being sent to persons to help them survive in the community, and the state has assumed the duty to look after them, then the amount of money at the patients' disposal should be for only those necessities not provided by the care they are in. Therefore, I believe that we have to equalize that system and I am working to do so. I don't know that I will succeed, I always caution you at that, but I fully agree the anomaly shouldn't carry on. If we have it equal for all people in all forms of care, there won't be quite the financial disincentive to change from one to the other.

Where a person is under 65, of course, the problem is different, and in many instances then we have to look to the person's own wealth. If they have wealth, I do feel that there is a right for the state to ask them to pay. If they don't, I think family benefits in the main will cover their needs and make sure that the co-payments and the other things are covered.

You say there is no provision to die at home. Maybe not. I question that, though. I question that. I think, for example, as my assistant just pointed out to me, we have three chronic nursing pilot projects for home care going on in the province right now where the person is either in unstable or deteriorating condition. But more than that, a number of people have, I think, chosen to take their last months at home. I have seen some of them, very close to me, within the last month.

You say we have no epidemiologists in the Ministry of Health. I can give you the names of six—

Mr. Godfrey: Full-time?

Hon. F. S. Miller: Yes.

Mr. Godfrey: Where are they reporting?

Hon. F. S. Miller: I can't tell you where their reports are; I can only tell you I have six of them, plus others marked at the bottom.

Mr. Godfrey: What are they doing?

Hon. F. S. Miller: I will ask some of my staff later on, or I will be glad to let you talk to them. Look, I run an open ministry, as some of your fellows on that side have discovered.

Mr. Godfrey: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order, I fully acknowledge that. You have been most accommodating, sir, in providing me with sufficient ammunition to shoot you down. Thank you.

Hon. F. S. Miller: And I will continue to do so, because I am not really afraid of criticism. I know just how much criticism can be made of this ministry or any other. Intriguingly enough, your problems are not necessarily me or my ministry; they are the system that doesn't want to change, and resists change, as you know.

Mr. Dukszta: As the minister, you are responsible for that.

Hon. F. S. Miller: I am responsible, I feel that responsibility keenly and I feel determined to change it. Listen, I am making a statement that doesn't indicate that I have given up; I just suggest to you that individually and collectively the members of your profession, the members of the hospital profession are a large body of people dedicated to the status quo.

Mr. S. Smith: May I make a point on that?

Mr. Chairman: We would like to take speakers in the order they have indicated they want to speak.

Mr. Reid: Go ahead, I will yield to my learned friend.

Mr. Chairman: Are you finished?

Hon. F. S. Miller: No, I am not finished but if he wants to criticise me—

Mr. S. Smith: Just a brief point. I appreciate the minister's candour, his friendship, his openness and his personality—and his ability for that matter—but I wish that at some point he would recognize that the job of government is to govern. I wish I didn't have to keep hearing from him and from some of his colleagues—as I did the very first time I laid eyes on the gentleman—that when people are ready for change he will bring it in. Sometimes there has to be leadership and I wish the government would not abdicate this.

Hon. F. S. Miller: There is a subtle difference between dictatorship and leadership and I would suggest to you that we—

Mr. Lawlor: Come on, there's a big difference.

Mr. Chairman: Order, please.

Mr. Lawlor: Not a subtle difference.

Hon. F. S. Miller: Thank you. There is a difference; I will leave the qualifiers out, if I may.

I am doing my best to lead. You may not think it is good enough and that is your privilege; if you sit on that side of the House and say it is good enough then something is wrong with you. We are doing our best to lead and I will do it in subtle ways.

Mr. Reid: That explains a lot.

Mr. S. Smith: The minister moves in mysterious ways.

Hon. F. S. Miller: I have learned a lot from the member for Rainy River.

Mr. Reid: The mills of the gods.

Hon. F. S. Miller: I agree with your comments on life-long records being required for employment exposure. This is one of the stipulations we have put to the Workmen's Compensation Board and the occupational and environmental health study so that we will have better records in the future of those known risks to allow those people studying the illnesses which we believe are work-oriented to have a better data base upon which to base their conclusions. We are going to do our best and it is already agreed that shall be done. I hope we can get it into a form which is useful and is not so difficult to work with that it becomes virtually a bureaucratic nightmare. We feel we can.

I can't guarantee Lyndhurst is going to open the extra beds; certainly I recommend it and I would hope I will be able to announce it before too long. It is a very specialized facility. It is very close to the base of the trauma centre we are using or intending to use for the experimental helicopter project and I would like to see the two tied together. We are preparing our position on that and hopefully it will be accepted.

Mr. Godfrey: The experimental helicopters programme?

Hon. F. S. Miller: No, in terms of where we do it and how; that's what I am saying.

Mr. Godfrey: Is that experimental helicopter project still on?

Hon. F. S. Miller: Yes. In this area we are suggesting that—it was a commitment and the commitment was that it will be tried. I have been given the job of seeing it work or proving that it does work, let's put it that way, or doesn't work.

I don't come into the thing and determine it must work but at least we will give it a fair go and see whether the advantages outweigh the disadvantages or the cost—in other words, if we feel we are getting value for the money spent. It won't be on a wide basis, I would suggest, but on a fairly selective basis.

I am sure you know that we do provide 80 hours of homemaker care for anybody who has home nursing care. I assume that but I just mention it in passing because some of your comments—

Mr. Godfrey: They need both.

Hon. F. S. Miller: Both are given at the same time. Once a person is qualified for home nursing care, they may well be given the homemaker's care to help maintain them in their home. The 80 hours can be spread out in any series of units.

You mentioned that we don't have a rehab team in the Lakehead. I am told we do and I am told we have a budget for it.

Mr. Godfrey: Excuse me, sir. I said there are no funds for the itinerant physio team at the Lakehead.

Hon. F. S. Miller: There is $75,000.

Mr. Godfrey: As of a telephone conversation yesterday, they had not been informed of that.

Hon. F. S. Miller: Yes, the letter has gone but that doesn't mean anything these days.

Mr. Godfrey: I suggest you telephone them. They are very anxious.

Hon. F. S. Miller: Okay. That is all I have to say on that speaker's comments.

[4:45]

Mr. Reid: I understand we are going to complete these estimates in 10 minutes. I would like to say an encouraging word to the hon. minister. As the hon. minister indicated in his early remarks, hopefully he will be able to attend the opening of a new hospital in Atikokan, which is in the great riding of Rainy River.

Mr. B. Newman: Is it the Pat Reid Hospital?

Mr. Reid: I understand it is going to be called the Pat Reid Memorial Hospital.

Hon. F. S. Miller: The Miller-Reid Memorial Hospital.

Mr. Reid: Well, I'll accept Reid-Miller Memorial Hospital.

Mr. Young: "Memorial" implies departure, Pat!

Mr. Reid: I would like, because it doesn't happen that often, to publicly thank the hon. minister for his flexibility and his interest in going to see the problem first hand in that community and to reverse a decision that had been made by his predecessor and so ensure the people of that community a facility that they sorely needed. I would like to thank him publicly and will do so on Dec. 12 whether he is able to be there or not. If we do it up right we may be the first patients in the hospital on the 13th.

I would like to say one brief word about hospital care—I hope I am still on the right vote—and that is on the continuing problem we also have in my particular riding and throughout the north in the matter of chronic hospitals. I am not going to take the time to go through it again. I just want to reiterate to the hon. minister that this is probably our largest problem as far as hospitals go. We have no hospital in the Rainy River riding to treat chronic patients.

The hon. minister is aware that the old folks home or senior citizens' home is used for the chronic hospital in the town of Fort Francis. People requiring chronic care must go to Thunder Bay for treatment and they are away from their families. They have the problem of travelling and they are always the people given the lowest priority because they don't come from that city to begin with. I would urge the hon. minister, if he and his officials would, to come up with some programme that will provide some chronic care facilities in the riding of Rainy River.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Yorkview. Are your comments on Item 2?

Mr. Young: Yes, they are, Mr. Chairman. Our time is fairly short, however. Perhaps I could just say a word or two and take a few matters up privately with the hon. minister later. I think the emphasis that has emerged here this afternoon is one that we cannot avoid looking at. Certainly the hon. member from this side of the House mentioned the fact that more resources, rather than less, ought to be put into this whole matter of health care. I would agree with him, if we are going to maintain the present kind of social system and the present kind of civilization which we now have.

I mean this. As the hon. minister himself has said time after time, we are tolerating in Ontario and in Canada and in western civilization the kind of thing which inevitably creates the problems in the health field. When we think of the things which the hon. minister has talked about—the matter of pushing on people sugar and the consumption of luxury goods which only build up obesity and trouble in the future, for not only the people themselves but for his department; when we think of the drive to get people to consume alcohol and make it respectable among our young people, and the same with cigarettes, and all the rest of it—the advertising that is

spent here results in more expenditure on the part of the hon. minister.

These are things which I could elaborate upon if I had the time. I haven't this afternoon, but I do want to bring to the minister's attention that there is no question that as long as we have this kind of a society in which the emphasis is upon profit-making, regardless of whether it is good for people or not, the emphasis is upon allowing the so-called private enterprisers or enterpreneurs, call them what you will—and I suppose it's pretty near impossible to prevent it in a free society—to drive at us the attitudes which will make money for them. This is one of the problems we face.

How we can circumvent that, how we can educate on the other side and gradually bring sanity into this civilization so that eventually the minister's expenditures go down—that is the big problem we face. I suppose he can say that that means bigger investment of resources and, therefore, a tough time for him right now in order that the investment pays off in the days ahead.

Then there's the other thing: It's a strange business that the mediating of health brings into being the highest income group in our society, along with the drug trade, one of the highest-profit businesses in our civilization. This is something we have to think about and realize that here lies one of the great problems that must be discussed and must be faced, because this should not be.

We ask practically every other person in the country and in the health field, the hospital administrators, the nurses, the whole service right down the line, to go on salary; yet we still cling to a piecework proposition in the other field. I know that's heresy right now, but maybe there are ways in which the minister can gradually move into this field and make some difference in this whole matter. Certainly, the drug trade has to be attacked in some realistic way, so that expenses can drop there.

There are a lot of details in this, but I know another member wants to have a word to say. I simply throw these things out and perhaps the minister and I can have a discussion privately sometime about some of them.

Mr. B. Newman: Mr. Chairman, I wanted to thank the previous speaker for giving me this opportunity to say a few words. I wanted to bring to the minister's attention the problem back in my own community and ask him who is going to make the decision concerning the rationalization of health services. The minister is aware that there is an Essex County Health Planning Council now meeting, listening to all sides of the issue. But the community have heard so many conflicting stories—one that one hospital was going to be phased out completely, one that another was going to be transferred into a chronic care hospital, a third something else, and the community is completely misinformed or ill-informed. I would ask the minister, at this time, to straighten out the situation in relation to the hospital services and the delivery of health care in the city of Windsor.

Hon. F. S. Miller: Mr. Chairman, we sent a letter to Windsor last week to the Riverview Hospital, saying that it should close March 31, 1976, unless the alternative is acceptable, and proposed to us by the end of this month. When I was in Windsor approximately a month ago, I said that I had to make a decision before the year-end.

Mr. B. Newman: Now the decision is irreversible, is it?

Hon. F. S. Miller: I think the wording I used there was: unless an acceptable proposal was in to us by the end of this month.

Mr. B. Newman: You certainly aren't giving the community sufficient time to arrive at a decision. They are meeting practically around the clock. I hope you understand that many in the community are going to be up in arms if you impose a decision of your own making on them rather than have them come to something on their own, something that would be probably a little more rational.

Hon. F. S. Miller: Just to answer: This is what I thought was called leadership.

Vote 2903 agreed to.

Mr. Chairman: This completes the estimates of the Ministry of Health.

Hon. F. S. Miller moved the committee rise and report.

Motion agreed to.

The House resumed, Mr. Speaker in the chair.

[5:00]

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Speaker, the committee of supply begs to report it has reached certain resolutions and asks for leave to sit again.

Report agreed to.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' HOUR:

ELECTION ENUMERATION

Mr. Grossman moved Resolution No. 3:

Resolved: That in the opinion of this House the government should place before the House legislation to permit the use of assessment roles as an aid to enumeration for provincial elections.

Mr. Grossman: In rising on this resolution, like many other members of this House I have just been through a period of time in which a provincial enumeration was conducted. In this case, it occurred during the summer months and, like many other enumerations before it, it was in my opinion hardly efficient and not nearly satisfactory for the electoral process involved.

The system, as it is set up, essentially provides for a preliminary list of voters to be obtained by a series of enumerators working essentially from a minimum of a Wednesday to a Saturday night at midnight. Subsequently, there is a revision which carries on for three weeks, during which period of time all those persons who were left off the list or were inaccurately put on can be re-enumerated and appropriate changes made.

This past summer the enumeration was conducted towards the middle of August and certainly in my riding literally thousands of persons were away. These persons in many cases came back to the city after the first enumeration had been completed and did not take the necessary steps in time to get on the voters' list. One could say that that is their responsibility, and I think to some degree that is accurate. But we also must look to the efficinency of the system, because it's true that very many people don't get involved in the electoral process until really 10, 14 or 16 days prior to the election. That's when interest intensifies, and the Election Finances Reform Act recognizes this by providing for advertising during the last 21 days only.

The current system certainly falls down in another way in that when those lists are posted, it is up to the elector to find the post in his subdivision on which the appropriate list is posted—he hopes that that voters' list has not been torn down—and then to take the necessary steps to find his returning officer, call him up and ask to be re-enumerated. There is a note left by the enumerator indicating that he has been around, but in too many cases that note gets lost in the shuffle. Someone returning home from summer holidays this year found that there was a lot of mail and that the enumerator's note was just one of thousands left in the door.

I don't think I have to make the case at great length with regard to the problems inherent in a short-term enumeration. Suffice to say that if there's a better system, a more accurate one and one that can be implemented with some ease, then I would suggest that this Legislature ought to be in receipt of legislation permitting the easiest and most efficient system.

The Ministry of Revenue, having taken over local assessment some years ago, now goes out on the streets every September and prepares what can be used as a permanent voters' list each and every September. In fact, the Monday morning after the Thursday election last September, I walked out of my house to be greeted by a municipal enumerator sent out by the Ministry of Revenue.

It is appalling to me to think that while pairs of poorly instructed enumerators—and I say poorly not because of the quality of the enumerators or of the returning officers, but only because of the time involved—were going out across this province, presumably in the computers here at Queen's Park, each and every voter in this province was listed on an assessment roll with an appropriate designation placed beside his name in that computer.

It would seem to me that it is not a great trick to ask those computers to spew out in subdivisions those persons eligible to vote in provincial elections, provided that the appropriate information is fed in. I am informed by the ministry that at the moment appropriate information is being fed in and that, in fact, by programming in the subdivisions and their numbers, by pressing some buttons, in a period of two or three days after the call of an election, a preliminary voters list can be available.

What would occur after that can be one of two things: first, the enumerators can be given these poll-by-poll lists and go out and make only one call—instead of a call back—make one call at each door, and where they get no response and cannot get the appropriate information from the neighbour, then that enumerator, I suggest, ought to be entitled to enter those persons appearing on the last revised Ministry of Revenue assessment rolls as the persons eligible to vote. The only consequence that would have is that in some cases persons would be shown as eligible to vote when, in fact, they had moved out. Frankly, that consequence is not as serious as the consequence that now comes from having an enumeration in a period of three

or four days essentially, when literally thousands of people get left off.

Mr. Lawlor: Do you think you would get more votes or less by your method?

Mr. Moffatt: Less.

Mr. Grossman: It matters not to this side of the House whether we get more votes or not, we want to see fair elections.

Mr. Samis: It sure matters in his riding.

Mr. Moffatt: Tell your House leader that.

Mr. Grossman: This system, for the benefit of those across the way, apart from allegedly giving them a better chance of getting elected—and I say allegedly because they always have excuses why they didn't make it this time—would save the voters of this province—

Interjections.

Mr. Gaunt: What will you say next time?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Mr. Grossman: I look forward to hearing this debate continue, because I would be very interested to hear whether or not the members opposite don't want to go to this sort of system and prefer to continue to get re-elected by the sloppy method we are using now; I don't.

Mr. Moffatt: You don't choose to get re-elected; is that what you said?

Mr. Grossman: The cost of enumeration in this province, calculated in the recent election on the number of enumerators we had and on the number of polling subdivisions there were in this province, is a bare minimum, without revision, of $2,694,000. That is the cost of the simple preliminary enumeration. To round it off, $2.7 million. That is without the costs of printing those lists; that is without the costs of the extensive re-enumeration.

I have left that out because the re-enumeration would be necessary in any event. It is shocking to me that we would go into that expenditure of $2.7 million some four weeks before the Ministry of Revenue went out and did exactly the same thing on Sept. 21.

In checking into this practice in the other provinces, I have concluded that the appropriate and necessary next step to shortening this ridiculous enumeration system would be to permit the shortening of the election period itself. I have a bill on the order paper which would call for the shortening of the election period from 37 days to 30 days.

I must address myself to that just for a moment because the extra seven days, quite apart from the fact that we drag ourselves and the public through those extra seven days, when they really don't become interested in the election until there are two or three weeks to go, means that all of us are renting campaign headquarters for a full two months. We are paying for telephones for an extra full month—and we know very well the Bell Telephone doesn't need the extra money—and we are paying for rental of other equipment for a full two months as well. I am informed that the purpose of having a 37-day election period is to permit a period of time for enumeration. That makes sense, because you will see from the returning officer's calendar that it calls in essence for the enumerators to get out on the streets approximately eight days after the writ is issued and to return with their lists no later than the Saturday night next following, which I suppose is about the 12th day.

All that period of time is necessary just to complete a duplication of what the Ministry of Revenue already has in its computer bank in Queen's Park. Where that period of time can be eliminated it can then permit the shortening of the election period to what I think is a reasonable length of time, being a full month for the voters to review our programme and whatever the other parties may bring forward.

I would refer you, for example, Mr. Speaker, to the Province of Quebec. Prior to 1972, Quebec had the same sort of enumeration we now have and the writ period was a minimum of 46 days and a maximum of 53 days. When Quebec was able to do away with the enumeration by going to a permanent voters' list, it reduced the election period to between 28 and 35 days and in essence the province has been sticking pretty close to the 28-day period.

Saskatchewan, I should add, has no permanent list, but its writ period is between 29 and 34 days. The system used in Great Britain calls for a permanent voters' list to be prepared by a registration officer in the spring and autumn of each year. I suggest that may be unnecessarily duplicative and that we could well get by with having the currently taken assessment lists used for our purposes.

As we go across the provinces of Canada, we find those provinces that do not have permanent notes' lists tend to be the ones

with the extensive writ periods. So taken together, I think we can have a very much more efficient system, a cheaper system to the tune of $2.7 million and one that operates more fairly. It would put an onus on people to be a little more alert, but those are persons who have recently made a change in their address. I say recently because what they would have to do is take care of any changes they have made subsequent to the September or October enumeration by the Ministry of Revenue. I think it is safe to say that it is not likely, although I am certainly in no position to assure the House that there will be elections in July or August. Therefore, it is fairly sure that at worst those lists would be dated 10 months. A simple system set up for revision, I suggest to you, has got to result in a more complete list than we are getting now.

[5:15]

We are in a period in which we have come through a federal election, in July, 1974, a municipal enumeration conducted by the ministry in the fall of 1974, a provincial election for which the enumeration was conducted in the summer of 1975, and the municipal enumeration following immediately thereafter. So the voters in this province have been enumerated four times in the last 15 months. I think that's a little much, Mr. Speaker, particularly when the tab for the enumeration, at least when it's done for election purposes, is a minimum of $2.7 million a crack. We've heard about cutbacks, what more could we do to fit in with the federal guidelines than to eliminate this cost?

Mr. Lawlor: Keep talking. We're getting ready to do it again.

Mr. Grossman: I suggest that this is one of those wonderful times when a decrease in cost brings with it an increase in efficiency.

I would urge upon this Legislature that it recommend that appropriate steps be taken so that in the election following the one of Sept. 18, 1975—be it two, three or four years hence—we are in a position to press the buttons in the computer—

An hon. member: It could be five years.

An hon. member: It could be a month.

Mr. Grossman: Yes, I agree it could be five years hence.

Mr. Ruston: Less than one year.

Mr. Moffatt: It could be two weeks.

Mr. Grossman: At the appropriate time we will be in a position to press the buttons on the computers and get our lists on day 27 or day 28 of a 30-day writ period, revised from that day forward, and end up with a much more complete voter's list; and one that more fairly serves the electorate. It will perhaps result in, as Mr. Camp would say, a more representative Legislature.

Mr. Warner: I certainly welcome any innovative suggestions that would bring about the defeat of the member from St. Andrew-St. Patrick.

Mr. Grossman: It would take more than that. You have tried everything so far.

Mr. Warner: Since we're dealing with matters of innovation and imagination as well as those of efficiency, I think it should be noted that the government's experimental situation in the by-election of what was called Stormont proved to be somewhat of a disaster.

Mr. Samis: In more ways than one.

Hon. Mr. Welch: Yes, we agree. And there's the disaster over there.

Interjections.

Mr. Warner: I hasten to add, Mr. Speaker, that despite the—

Mr. Moffatt: The final result.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. Order.

Mr. Warner: I hasten to add that despite the experimentation with computers—

Hon. Mr. Welch: What a result. What a revolting result.

Mr. Warner: —what we added was a human dimension, the likes of which have never been seen in that riding before.

Hon. Mr. Welch: That's right.

Mr. Warner: And which are legendary at this point.

Mr. Samis: You always think the worst of everything over there, don't you?

An hon. member: You'd better start over again.

An hon. member: Watch him; he's shooting at you.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. We all have a time limit, so let's give the hon. member the opportunity to use his 10 minutes.

Mr. Yakabuski: There have been a few mistakes in Cornwall, but it's all over next time.

Mr. Warner: All of you are aware that what I'm referring to is that in that by-election the government attempted to experiment with computer lists in terms of enumeration. They further attempted to refine the experiment—

Hon. Mr. Davis: On a point of order, the government had nothing to do with it.

Mr. Warner: Okay, the returning officer. They further refined that in the by-election in Ottawa, and those computer results were rather disastrous as well. The election workers were confronted with a computer list listing people alphabetically. When the campaign workers from the various parties went to a particular street, trying to sort out who was residing in which house, because the names were listed alphabetically it became an almost impossible task. I will assume that that type of experimenting has been dropped.

What concerns me somewhat is to hear the government members speaking about abandoning the present practice when an all-party committee from this House dealt with the whole issue in the last session and felt that despite the kinds of criticisms that have been heard, the procedures used here in Ontario measure up very favourably when considered with other jurisdictions in terms of the percentage of those people who are eligible to vote actually ending up on the voters' list. The percentage turnout in provincial elections is normally quite favourable.

Sure, there is room for some criticism but I think members should realize it probably isn't reasonable simply to eliminate the kind of system we have now. I could see using the system of municipal lists as a backup to what we have now, to augment the present situation but not simply to replace it.

If the member is concerned about imagination, I ask him to consider the prospect, on the first two full weekends of the election period, of having the enumerators stationed in shopping centres, in particular in the food stores. That procedure has been used in other jurisdictions and, on the assumption that almost everyone purchases food, those people who have not been picked up on the door-to-door enumeration obviously will be covered by their appearance at the supermarket.

Mr. Shore: What about the liquor stores?

Mr. Grossman: You might as well use it for that.

Mr. Warner: I offer that foreward as a point of imagination for the member to consider before he drafts his bill. In terms of efficiency, we have to also consider that just elminating the door-to-door enumerators may not be the answer. The member is assuming that the municipal records do not contain errors. I would put to him that in addition to what he is looking at he adds the possibility of people being able to go to government offices, such as the post office or whatever, to put their name on the list ahead of time.

I am not convinced by his remarks that the length of the election is necessarily linked to the enumeration process. I would contend that the length of the election period is of great necessity for those people who come from geographically large ridings such as those in northern Ontario. It is essential there to have a sufficient amount of time to be able to reach the electorate.

It is fine for us in Metro Toronto to talk about a short period for the election because we have such a small geographic area. We have considerable use of the media but that advantage does not rest with the northern members. I think it would place a hardship on those northern members to shorten the period of the election. Therefore, the election time is not necessarily linked with the enumeration process.

I suggest they are two entirely different subjects and, if the member is looking at shortening the length of the election he should settle upon some other argument for shortening it. I am pleased to see it shortened to 37 days. I think at this point in time, unless there are other arguments to be put forward, it is a perfectly legitimate length of time and shouldn't be tampered with.

I am not very happy with—not the process but the way in which that process is conducted. I received complaints, as I am sure other members did, regarding the enumeration and the complaints I received for the most part were that the enumerator called once and never returned. The Act clearly states they are to call twice and it specifies the time periods.

In many cases that did not occur and the most flagrant violations of that were in apartment buildings. There are obviously difficulties there. By and large with people in apartment buildings, both members of the family are out working. They are only home at suppertime. I would suggest, if the member is looking for some solutions, that we alter the time period during which those enumerators must make their calls. My suggestion

would be that the enumerators be instructed that their initial call be between the hours of 5 p.m. and 7 p.m., deeming that to be the normal suppertime for most people. That is the time when they are most likely to find them at home.

The second call should be placed in a time period other than that—either from 7 to 10 in the evening or prior to 5 o'clock. But the initial call should be made during that supper hour. I suspect, if that were the case, you would get most of the people enumerated on your first call. Make a second call during those other times and then use the municipal list as the backup. As far as I'm concerned, from where I sit, that would be sufficient to get everybody on the list, and provide the opportunity for people to get their name on the list by either going to the returning officer or visiting a government building, such as a post office.

I think that if the government were to support that kind of idea and, in addition, consider very seriously the prospect of having your enumerators stationed in food stores during the first weekend and possibly the second weekend, there should be no reason to find people left off the list. I really don't think that the member for St. Andrew-St. Patrick should be that concerned about eliminating the present system. I think that with the valuable suggestions from this side of the House, the present system, like so many other systems can be vastly improved—and we're quite willing to help the government do that.

Mr. Eakins: I just want to say that the resolution as worded is a bit of a motherhood thing. It's hard to be for it; it's hard to be against it. But I do agree with the hon. member that there's certainly room for a lot of improvement. In the last election, a tremendous number of people were left off the enumeration lists.

I don't know whether the Premier was in the House at the time to hear the hon. member say that the province's enumeration was a real disaster, but I'm sure that many people here will agree that it was. In regard to the length of time for electioneering, it might not take long to cover the riding of St. Andrew-St. Patrick, but it takes a little longer to do the great riding of Victoria-Haliburton.

Mr. Good: Les Frost knew that.

Mr. Eakins: That's right. The work on the assessment rolls is done in the latter part of September or the first of October. It's my understanding that by the time it gets through the computer and out again, it's somewhere around January before they know just what the complete list comprises. As we know, the provincial election dates vary. Sometimes they're held in the fall, sometimes in the spring or summer—so in many cases the enumeration will be out of date. Certainly this year, the enumeration was one year old when the election was called on Sept. 18.

Assessment rolls do not include complete information. They mainly include owners and tenants. I just wonder how many students and boarders of all types, who are not paying rent directly, would be affected. There are the people in the university towns and cities, the sons and daughters over 18, working and going to school; and the parents or other relatives boarding with the homeowners and not paying municipal taxes or not paying rent directly.

I believe that the use of assessment rolls can only be successful as an aid if the election people on voting day can treat all citizens alike. For instance, the rural people can be sworn in on the day of the election, but not those classed as urban residents. I wonder what the reason is for that. Is it that the government doesn't trust the urban people as they do the rural people?

Mr. Good: That's primarily it.

Mr. Eakins: Perhaps they should all be able to be sworn in on election day.

Mr. Yakabuski: You've only got a block to go. The rural people have 50 or 60 miles to go sometimes.

Mr. Good: We've got rural people.

Mrs. Campbell: The poor at the south end have to go all the way up to the north.

Mr. Eakins: I believe that the whole exercise of elections should be to make sure that the maximum number of people can participate. In 1969, the present Treasurer (Mr. McKeough)—he was then Minister of Municipal Affairs—appointed me along with a number of others to review the Municipal Elections Act. One of the things we tried to keep in mind at all times was that this revision should make it possible for as many people to participate as possible, and this was the exercise. I think if we're to have something effective in legislation here, then there should be a complete review.

Perhaps the government should have supported some of these measures when this was last discussed in 1970-71. I think that many of these things could have been cleared up at that time.

[5:30]

Mr. B. Newman: Right, right.

Mr. Eakins: The member mentions, and I would agree, that it seems like an exercise in futility, having three enumerations—provincial, federal and municipal. Somewhere along the line you've got to get together and have some of these same things in each Act. For instance, when I served on the municipal elections committee, one thing we recommended to the provincial government was that voters should be Canadian citizens, period. This is in the federal Act, but not in the provincial Act. So here is an area in which we could have some common thought.

Mr. Good: You came close to it, but you turned it down in the last minute.

Mr. Eakins: The recommendations of the municipal elections committee was not adhered to.

Mr. Ruston: No way—

Hon. Mr. Welch: We didn't want to disenfranchise the British subjects.

Mr. Yakabuski: The NDP will get you next time. They have got it labelled.

Mr. Eakins: I would like to make one strong suggestion—

Mr. Ruston: They thought they had it last year—

Mr. Eakins: —that in future revisions strong consideration should be given to handicapped people so that they can vote. There are many people on crutches and in wheelchairs and with other physical problems. I think that changes should be made to accommodate these people. I would just like to say, in conclusion, that I feel that rather than picking out one area, if we are going to do the job we should do it in a comprehensive way; it should be done in an all-over review and revision of the Election Act.

Mr. Jones: In seconding the resolution of my colleague, I would like first to compliment him on having brought this forward. I don't think he pretended for one moment that it is an instant answer, nor that it would not need some careful attention to make sure inequities were kept to a minimum, or hopefully avoided entirely. I think that the member has outlined some very important points that were missed in some of the comments and debates from the other side of the House.

I will just remind the members, if I could, that he addressed himself to costs and the need for a saving of costs. He mentioned some rather large figures. When you are talking in terms of $2.7 million, any saving from that is something that we must come back to and not shirk lightly. The member for Scarborough-Ellesmere (Mr. Warner) mentioned that he would like to see a couple of things —the shopping centres for one. I would just suggest, with all due respect, that that probably is a very hit-and-miss approach, and may not add terribly much to it. He suggests a difference of the time. With all due respect, time still doesn't address itself to cost. For these apartment people you mentioned, you would still be having to go back again, once, twice, thrice and sometimes maybe five and six times, as happens under the present system.

Mr. Warner: It is used successfully in British Columbia.

Mr. Grossman: Everything is.

Mr. Yakabuski: Nothing too successful out there now.

Mr. Jones: We mentioned the variety that exists between the different ridings—

Mr. Ferrier: Don't prejudge them, Paul.

Mr. Yakabuski: Insurance is a disaster out there.

Mr. Jones: We talked about that but if we don't—

Mr. Warner: You are an expert on disasters, that's for sure.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The hon. member from Mississauga North has the floor.

Mr. Jones. If we never try, for sure we're never going to make an improvement. Yes, we noted the comments of the other side—of some of the complications we would have in trying to do it. But I would also like to say in comment to the member for Victoria-Haliburton, I don't have as large a riding to be sure, but I do have a mixture, unlike the mover of this motion. I have urban as well as large rural areas on some 40-miles kittycorner in my riding; so I do know that when we come to your question of why the rural people can be sworn in, versus the urban people, there's been found a need for that for some longstanding time. You don't have the shift of population, and very often in the rural area neighbour does indeed know neighbour and can attest that it is he in a swearing-in process. and it counteracts the large size.

We're going to have to continue that sort of thing. What the resolution reads is that it would be using these enumeration lists as an aid. For my part, I would like to see us eventually come to a complete, permanent list. This is, indeed, the answer to shorten the time period in order that we can, finally, come to the lesser period. Holidays were the factor this time, where a lot of people who were away were disenfranchised. They sort of threw up their hands in disgust and said: "We can't get in."

Interjections.

Mr. Good: It didn't work out that way.

Mr. Jones: These things can happen in reverse ways through any period of time the election might happen. Here we find an agreement somewhere, I sense, in the comments that were made that there is a lot of merit in having a shorter period. It's been tried in other jurisdictions and it is working. People have an awful lot of things, today, competing for their time. It might cause people, as the mover of the resolution mentioned, to polarize their attention on the election and the issues and make a point of making certain that they were on the list.

We talk about the cost-saving potential of such a list as was mentioned by the member for Victoria-Haliburton, who could see merit in the fact we need to have one. We've had four since July, 1974 of what essentially amounts to an enumeration. Any cutting out of that is certainly something we should be looking to in this continuing quest for the saving of government spending and/or any other spending in connection with the workings of government.

We must also, in looking at a proposal such as we're discussing here today, take quite a consideration for what I experienced in my riding. I mentioned that it has rural aspects. It also has a lot of new urbanization. I would like to see these lists, perhaps with the returning officers having an up-dating, rather than relying just on the assessment list. We talk of it as an aid, taking and looking at it every six months at the updating. In our case, we found that a returning officer literally went from one Saturday to the next only to find that 800 to 1,000 people moved in in one new subdivision alone. All of a sudden, there was a surge of moving vans and instantly there were these people. You should have to do an up-dating almost on a constant basis.

I have one other thought in speaking of these lists, that perhaps we should borrow from the federal exercise. We should send out a mailing of these lists to the people, alerting them with the normal advertising rather than having them go down the proverbial poll to see if they're on the list. This also could be blended in.

Mr. B. Newman: Who are you going to mail it to?

Mr. Jones: Right now we can't.

An hon. member: Who is going to deliver it?

Mr. Good: To those on the voters' list?

Mr. Jones: What I'm proposing is that we would have the use of this list that the mover mentioned—our assessment list—as an aid to speed up, from the present number of days, to perhaps three days, this first enumeration. Then they send that list in a way that it is done in our federal elections. Then we would consider maintaining the follow-up special enumeration. This would bring us a step closer to the permanent list. That's the exercise. With the holidays we saw in this last election and all the unforeseen things that we could see cropping up in future elections, we are still looking for the shorter period. All the costs are constantly being criticized because the elections are too long. They're too costly. The mover mentioned, of course, some of the highlights in expenses, to say nothing of the expenses of individual candidates of all parties. I know that in my election campaign, all three parties subscribed in our debate to a shorter period. The only stumbling block that seemed to stand in the way was the physical availability of an enumeration list of the working people in the street for each of those parties. I think we can see that if we just look for more efficiency, we could actually have a common approach which could bring about a common improvement for the workings of our election and, also, effect cost-savings when we're talking in terms of trimming 20 per cent off $2.7 million or anything. We have to look to it.

I urge the support of this resolution.

Mr. McClellan: I would like to speak against adoption of this resolution in the strongest possible way. In recommending that assessment rolls be used as an aid to enumeration the member from St. Andrew-St. Patrick has overlooked, it seems to me, a fairly important matter and that is that assessment rolls don't show the person's citizenship. I am surprised that the member—

Mr. Grossman: It's very simple.

Mr. McClellan: In all cases? I was under the impression that the assessment rolls in the municipality of Metropolitan Toronto did not show citizenship. We may have a stalemate on that. I'll try to argue against it on the grounds of both eventualities. If, as I suspect, the rolls do not show citizenship, then we are faced with enormous problems. My riding, Bellwoods in downtown Toronto, is not dissimilar to St. Andrew-St. Patrick. There are 17,000 households in the riding. One could extrapolate and correlate with the census data that there ought to be between 50,000 and 60,000 eligible voters from that—or somewhere between 40,000 and 60,000, let us say. In fact, there are only close to 20,000 eligible voters by virtue of the citizenship requirement. The situation is the same with respect to citizenship in from 10 to 16 other Metro ridings.

I am not prepared to concede it, but let's assume, for the sake of argument, that citizenship is shown on the assessment rolls. The member has conceded that the rolls are 10 months out of date, or would be 10 months out of date. I am aware that the citizenship courts in this city process in the order of 600 to 700 new citizenship applications every month. So you are talking about some pretty serious omissions even in the event that the assessment rolls do show citizenship, which I believe they do not.

I think that the member's solution to the problem is totally inadequate. I agree that this summer we experienced a bad enumeration; I think there are a number of reasons for that. Maybe I could just touch on some of them briefly.

In the first place, we were subjected to a summer election. And for whatever reasons the Premier decided to go to the polls in the summer, it's obviously a very awkward time to do it. A lot of the dilemmas arose in ridings like those of St. Andrew-St. Patrick where many people were away. That could simply be remedied by a more judicious choice of the time of the vote.

Interjection.

Mr. McClellan: Why one would want to call an election when most people are away, one can surmise for onself. I think as well that after 35 years of Conservative rule—

An hon. member: Thirty-two.

Mr. McClellan: —the DRO—

An hon. member: It's over.

Mr. McClellan: Maybe it is over. The Conservative election apparatus is rusty and creaky and I think a simple look, or perhaps a deep look, at the competence and skills of the DROs is in order at this point in our history.

Third, there are a number of very simple things that can be done to improve the enumerating system as it stands. I think myself that there is no substitute for people going around their own neighbourhood and knocking on doors and developing a list on that basis.

It ought to be possible, very simply—and at one point it was possible—to register voters who had been missed on the enumeration lists on election day by a simple process of swearing-in, on the basis of identification, as an eligible voter. It seems to me that would have solved a lot of the problems that arose last summer if it had been combined with some kind of a reasonable advertising campaign around people's voting rights in a provincial election.

Just to digress briefly, I want to make the point that I think that the black community in Metropolitan Toronto was effectively disenfranchised during the past provincial election by virtue of the fact that it was not made clear, until after the first enumeration who, in fact, was entitled to vote in an Ontario election. There was a lot of confusion as to the status of British subjects or whether Canadian citizenship was required in order to vote. There never was a clear statement of eligibility to vote in the provincial campaign. It turned out that there was a list of about 42 countries, citizenship from which was sufficient to provide eligibility in the election.

I am suggesting that a massive advertising campaign about people's voting rights is more than in order, it is required out of necessity, particulary in our more cosmopolitan urban areas. That kind of a programme could do much to deal with the problem of people being left off by virtue of failure to know about their rights.

[5:45]

I think one of the speakers—I can't remember which one—already mentioned a much more effective way of advertising the voters' lists namely by mailing the preliminary list to every household. Surely we have moved beyond the time when we can pretend that posting a preliminary list on a lamp post in an urban area is going to mean anything except that a bunch of kids are going to tear it down within 45 minutes. It is such a simple

thing that could be done; it could be done easily and effectively.

There are some real problems about the enumeration but I think that the resolution before us is curiously inept and doesn't speak at all to the problem. One could speculate—I won't speculate—but I think that a more serious review of the whole question is clearly in order. Again I want to go back to my original point that I think the citizenship aspect is an important one and that the measure ought to be thrown out on that basis, and I wish we could get a conclusive statement on this—that citizenship is not shown on the assessment rolls.

Mr. G. I. Miller: I really can't support the resolution as it has been presented. I think there are many merits in the fact that it should be reviewed. I don't think we should have enumerations going on four times in one particular year. It does seem a waste of the taxpayers' money and I think I could support anything that would make it more efficient.

As far as the enumeration is concerned, it can be used in many ways on an assessment roll. I think it could be of benefit to our area municipalities. I was a regional councillor before I was elected as member for Haldimand-Norfolk. There was considerable discussion that we didn't have an up-to-date assessment roll determining how many people were in our area and consequently, our grants being based on this, there was considerable discussion from this side that we were losing money on behalf of the municipalities.

I think if it was updated once a year and then used for all elections, if this would be possible, it would be a step in the right direction. It could benefit both the area municipalities as well as the voter himself. I think we have to devise a method whereby we can get as many voters out on election day to make use of their franchise. I think it has to be important to our democratic system that we encourage as many voters to vote as possible. I think, too, there should be provisions made so that the handicapped voters could vote at an outside poll.

We can discuss it at great length today, but I think it would have to come back to a committee of the whole House and it will take a tremendous amount of study, so that perhaps it could be simplified and be of benefit to all areas of government. This is what I would like to see happen.

As far as a 30-day election goes, in a rural riding, I think you need all the time. I know from my experience, one certainly couldn't cover one's riding in 37 days. I think it is a time when you can asssess the pulse of the people you represent and I think you should take advantage of this. Thirty days wouldn't give you the time needed, especially in rural ridings. Basically, I think some of the ideas are good, but I think it should be reviewed by a committee from all parties that would come in with recommendations.

Mr. Speaker: Does the member for Windsor-Walkerville wish to speak on this?

Mr. B. Newman: Yes, I would like to, Mr. Speaker. Having been one of the members of the committee—

Mr. Speaker: I might point out that another member wishes to speak and if you wish you could split the time between the two of you. That would probably be acceptable. The member for Windsor-Walkerville may continue.

Mr. B. Newman: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Being one of the members who revised the present Election Act, I would like to give the members of the House some of the experiences we did have. We found no jurisdiction that has a more up-to-date voters' list than do the Canadian jurisdictions and the provinces, and that is as a result of our enumeration being so close to the election. We could have permanent voters' lists but they would be extremely expensive to maintain. You would need another staff of bureaucrats, simply to look after that, and even in jurisdictions that do have them, they find it is a real headache and extremely costly.

One of the members made mention of having the voters' lists distributed to the householders. The suggestion is good, but you can't use the householders at all because you are dealing with individual polls and, as a result, you are liable to have poll 1 voting into an area that is part of poll 2 and part of poll 3.

What I would suggest instead is to give additional authority to the enumerators and pay them so that they could actually distribute the voters' lists, not to those who are on the voters' list but to every single household within the individual poll in which they were assigned the enumerating. It is extremely important that we get the voters' lists out to those who are not on the lists. For those who are on the lists, there is no problem there whatsoever.

Also, other responsibilities could be given to the enumerators, such as to distribute, during the course of the election, notices of special enumeration which would likewise go to every individual, and these could go through householder mailing, so that those who have been left off the voters' lists would

know just exactly where they could go to have their names included. That would entail additional expense because the enumerators would have to be paid accordingly for this extra work.

One of the bad features concerning the use of assessment rolls has already been mentioned by the member for Victoria-Haliburton—that a lot of individuals would have been left off the voters' lists, especially students and younger members of the family. I would think that one of the things we should be looking forward to is making it as easy as possible for the citizen to exercise his franchise. The citizen I am looking at is the one who is handicapped.

Too often, polling subdivisions are selected in areas that are practically inaccessible except to the Tarzan or one who is extremely well physically. The handicapped who have difficulty manipulating a wheelchair or whose chair will not get through a door, who have to be carried downstairs to a basement or upstairs to the second floor of a church or a club hall are really being punished.

In my estimation the government should consider drive-in voting where the individual would be driven in the car to the location of the polling station. Exactly as we have drive-in banking, we would have drive-in voting and there is no problem with that whatsoever. I think it could readily be made practical and it would facilitate the ability to vote of the individual who is handicapped.

I also think that immediately after a general election—just as we always have redistribution after every census so to speak—a committee should be set up to look into the Election Act. It should be an all-party committee so that at that time, when all these ideas are fresh in our minds, we could improve the Election Act and make procedures simpler and better for all concerned.

I think I have taken up more than my fair share of the time. I give these thoughts to those who have the idea that the use of the assessment rolls is the answer to the thing. It just doesn't work in other jurisdictions.

Mr. Speaker: A moment ago we split the time between two. I really should have let—

Mr. Kennedy: Is it our turn, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Hodgson: Okay, we will yield.

Mr. Speaker: Maybe you can each take a minute.

Mr. Moffatt: Maybe, we could split the time between the two of us. I wanted to add to what has been said.

The comments of the member for Windsor-Walkerville, I think, do have some merit in them. I don't see how the assessment roles can be used in the fashion suggested here, really, to do any of the things the hon. member hoped would happen with this particular bill. I cannot see the costs being cut with the use of assessment rolls as an aid, and it very clearly says aid.

I would suggest, because his comments were general, that the general comment I heard most often expressed with regard to people being disenfranchised in the last election was that the advance polling date was not advanced far enough to be of any general significance or consequence to those people who were going to be out of town. I would have appreciated it if the member had attacked that particular part of the problem—

Mr. Grossman: It's in my private member's bill.

Mr. Moffatt: Okay. That particular part of the problem, it seems to me, is one which needs to be very carefully looked at and I think changes could be made there.

Mr. Kennedy: I commend my colleagues and all members of the House for their contribution on this. I want to say quickly, as I see using the assessment roll, that assessment records a property not a person. Properties don't vote, but people do. One looks at an assessment roll and sees A. G. and F. C. Brown, say. Who are they? Is it a man or a woman? Are they eligible?

I agree the hon. members are on the right track to expedite and facilitate voting. It is quite surprising the number who, for one reason or another, are disenfranchised. I think of those who were away for our own election and it seemed to me that September was the biggest holiday month of all, exceeding even July and August. I do think we should look at an advanced poll in advance of the current one, if you like, or else a broadening of the use of proxies. I think if a person happens to have booked a flight to go on vacation—we wouldn't go to some exotic island to get a proxy from him although I wouldn't mind—there should be some provision that if they are leaving 15 or 20 days or some such number of days in advance of the election, they would not be disenfranchised because they are going to be away for two weeks. They are going to be back. Say it runs to being four-year government—they shouldn't be dis-

enfranchised. I also support the comments suggesting the handicapped should be able to register their vote more easily.

Mr. Grossman: Mr. Speaker, on a point of privilege. I think perhaps the impression has been abounding in the chamber that some criticism is meant of the persons running the system at the present time. I want to re-affirm my own opinion that those persons running the present system—the Clerk of House, wearing his other hat, and the other persons charged with that duty—are running it as efficiently and as effectively as it could possibly be run. I think this House owes a vote of thanks to those who run the system as it is presently set out.

Mr. Speaker: This item is discharged from the order paper.

Hon. Mr. Welch: I think we all agree it has been a very interesting discussion about a very complicated issue.

Before moving the adjournment of the House may I indicate that tomorrow we will hopefully complete the second reading debate on Bill 20. Assuming that we have second reading of that bill and there is still some time, we will then go into committee of the whole House to deal with legislation which is in the committee.

Wednesday, of course, is a committee day and there will be no House. On Thursday, we will go into committee of supply and carry on with estimates. I think we start with the Provincial Secretary for Social Development.

To accommodate the Minister of Revenue (Mr. Meen), if we do get into committee of the whole House tomorrow, we will start with Bill 8; we will not do Bill 4 because the Minister of Energy (Mr. Timbrell) is in estimates. We will do Bills 8, 2, 3, 6 and 7.

Hon. Mr. Welch moved the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to.

The House adjourned at 6 p.m.

ERRATUM

No.	Page	Col.	Line	Should read:
5	163	2	9, 10	creased in the Don Jail this year by 35 correctional officers; five in Brampton and 60 at

PARLIAMENTARY ASSISTANTS

Mr. F. Drea	Assistant to the Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations
Mr. R. G. Eaton	Assistant to the Minister of Agriculture and Food
Mr. D. A. Evans	Assistant to the Minister of Transportation and Communications
Mr. W. Hodgson	Assistant to the Minister without Portfolio and Chairman of Cabinet
Mr. N. G. Leluk	Assistant to the Minister of Culture and Recreation
Mr. L. Maeck	Assistant to the Minister of Education
Mr. D. J. Wiseman	Assistant to the Minister of Health
Mr. P. J. Yakabuski	Assistant to the Minister of Natural Resources

CONTENTS

Monday, November 17, 1975

Oil and gas prices, questions of Mr. Timbrell: Mr. Lewis, Mr. Nixon, Mr. Makarchuk, Mr. Bullbrook 607

Toronto teachers' negotiations, questions of Mr. Davis: Mr. Lewis, Mr. Nixon, Mr. Foulds 608

Mississauga inquiry, question of Mr. McMurtry: Mr. Singer 611

Flood damage, questions of Mr. Bernier: Mr. Singer, Mr. G. I. Miller 612

Spadina extension subsidy, question of Mr. Snow: Mr. Singer 612

Violence in hockey, questions of Mr. McMurtry: Mr. Eaton, Mr. Shore 612

Darlington generating station, questions of Mr. Davis and Mr. Timbrell: Mr. Moffatt 613

Rondeau Provincial Park home leases, questions of Mr. Bernier: Mr. Spence, Mr. Good 613

Metro Toronto highway signing, question of Mr. Snow: Mr. Williams 614

Minimum wage, question of B. Stephenson: Mr. Samis 614

Wintario funds, question of Mr. Welch: Mr. Kerrio 615

Mortgage interest tax credit, question of Mr. McKeough: Mr. Leluk 615

Health study of asbestos workers, question of Mr. F. S. Miller: Mrs. Sandeman 615

Great Lakes water levels, question of Mr. Bernier: Mr. Haggerty 616

Youth employment opportunities, question of Mr. Davis: Mr. Deans 616

Daycare budget, question of Mr. Taylor: Mr. McClellan 616

Griffith Island hunting lodge, question of Mr. Bernier: Mr. B. Newman 617

Corporations Tax Act, question of Mr. Meen: Mrs. Bryden 617

Intern student payments, question of Mr. F. S. Miller: Mr. S. Smith 617

Estimates, Ministry of Health, Mr. F. S. Miller, concluded 618

Private members' hour 642

Resolution No. 3, on use of assessment roles for enumeration purposes, Mr. Grossman, Mr. Warner, Mr. Eakins, Mr. Jones, Mr. McClellan, Mr. G. I. Miller, Mr. B. Newman, Mr. Moffatt, Mr. Kennedy 642

Motion to adjourn, Mr. Welch, agreed to 652

SPEAKERS IN THIS ISSUE

Angus, I. (Fort William NDP)
Bernier, Hon. L. Natural Resources (Kenora PC)
Breithaupt, J. R. (Kitchener L)
Bullbrook, J. E. (Sarnia L)
Bryden, M. (Beaches-Woodbine NDP)
Campbell, M. (St. George L)
Cunningham, E. (Wentworth North L)
Davis, Hon. W. G. Premier (Brampton PC)
Deans, I. (Wentworth NDP)
Dukszta, J. (Parkdale NDP)
Eakins, J. (Victoria-Haliburton L)
Eaton, R. G. (Middlesex PC)
Ferrier, W. (Cochrane South NDP)
Foulds, J. F. (Port Arthur NDP)
Gaunt, M. (Huron-Bruce L)
Godfrey, C. (Durham West NDP)
Good, E. R. (Waterloo North L)
Grossman, L. (St. Andrew-St. Patrick PC)
Haggerty, R. (Erie L)
Henderson, Hon. L. C. Minister without Portfolio (Lambton PC)
Hodgson, W. (York North PC)
Jones, T. (Mississauga North PC)
Kennedy, R. D. (Mississauga South PC)
Kerrio, V. (Niagara Falls L)
Lawlor, P. D. (Lakeshore NDP)
Leluk, N. G. (York West PC)
Lewis, S. Leader of the Opposition (Scarborough West NDP)
Makarchuk, M. (Brantford NDP)
McClellan, R. (Bellwoods NDP)
McKeough, Hon. W. D. Treasurer, Minister of Economics and Intergovernmental Affairs (Chatham-Kent PC)
McMurtry, Hon. R. Attorney General (Eglinton PC)
Meen, Hon. A. K. Revenue (York East PC)
Miller, Hon. F. S. Health (Muskoka PC)
Miller, G. I. (Haldimand-Norfolk L)
Moffatt, D. (Durham East NDP)
Newman, B. (Windsor-Walkerville L)
Nixon, R. F. (Brant-Oxford-Norfolk L)
Philip, E. (Etobicoke NDP)
Reid, T. P. (Rainy River L)
Riddell, J. (Huron-Middlesex L)
Ruston, R. F. (Essex North L)
Samis, G. (Cornwall NDP)
Sandeman, G. (Peterborough NDP)
Shore, M. (London North L)
Singer, V. M. (Wilson Heights L)
Smith, S. (Hamilton West L)
Snow, Hon. J. W. Transportation and Communications (Oakville PC)
Spence, J. P. (Kent-Elgin L)
Stephenson, Hon. B. Labour (York Mills PC)
Sweeney, J. (Kitchener-Wilmot L)
Taylor, Hon. J. A. Minister of Community and Social Services (Prince Edward-Lennox PC)
Timbrell, Hon. D. R. Energy (Don Mills PC)
Warner, D. (Scarborough-Ellesmere NDP)
Welch, Hon. R. Culture and Recreation (Brock PC)
Williams, J. (Oriole PC)
Yakabuski, P. J. (Renfrew South PC)
Young, F. (Yorkview NDP)

No. 17



Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT — DAILY EDITION

First Session of the Thirtieth Legislature

Tuesday, November 18, 1975

Afternoon Session

Speaker: Honourable Russell Daniel Rowe
Clerk: Roderick Lewis, QC

THE QUEEN'S PRINTER
PARLIAMENT BUILDINGS, TORONTO
1975



CONTENTS

A list of the speakers taking part in the debates in this issue of Hansard appears, in alphabetical order, at the back of this issue.

Daily contents of proceedings also appears at the back of this issue. Reference to a cumulative index of previous issues can be obtained by calling the Hansard Reporting Service indexing staff. Phone 965-2159.

Hansard subscription price is $15.00 per session, from: Sessional Subscription Service, MGS, 9th Floor, Ferguson Block, Parliament Bldgs., Toronto, M7A 1N3. Phone 965-2238.

LEGISLATURE OF ONTARIO

TUESDAY, NOVEMBER 18, 1975

The House met at 2 p.m.

Prayers.

Mr. Worton: Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to introduce 50 grade 10 students from Guelph Collegiate Vocational Institute along with their teachers, Mr. Ross Harding and Mr. Arthur Barnes.

Mr. Grossman: Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to introduce to the House the Adult Day School from Dundas St. West in the city of Toronto, in my riding. They are accompanied by Sister Mary Alexander, Chris Fraser, Gerry Fink and Sonia Ernest. They are 50 adults attending this very important class and I've assured them that they will have the pleasure of observing our very well disciplined question period. Would you please welcome them?

Mr. Deans: Mr. Speaker, I would like to introduce 50 students from Lawfield Public School in Hamilton, with Mrs. Becker, their teacher, and with my son, who, in the tradition of this House, will no doubt have a seat here some day.

Mr. Warner: Mr. Speaker, I introduce to the House grade 13 students from Winston Churchill Collegiate in that thriving, beautiful borough of Scarborough. Would you welcome them, please?

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of personal privilege. In the Toronto Sun this morning there is a story headlined, "Hunting Lodge Raided." I noted in the story that I am listed as on of the illustrious members of this particular exclusive private hunting lodge. I would like to draw to your attention and to the attention of the Sun reporter—

Mr. Roy: You say you can't afford it?

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: —that I am not a member of that lodge. I am not a hunter. I will accept the adjective "illustrious" but the rest is not correct.

Mr. Martel: You have got the right class.

Mr. Speaker: Let the record stand corrected.

Statements by the ministry.

HIGHWAY TRAFFIC ACT AMENDMENTS

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, two of the major problems facing all Canadians today are the energy crisis and the soaring number of deaths and injuries resulting from traffic accidents. Our consumption of motor fuels has reached a staggering 3.8 billion gal. annually, while over 1,200 people die in motor vehicle accidents every 12 months. It annually costs an estimated $90 million in direct OHIP charges alone for medical treatment for the injured.

In light of these disturbing figures and in an effort to achieve sizable savings in lives, dollars and fuel, we propose to take two significant steps. Firstly, we propose to amend the regulation of the Highway Traffic Act, reducing the 70-miles-per-hour limit on Ontario's 662 miles of freeways to 60 miles per hour for automobiles and commercial vehicles. At the same time, 60-miles-per-hour highways considered part of the King's highway system will be reduced to 50 miles per hour. In addition, any King's highway now designated as 55 miles per hour will be reduced to 50 for all vehicle traffic. We shall be asking the municipalities to take similar action.

Secondly, the Minister of Transportation and Communications (Mr. Snow) later this afternoon will introduce an amendment to the Highway Traffic Act to require the mandatory use of seatbelts in all motor vehicles which are equipped with them. Exemptions will be provided for such situations as children under two years of age; persons holding a physician's certificate stating the reason they are unable to wear a seatbelt, and persons required by the nature of their work to enter and leave their vehicles frequently. Section 147 (2) of the Act is to be amended to exempt owners of motor vehicles from liability in respect of the wearing of seatbelts when they are not driving the motor vehicles.

I must add that by definition the term seatbelt is legally taken to include the so-called shoulder harness if it is part of the equipment installed in the vehicle.

The lower speed limits, at least on the freeways and the entire King's Highway system, will go into effect just as soon as an order in council can be passed and arrangements can be made by the Ministry of Transportation and Communications to alter the signs. The new legislation will apply to all drivers using Ontario highways, whether they come from out of the province or out of the country. It will become law, effective Jan. 1, assuming passage by all members of this House, on New Year's Day, 1976.

Mr. Roy: Mr. Speaker, we will be supporting this resolution. It only took a year to convince the government of this.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

PCB CONTROL

Hon. Mr. Kerr: Mr. Speaker, in Ontario we have been aware of the hazardous propensities—

Interjections.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Hon. Mr. Kerr: —of polychlorinated biphenyls, commonly known as PCBs, since the late 1960s and my ministry has already taken active measures to control and to eliminate eventually this hazardous contaminant from industrial use.

Today I am serving notice to industry operating in Ontario that it should begin its search for alternative, harmless materials to replace PCBs in products. As Minister of the Environment, I can no longer permit this environmental hazard to continue when substitute materials are available. Through the co-operation of national and international agencies concerned with environmental protection, there is no reason why we can't eliminate the use and importation of PCBs in Ontario as soon as possible.

PCBs are a class of man-made chemicals which are resistant to chemical change, stable under heat, non-flammable, non-corrosive to metals, low in volatility, low in water solubility and high in electrical resistance. Because of these properties, PCBs were used from the mid-1930s until about 1970 in three general types of industrial application:

1. Open-end applications, such as paints, specialty inks, paper coatings and plastics.

2. Nominally closed applications, such as the working fluid in hydraulic or heat transfer systems.

3. Closed electrical systems, as the insulating fluid in certain kinds of transformers and capacitors.

In 1970, through the inspection procedures and influence of my ministry, the use of PCBs in Ontario was limited to closed systems only and their use in open applications and in hydraulic and heat systems was restricted.

In the late 1960s it was discovered that one of the industrial virtues of PCBs, their resistance to chemical change, led to persistence in the environment. Further developments were biomagnification and accumulation in the food chains of fish and wildlife. Because of these factors, evidence has accumulated which indicates that these compounds are a hazard to certain species of wildlife with real implications of adverse health effects on humans. The Ministry of Health is monitoring international research on health effects to provide Ontario with the most current information on which we can base government action.

We know that past usage has resulted in the existence of PCBs in various levels of trace concentration in the environment and it is likely to be a considerable time before control actions provide measurable improvement. We also know that the potential toxicity of PCBs is well established and that reproductive failure and mortality in herring gulls around Lake Ontario have been attributed to PCBs. It is an insidious product. Consideration of the possible long-term effects is important.

It's the things we don't know—and can only suspect and investigate—which concern us. Before the cutback in use of PCBs, before the world was aware of a problem, transformers and capacitors, filled with PCBs, and adhesives, upholstery, inks and a host of other products containing trace levels of these chemicals, were used and disposed of in incinerators and landfill sites. We have unconfirmed reports that some PCBs are still entering the environment from these and other sources. On top of all this, there is some concern that PCBs from sources around the world are migrating throughout the global environment via both water and air.

However, I assure the members that my ministry is seeking answers in these unknown areas, and that we have taken these steps in dealing with the known situation:

First of all, we established a task force in 1970 which has reviewed sources of PCBs to determine control measures.

Second, extensive monitoring has been undertaken to determine the occurrence, distribution and concentrations of these substances in the environment.

Third, industrial plants using PCBs have been inspected and control facilities improved to eliminate discharges to the environment.

PCBs are not manufactured in Canada. Monsanto Industrial Chemicals Co., a US firm, is the only North American producer of these chemicals. The company agreed to sell only to electrical transformer and capacitor manufacturers and to large users of this equipment, such as Ontario Hydro, restricting uses of PCBs to enclosed systems with no discharge to the environment. The ministry has inspected and monitored all former and current Monsanto customers to ensure that their control systems are satisfactory. The few deficient systems we found have been cleaned up.

I wish to add that the staff of my ministry are consistently checking all known sources of PCBs to ensure that control measures are effective. All PCB users now return scrap or waste to Monsanto for disposal or ship it to the Chemtrol disposal facility in Lewiston, New York. Ontario Hydro stockpiles equipment at the Kipling Ave. depot for subsequent disposal at the Chemtrol facility. I have asked the staff of my ministry to keep watch on these disposal sites to ensure that equipment is being properly safeguarded in the disposal process.

[2:15]

This is not just a matter of abatement at the provincial level for Ontario sources but a matter of international concern. The International Joint Commission has recommended the development of standards and remedial measures. Recently, the Great Lakes basin commission recommended banning the industrial use of polychlorinated biphenyls. The eight states and 12 federal agencies represented are asking the US Congress to approve this ban and pass a bill to classify PCBs as prohibited hazardous substances.

In Ontario and throughout the world there is a huge capital investment in essential equipment—controlled, closed systems such as transformers and capacitors which employ PCBs. Replacing this equipment with new and larger units, using less hazardous substances, will take time and require the expenditure of large sums. This, however, is not my concern as Minister of the Environment. My concern is that in Ontario and in Canada industry stop using PCBs as soon as possible and that other harmless materials be substituted.

Our investigations into the distribution of PCBs in the environment are continuing. Some 350 samples of sediments, lake waters, water life, sewage treatment plant, power plant and industrial effluents and rain water have been taken for PCB analysis.

We have given first priority in analysis to fish samples taken by the Ministry of Natural Resources and an announcement was made recently by the Ministry of Health on the elevated levels found in cohoe salmon taken in the Credit River this year. Approximately 50 per cent of the current samples showed levels of PCBs in excess of the existing US guideline of five parts per million for human consumption. Yesterday the Department of National Health and Welfare announced a temporary guideline of two parts per million for PCBs in fish.

We are working as closely as possible with federal agencies at both technical and ministerial levels on all matters associated with this industrial compound. Environment Canada is going to regulate PCBs under the federal Environmental Contaminants Act. This Act has had its third reading and is now before the standing committee of the Senate. I look forward to early proclamation of that Act as a step toward the elimination of PCBs from industrial usage in this country. However, I must emphasize that a necessary complementary step must be further federal action to control the importation of these compounds from any source.

Mr. Speaker: Oral questions.

OIL AND GAS PRICES

Mr. Lewis: A question if I may, Mr. Speaker, of the Minister of Energy. How does he explain the apparent behaviour, as documented in the press today, of British Petroleum as a major oil company in its clear violation of the limits which he imposed when the price freeze on the sale of gasoline was removed? What does he intend to do about the discrepancies all around Metropolitan Toronto and apparently throughout southern Ontario as a result of BPs behaviour at least?

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: Mr. Speaker, my deputy minister is at present trying to contact the vice-president of BP in Ontario, Mr. Mitchell. I understand the Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations (Mr. Handleman) will be contacting the president of BP Canada Ltd. which, as you know, is 70 per cent owned by the government of England. That's Mr. Derek Mitchell.

Mr. Lewis: Would you like us to contact Harold for you? We would be pleased to try.

Can I ask the minister how is it that in the pricing of gasoline in Ontario, representatives of oil companies—I have the price notifications in my hand—can arbitrarily jack up prices eight and nine cents a gallon when the minister has put a limit on it and then, in a matter of minutes, change the price listings on the form lowering them by two or three cents? What is there that is so capricious and wilful about pricing in the oil industry—at gasoline pumps and in home heating fuel—that he will allow these companies to get away with this kind of consumer gouging without passing legislation to restrict it?

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: I think the government's position on this is very well known and very clear.

Mr. Martel: We don't believe you.

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: We indicated to all of the companies the government's feelings about prices after the expiration of the freeze; namely, 5.4 cents on motor gasoline and 4.8 cents on home heating oil. What has not been determined—and this is why my deputy is trying to contact the president of the company for Canada—it is to determine whether the material that you have—and I have copies of that same material—results from a directive from the head office of the company. If it is, and they are clearly in violation of the government's guidelines—

Mr. Lewis: What would you do?

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: —then if they will not roll it back, we will then have to take some action.

Mr. Nixon: A supplementary question: Would the minister not agree that one can't blame the company for taking those actions since there is no regulation or law which prohibits it, and that the minister must move—whatever BP does in response to his inquiries—by legislation or by empowering the Ontario Energy Board, to have continuing regulation of these prices?

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: Once again, the member for Brant-Oxford-Norfolk—or whatever it is; southwestern Ontario—is prepared to forget about the fact that we have a royal commission; that the commissioner will complete his work within the next three or four months and that we will have his findings on that.

Mrs. Campbell: So are the oil companies.

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: We are not prepared to move on that question until we have the findings and his recommendations.

Mr. Nixon: You will have to move.

Mr. Bullbrook: Let them gouge until February, is that it?

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: The member asks, should we do it because BP may be breaking the spirit of the government's guidelines?

Mr. Nixon: It doesn't matter what their response is.

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: We want to determine, first of all, if this is because of the activities of somebody lower down the totem pole, if you will, in the field, or whether it has come from Montreal. If it has come from Montreal, then we can do something about it.

Interjections.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Mr. Nixon: It is probably the Prime Minister.

Mr. Breithaupt: They don't return your call.

Mr. Nixon: This is a nationalized company now.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Wilson Heights, with a supplementary.

Mr. Singer: Has the minister received from his own officials—

Mr. Nixon: Those of the economy—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. We may be a little out of order here. Perhaps we better have the member for Wentworth first.

Mr. Deans: I would like to ask the minister whether he intends to pursue the statement that came out of Montreal today, as reported in the press, that they can raise it whatever they like, there is no regulation in the Province of Ontario?

Mr. Singer: That's right.

Mrs. Campbell: That's true.

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: Again, until we have some indication from the more senior people; namely, the president of the company—

Mr. Deans: Come on, he doesn't raise the prices and you know it!

Mr. Lewis: It is just carte blanche as far as you are concerned.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: I have indicated today and on previous days that we will do what we can to, first of all, encourage them to live within our guidelines. If that can't be done—

Mr. Nixon: Oh baloney.

Mr. Samis: Oh, come on.

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: —I know that all you over there have this great penchant for regulation of anything and everything—that if they will not live within the guidelines then we will have to act through legislation.

Mr. Deans: How do you return the money to the consumers who have been gouged in the meantime?

Mr. Martel: Sinclair was right.

Mr. Lewis: You are in trouble with these oil prices again.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. We will have a final supplementary on this question from the member for Wilson Heights.

Mr. Singer: Has the minister received from his own officials or from the law officers of the Crown, or sought from either of those civil servants, an opinion as to whether or not the actions by this company are in breach of the combines legislation as contained in the Criminal Code? If he hasn't received the opinion yet, is he now seeking such an opinion?

Mr. Renwick: That will certainly help the consumer in Ontario.

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: I have asked my staff to give me an opinion on that.

Mr. Lewis: Does it not bother the minister that prices are set in this fashion—raised a cent and down a cent arbitrarily by representatives—when each cent across the board represents $45 million more out of the pockets of the consumers of Ontario? Does he not think he should now have legislation indicating in a tough regulatory way what he will do with any company which violates his guidelines by 1/10 of one cent?

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: I think that the position of this government and its concern about petroleum prices is well known, going back as long as I have been in the Ministry of Energy, and our position that we took—

Mr. Roy: You wouldn't hazard an opinion yourself, would you?

Mr. Lewis: Does it not bother you?

Mr. Speaker: Any further questions?

Mr. Lewis: Yes. I would like to ask the Minister of Energy—

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: I would like to finish my answer, Mr. Speaker. Because of the babbling over there I couldn't finish it.

Mr. Breithaupt: Fighting Dennis.

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: The fact of the matter is that we lead the fight in this country—

Mr. Good: When are you going to grow up?

Mr. Lewis: Nonsense, nonsense.

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: We lead the fight in this country to try to stop petroleum product increases.

Mr. Good: You people set the way.

Interjections.

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: The fact of the matter is that it was the federal government with the support of the producing provinces—including, I remind members, two NDP provinces —which forced the increase in the basic cost of crude oil which has resulted in these petroleum product price increases.

Hon. Mr. Irvine: That's right.

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: It is not nonsense, it is fact.

Interjections.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. That's the sort of question which becomes argumentative and requires practically the same answer. Does the member have further questions?

Mr. Lewis: Only argumentative in the reply. May I ask the minister, as part of his leading the fight or the war or whatever it is on behalf of the consumers of Ontario, did he realize, subsequent to the estimates committee discussion of his ministry, yesterday afternoon, that a survey of the prices in northern Ontario conducted yesterday—which we confirmed again this morning—shows that the regular gas price at Goganda is today 88.9; at Hornepayne 92.9; at Gogama 92.3; at Keewatin 91.9; at Marathon 94.3; ranging upwards to 99.9 cents a gallon for unleaded?

An hon. member: For unleaded?

Mr. Lewis: For unleaded. Does the minister not think (a) this nefarious scheme

achieved by the government of Ontario to take money from consumers of the north should be examined town by town to see if his limits were exceeded; and (b) special protection by way of a freeze must be given to northern Ontario since he will do nothing apparently until the winter is over?

Mr. MacDonald: One member of the cabinet is acclaiming that.

Hon. Mr. Bernier: Yes.

Mr. Lewis: What will the minister do about this split in the cabinet?

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: Mr. Speaker, I indicated in committee that I do not think that—

Mr. Foulds: You don't think, that's the problem.

Interjections.

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: Mr. Speaker, I am reminded of an expression told to me by one of the students when I was a teacher at Don Mills Junior High School: Sarcasm is not wit, it is merely the babbling of a diseased mind. That student had a rather good point six or seven years ago.

Mr. S. Smith: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, if the minister will not respond to the question—

Interjections.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. Any question which asks "Do you think" and "Do you not think" is really not asking for information. It is offering suggestions and debating. We are allowing the minister to answer this but if we had fewer interjections we could get on with the normal question period.

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: Mr. Speaker, I indicated in committee that I could not in all good conscience recommend—

Interjections.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The hon. minister.

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: —I could not in all good conscience recommend a freeze for one part of the province and not the other. As I have said—and I repeat it again—I do not rule out the possibility of a complete freeze for the whole of the province again if we are not able to get the complete co-operation of the companies.

Mr. Breithaupt: While the minister is reviewing the exceptional price differentials between northern and southern Ontario, would he review as well the clear differential which exists between those service stations servicing 401 with their captive market and the rates in adjoining communities?

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: If the hon. member would take the time to read Hansard of estimates committee or if he would look at Hansard toward the end of the last parliament, before July 18, he would find very clear references to the fact that I, and the government, have asked the commissioner to look at price differentials—

Mr. Shore: What is happening tomorrow?

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: —particularly between northern and southern Ontario but, for that matter, the whole of the province.

Mr. Breithaupt: Further supplementary, can the minister advise us what the commissioner has done in those three months?

Mr. Foulds: Supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

Interjection.

Mr. Speaker: If members wait until they are called, they would be in the right order. The member for Port Arthur.

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: With respect, Mr. Speaker, I think the member for Kitchener had a supplementary which I heard.

Mr. Speaker: The member did have a supplementary?

Mr. Roy: Mr. Speaker, it is going to come as a surprise to you but you are running this House.

An hon. member: Are you the Speaker?

[2:30]

Mr. Foulds: Can the minister explain or tell us why he cannot at this time indicate a government policy that would equalize prices of gasoline between north and south—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Mr. Foulds: —which would treat all motorists in the province equally?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. It becomes a debate when there's a series of questions which get into the whole field of the pricing of oil or whatever it might be. It's the same as a debate that takes place in the estimates committee, and this is not the function of question period. I would remind you again, the debate shouldn't be carried on at this

time. It should be a question for information, please.

Mr. Bullbrook: Why don't you rule that way once in a while?

Mr. Speaker: If you have a question based on the original answer, that's fine. It had to do with pricing in northern Ontario; it was not a general policy question whatsoever. That is not the sort of question that is suitable as a supplementary. Now the member for Kitchener. Is his a proper supplementary?

Mr. Breithaupt: I did not ask for a supplementary.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. We're wasting time but I'll hear the member for Port Arthur on his point of order.

Mr. Foulds: It has always been my understanding that a question beginning with the word "why" was in fact an interrogative. It has always been my understanding, with great respect, Mr. Speaker—

Mr. Singer: Sit down.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Mr. Foulds: —that it was our job to find out the policy of the government.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The hon. member is debating. The questions are supposed to be for information.

Mr. Roy: Hasn't your leader told you that yet?

Mr. Speaker: Secondly, the supplementaries, if any, are supposed to be related to the answer that was given. "Why" starts an interrogative question; that's true, but it needn't necessarily be related to the original question. Just because it's got a "why" in front of it doesn't necessarily mean it's in order. Now, please, we're wasting time.

Mr. Foulds: With great respect, it happens to be a matter of great importance.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The Speaker has the floor.

Mr. Singer: That's right. Name him.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The original question by the Leader of the Opposition, as I recall it, and it was some time ago now, had to do with the pricing in northern Ontario. Asking a question on the general policy of the government is not supplementary to that question really. It's a new question.

Mr. Bullbrook: You are absolutely right.

Mr. Foulds: With great respect, Mr. Speaker, the question was specifically about equalization of prices between north and south which relates to the—

Mr. Roy: Your point of order is not debatable.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. Now you're debating with the Speaker.

An hon. member: Throw him out.

Mr. Speaker: It had to do with "is the government going to have a general policy?" I remember the question very clearly.

Mr. Bullbrook: The Speaker is on his feet. Sit down.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The hon. member knows he's supposed to sit down when the Speaker is speaking.

Interjections.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. There is one point of order to deal with now. Does the hon. minister have a point of order?

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: I think it might assist, Mr. Speaker, if I pointed out that the question was answered in estimates committee yesterday afternoon.

Mr. Martel: That was a nothing answer.

Mr. Speaker: Is there a further supplementary to the original question or can we get on with new questions? The Leader of the Opposition.

TORONTO TEACHERS' NEGOTIATIONS

Mr. Lewis: One short question to the Minister of Education: What substance is there to the rumour about the parties in the Metropolitan Toronto teachers' dispute coming back to the bargaining table; and how is that being effected?

Hon. Mr. Wells: I am happy to tell my friend and the House that there are definitely clear signs that the talks will be resuming. I expect that there will be some announcement about this in the next day or so.

Mr. Deans: Next day or so?

Hon. Mr. Wells: I have been talking to both Mr. Shime, the chairman of the Education Relations Commission, and the chairmen of both negotiating teams. I think we'd all like to see faster action with them all talking again, but I think I can assure the House that action is going on and things are happening that will see talks beginning very shortly.

Mr. Nixon: Supplementary: Are these initiatives being taken by Mr. Dickie or the school board and teachers?

Hon. Mr. Wells: Mr. Dickie is not involved in these initiatives.

Mr. Nixon: Not?

Hon. Mr. Wells: Not.

TOBACCO AUCTION

Mr. Nixon: I would like to ask the Minister of Agriculture and Food if he is prepared to meet with the officials of the Ontario Flue-Cured Tobacco Marketing Board and the representatives of the buyers, as the sale of the $200-million tobacco crop is now at a standstill since auction barns were closed yesterday?

Hon. W. Newman: Mr. Speaker, the Farm Products Marketing Board has been asked by the growers to try to arrange a meeting with the manufacturers' council. We have talked to some of the manufacturers' council and we would anticipate, hopefully, to be able to arrange a meeting this week to deal with the matter.

Mr. Nixon: Supplementary: Would the minister not agree that instead of trying to arrange a meeting with the manufacturers he, as minister, would be well within his rights if he asked or instructed the representatives of the two sides to attend him in his office because it appears that since the manufacturers have raised the price of cigarettes—they tell me by six cents a package—and are now giving a lower price to the farmers, there is something irreconcilable in the marketing procedures as seen by the manufacturers and the Minister of Agriculture and Food has a prime responsibility to set this straight?

Hon. W. Newman: Mr. Speaker, as you know, the growers have a price which they've agreed upon. The bids for tobacco at this point in time are less than the agreed-upon overall average price for the season. Yesterday, the growers closed down the sales and as a result of that, remembering that we have a Tobacco Growers' Marketing Board, they have requested us to see if we can arrange a meeting with the manufacturers' council through our Farm Products Marketing Board, which we are in the process of trying to arrange right now. I think if the growers want further meetings or if the marketing board does, I'd be glad to listen to them at any time. They've asked for this meeting at this point in time. We are trying to set this meeting up to get this matter back on the tracks.

Mr. Nixon: Supplementary, if you'll permit, Mr. Speaker: Does the minister believe this agreement between the growers and the manufacturers for an average 95 cents per pound minimum is binding on the manufacturers? Is it possible that we in this Legislature should take some action to make it binding?

Hon. W. Newman: I don't have any reason at this point in time to feel that the tobacco manufacturing council will not live up to its part of the bargain in the negotiations it had with the tobacco marketing board.

Mr. Moffatt: Would the minister undertake to provide information for the House which would indicate the kind of guarantees he has from the tobacco council which would be passed along to those growers so they will be assured that there will be no crisis in that industry if those barns are being closed?

Hon. W. Newman: As I said we were trying to get the Tobacco Growers' Marketing Board and the manufacturers' council together to discuss this matter. I think they've requested our Farm Products Marketing Board to arrange this meeting and I anticipate they will have a meeting this week. I do not intend to interfere at this point in time until they've had a chance to discuss this matter and have tried to work it out.

Mr. Nixon: I have a question of the Minister of Agriculture and Food on the same subject. How could the minister say there is no indication that the manufacturers—that is, the buyers—are not living up to their agreement when they refuse to pay the 95 cents per pound and, as a matter of fact, are a full 10 cents below that? They refuse to raise their bids up to anywhere near that agreed level and the auction barns are closed. Is the minister further aware that every day those barns are closed means a potential loss of millions of dollars to the farmers concerned and this must be a matter of direct concern to the minister?

Hon. W. Newman: It is very much of direct concern to me and that's why I've been talking to the marketing board about this particular matter. That's why the growers marketing board is very much concerned; that's why they closed it down. They were bidding, I believe, 86 cents and I believe

the price set was 94 cents. That's why they closed it down because they were not bidding up to the full 94 cents.

This is the first round they're on now. We're hopeful, when they get into the second round, which will probably be next week, that matters can be sorted out. The Farm Products Marketing Board is arranging a meeting this week with both sides to try to resolve the matter. I'm fully aware of the growers' concerns in this matter.

Mr. Roy: I think you will have to call Gene Whelan in.

Hon. W. Newman: Yes, sure, he'd—

EGG MARKETING BOARD QUOTAS

Mr. Nixon: I have another question of the same minister. What action is he going to take now that it has apparently been made public that inspectors under the jurisdiction of the Egg Marketing Board have indicated that some members of the board are breaking the regulations which they are enforcing among their competitive colleagues in the egg production business in Ontario?

Hon. W. Newman: I read the Globe and Mail this morning, too, and it was brought to my attention. I'd like to point out two or three things. First, it was our own inspectors —the board's own inspectors—who discovered that some of the directors may be—may be, I say—in violation of quota. Of course, I've not personally seen the report. The report was to be released today. It was released yesterday by one of the members of the board and thus it was in the paper this morning. I have asked for a copy of it and I want to see the facts and figures as they are before I make a final determination.

This morning I met with the Farm Products Marketing Board again to discuss this matter and I've asked them to arrange a meeting with the Egg Producers' Marketing Board as soon as possible. Hopefully again, that meeting will be held this week. Of course, today as members know, the semi-annual meeting of the egg producers is being held here in Toronto and there will be about 200 or 250 egg producers there. I have some of my staff at that meeting monitoring the meeting as it goes on today. Of course, once the Farm Products Marketing people have met with the Egg Producers' Marketing Board, I will review and assess the results of the meeting, and the facts, and the report, and at that point in time I will take any action that is necessary.

Mr. Nixon: Since this group operates under the authority granted by this House, has the minister consulted with the Attorney General (Mr. McMurtry) as to what specific steps should be taken, if, in fact, the members of the board are taking this liberty with the authority granted by this House?

Hon. W. Newman: The Egg Producers' Marketing Board has a certain authority to ask the Farm Products Marketing Board for the right of seizure, if it wishes to ask for that at this point in time. That's why I want to see all the facts because it's been alleged in the paper that six of the 13 members of the board are over quota. In one case—I'll only give you a small example—in a flock of 10,000 hens he has something like 50 some hens over. It's over, but as you know hens do die each day and they are replaced and it's not quite that easy to keep within the one or two they are supposed to. So once I get all the facts before me and I have talked to the Farm Products Marketing Board, we will have a full report and I will take any necessary action that needs to be done.

GRIFFITH ISLAND HUNTING LODGE

Mr. Nixon: A question of the Premier: Did it concern him as much as it did the Minister of Housing (Mr. Rhodes) and the rest of us—the stories associated with this little enclave on Griffith Island in Georgian Bay? Has he made any inquiries as to how these people could get away with flouting the game and fish laws; how they could, in fact, be serving intoxicating beverages without having a club licence; how, in fact, they could have armed guards around the island so that casual boaters could not land on it; and how, in fact, there could be members of the Premier's own party—in fact, former cabinet colleagues—who are members and regular visitors there? Can he report upon these matters to the House, and if not, will he look into it and give us a report?

Mr. Breithaupt: A full report.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I cannot. I would leave this matter totally to the Minister of Natural Resources (Mr. Bernier), who I know understands the problem and I'm sure would be delighted to give any answers to the House.

Mr. Nixon: Supplementary: Has the Premier ever visited Griffith Island, or have any of his colleagues visited Griffith Island, to his knowledge?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I cannot speak for my colleagues. I must say, knowing perhaps this question came from a Mr. Greer through the leader of the Liberal Party, as often happens, I would just like to inform him, through you, that yes, I have been there for dinner on one occasion. I have never hunted at Griffith Island. In fact I have never hunted anywhere.

Mr. Nixon: But the Premier didn't take a drink or anything like that? Did he catch a fish?

Hon. Mr. Davis: I haven't hunted anywhere. I haven't even caught a fish, and I haven't hunted. However, I have been there. I will not speak for my colleagues.

Mr. Speaker: Any other questions of urgent public importance?

Mr. Nixon: I gather you have not been asked either, Mr. Speaker?

Hon. Mr. Davis: It was a very good meal.

Mr. Lewis: Those moose antlers the Minister of National Resources was carrying on Monday morning are at the airport.

Hon. B. Stephenson: Mr. Speaker, if the Leader of Opposition would be quiet for a moment, I'd be very happy to answer the questions raised by three of his colleagues last week.

Mr. Lewis: I am listening intently; intently.

FALCONBRIDGE LAYOFFS

Hon. B. Stephenson: The question was regarding the layoff of 438 workers from Falconbridge Nickel Mines and it was imputed that perhaps there had been bad faith bargaining on the part of the company in the recent negotiations. The ministry has inquired into this matter. At the present time there is no evidence of any lack of good faith on the part of the company in its negotiations.

Mr. Lewis: No, is that right? What an inquiry!

Hon. B. Stephenson: The reason for the layoff of 438 workers is a combination of gear-up time and a down-turn in the market during the period of the strike. The numbers laid off constitute less than 10 per cent of the total complement of the company—

Mr. Lewis: That's all?

Hon. B. Stephenson: —and therefore the company has complied totally with the Employment Standards Act.

Mr. Deans: Can the minister indicate whether the proposed layoffs were ever discussed at the bargaining table prior to the agreement being reached?

Hon. B. Stephenson: I am informed that they were never discussed.

Mr. Lewis: Oh, but that is good faith bargaining. Very good faith bargaining. Quite an inquiry.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Mr. Germa: Could I ask the minister to assure the House that the surplus inventories causing the present layoffs were not as a result of the company deliberately building excess inventories in order to meet negotiations?

Hon. B. Stephenson: Mr. Speaker, I have no such knowledge, but certainly if there is, in fact, any feeling on the part of the union that bad faith was involved they are at perfect liberty to use the resources of the Labour Relations Board.

Mr. Lewis: There's a $50 fine you know. [2:45]

CANADIAN WESTINGHOUSE

Mr. Deans: I have a question of the Premier. Regardless of the historical legal position that's involved, is the Premier concerned about the current situation which affects 2,300 workers of Westinghouse Canada? Does he feel it appropriate that an American company, in the process of a sale of its American operation, should be able to sell Canadian rights without consideration for the Canadian economy or employees? Does he intend to make representation to Ottawa or, for that matter, representation to the United States? Does he intend to change any laws? Does he intend to take any action to try to preserve the jobs of 2,300 people?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I'll answer the first part of the question. Yes, I am concerned. The balance of the question should be directed to the Minister of Industry and Tourism.

Mr. Deans: I would like to redirect the question in order that I might get the answer.

Hon. Mr. Bennett: Mr. Speaker, this question was raised in this House about one week ago, and it was answered—but I'll repeat the

answer to clarify the situation. I have been in touch with the minister of the Department of Industry, Trade and Commerce for Canada, Mr. Jamieson, and we have discussed the problem. He and his colleagues at the federal level are in discussions with White Corp. and, indeed, with Westinghouse Canada. It relates to who owns the rights to the trademarks. There is some confusion, there is no doubt about it.

Mr. Lewis: That's quite a price to pay.

Hon. Mr. Bennett: It might be quite a price to pay, Mr. Speaker, but the fact remains that the trademarks have never belonged to Westinghouse Canada Ltd. They have always been owned by the parent company and, under special arrangements, have been given out for use by their various companies throughout the world. At this very moment the argument relates as to who can have the rights to the trademark. White Corp. at the time that they completed the deal with the American Westinghouse Corp., also took over the world rights for the trademark.

We have been in contact with Mr. Jamieson. He is continuing with his negotiations. It's in his interest to see that the Westinghouse manufacturing trademarks stay with the Canadian company to give us some hold on that particular industry in this country.

Mr. Renwick: There are compulsory licensing arrangements, and the minister knows it.

Mr. Deans: One supplementary question: Does the minister recognize that there is a major lawsuit currently being lodged in the US to block the sale to GSW? Is he prepared either to take some legislative action—

Mr. Speaker: One question.

Mr. Deans: —here or to recommend legislative action in Ottawa to do away with this kind of nonsense and damaging effect?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The member asked one question.

Hon. Mr. Bennett: Mr. Speaker, let us first of all correct the statement. The lawsuit does not relate to whether GSW—General Steel Wares—should take over the Westinghouse Canada operation.

Mr. Deans: That is the effect of it.

Hon. Mr. Bennett: It relates, Mr. Speaker, singularly and solely to who has the right to the trademark in Canada—the Westinghouse circle with the "W" in it. That's really what it relates to and not whether GSW will eventually become the owner of Westinghouse assets. The trademark is the thing in point. Mr. Jamieson is reviewing it. Our people from our ministry have been in discussion with him. Indeed, there have been others in the industry who have been working with him to try to find a solution to the problem.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Sarnia.

An hon. member: Betty Furness is involved in it.

ANTI-INFLATION PROGRAMME

Mr. Bullbrook: I'd like to direct a question either to the Premier or the Treasurer, whomever would be most appropriate. Could the Premier advise the status of the draft agreement between this government and the government of Canada in connection with his commitment to AIB? Secondly, could he advise whether we might be made privy to it shortly, especially those of us who have the obligation in connection with the select committee on Hydro rates?

Hon. Mr. Davis: I think, Mr. Speaker, that question should be directed to the Treasurer.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: We have not yet seen a draft agreement. I think we saw a brief outline of one and the officials are meeting in Ottawa today and tomorrow. Presumably they will be looking at a model agreement; I think that is what they're calling it. The ministers will not see it until a week from tomorrow when there is a meeting of the Ministers of Finance.

Mr. Bullbrook: By way of a supplementary, does the Treasurer think it would be possible for us, as members of the Legislature, to have some information in connection with the draft agreement by, say, 10 days?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: I don't know that.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Renfrew South.

Mr. Roy: Oh, the parliamentary assistant is here, is he?

OLYMPIC GAMES

Mr. Yakabuski: Is the Premier aware that since the government of the Province of Quebec has taken over the financial affairs of the 1976 Olympics, there is a growing concern that the taxpayers of this province, and perhaps the other provinces of Canada, will get hooked to bail out the Olympics?

Mr. Singer: Is that a question?

Mr. Cassidy: It's just a kind of specious statement.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I'm aware of the decision of the government of Quebec to take over some aspects of the administration of the development of the Olympic site. I can't see how this, certainly from our standpoint, can have an impact on the taxpayers of the Province of Ontario because I think the Prime Minister of Canada has said—and I'm sure he will not change his mind—that it is not the intention of the federal government to become financially involved.

Mr. Roy: Not like some people we know?

Hon. Mr. Bennett: The member for Ottawa East comes first.

Hon. Mr. Davis: As I recall the statements which have been made by the government of Canada, I would say to the hon. member it would appear as though there would be no financial support from the government at Ottawa, which means the taxpayers of the Province of Ontario will not be involved in any short-fall in any financing of the Olympic games by the city of Montreal and the Province of Quebec.

Mr. Roy: A supplementary on that: I take it from the Premier's answer that he doesn't agree with the mayor of Toronto who made a speech in Montreal—

Mr. Speaker: Your question? Or is that an interrogatory statement?

Mr. Roy: My God, you are touchy with the people on this side, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Question.

Hon. Mr. Handleman: He is not running against the member for Ottawa East.

Mr. Roy: My question simply is this: The Premier doesn't agree with his Conservative colleague, the mayor of Toronto, who made a speech in Montreal saying that all taxpayers in Ontario—or in Canada for that matter—should contribute to the Olympics?

Hon. Mr. Davis: I saw a headline attributed to the mayor of the city of Toronto; I did not see his speech nor have I had communication with him. It may come as a bit of a shock to the hon. member but those of us who do support the same political parties don't always have the same point of view.

Mr. Roy: We know that.

Hon. Mr. Davis: That should come as less of a shock to you in that party than any other party in this province.

Mr. Roy: The Premier should not emphasize the obvious.

PAPERWORKERS' STRIKE

Mr. Ferrier: I have a question, Mr. Speaker, of the Minister of Labour. Will the minister intervene with the Abitibi Paper Co., on behalf of the members of the Canadian Paperworkers' Union in Iroquois Falls and elsewhere in the province, to suggest that Abitibi pay the outstanding holiday pay in accordance with the expired collective agreement?

Hon. B. Stephenson: Mr. Speaker, if the request made by my hon. colleague is within the purview of the Employment Standards Act, I would certainly so intervene.

Mr. Ferrier: Supplementary: If the request is not within the purview of the Employment Standards Act, will the minister still consider intervening to suggest that, as good corporate citizens, maybe Abitibi should take this move and pay this holiday pay to these workers?

Hon. B. Stephenson: Yes, I should most seriously consider this matter.

Mr. Reid: On the same subject, as the minister knows this continuing pulp and paper strike in northern Ontario is very serious. Can she report to the House anything new, any new developments? Can she also indicate at the same time whether any other mills in Canada have been before the Anti-Inflation Board in Ottawa and if that board has made any decision as to the effect of agreements in the pulp and paper industry?

Mr. Speaker: For the information of certain members that is an original question.

Hon. B. Stephenson: I would agree with my colleague that this is a most serious strike. Unfortunately, I can report no new major development this week; we are still hopeful that there may be one this week.

There has been one settlement in the paper industry in Canada, in New Brunswick with the K.C. Irving plant. The settlement was above the Anti-Inflation Board guidelines and there is agreement between both parties to take that settlement to the board for clarification and consideration of the matter. To my knowledge this has not come before the

board as yet and therefore we have no ruling by the board as yet.

Mr. Reid: May I ask by way of supplementary: Does the minister feel that decision by the board will affect settlements in the Province of Ontario?

Hon. B. Stephenson: I would think that if we did have a ruling by the Anti-Inflation Board it could provide a stimulus to the resumption of negotiations in the Province of Ontario.

KITCHENER COURTHOUSE

Hon. Mrs. Scrivener: Mr. Speaker, on Thursday last, the hon. member for Kitchener-Wilmot (Mr. Sweeney) asked a question concerning the new Kitchener courthouse. I would remind the hon. member that this project is one of five announced last July by the Treasurer (Mr. McKeough) in his supplementary budget speech designed to stimulate employment in Ontario. I might add that the leaseback system has been utilized at this time because of the government policy of controlling new capital expenditure wherever possible.

The Kitchener project was advertised for tenders, with a closing date of Oct. 7, 1975. The following are the names of the bidders and their annual rental bids: Van Bots Construction Co. Ltd., $749,000; Bramalea Consolidated Developments Ltd., $785,856; Manufacturers Life Insurance Co., $802,284; Olympia and York Developments, $828,000; Major Holdings and Developments Ltd., $858,000; Ball Brothers Ltd., $894,000; and Ownix Developments Ltd., $1,024,760.

The low bidder, Van Bots Construction Co. Ltd., was awarded the contract on Nov. 6, 1975. Upon expiry of the 25-year lease, the building will become the property of the province. Van Bots Construction Co. Ltd. is an Ontario firm, as are all of the other bidders.

If, as the hon. member suggests, local contractors think the building could have been obtained at a lower cost, then I think this viewpoint should have been reflected in their bids.

INCO/FALCONBRIDGE BUSINESS POLICIES

Mr. Laughren: A question of the Premier: In view of the fact that International Nickel and Falconbridge Nickel Mines never have taken the Sudbury community into their confidence; in view of the recently announced layoffs, and particularly in view of the fact that two years ago Falconbridge Nickel Mines, while at a meeting with my colleagues from the Sudbury area and with municipal and regional officials as well as a federal member of Parliament, announced their long-term plans were their business, not ours, will the Premier reconsider his statement of Friday and appoint a select committee to look into the long-term plans for extraction and processing of ores in the Sudbury area and elsewhere?

Hon. Mr. Davis: No, Mr. Speaker.

Interjections.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Mr. Laughren: Supplementary: I wonder if the Premier realizes how terribly difficult it is for a community that lives always with a boom and bust economy.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. This should be a question of information, not what the Premier wonders about things.

Mr. Laughren: This is a reasonable supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Ask a direct question.

Mr. Laughren: I am trying to. Does the Premier understand how difficult it is for a community that lives with boom and bust and uncertainty to make long-term plans for the people of the community? Does he not realize that the government has a responsibility to require the private sector to be more co-operative? Why won't he do something about it?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I recognize the implications of a major industry in a community, particularly when it is the prime industry of that community. There are several others in the Province of Ontario: the situation is not confined to Sudbury. I was asked by, I believe the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Lewis) or one of his colleagues whether or not the government would consider appointing a select committee. I don't think that that is a reasonable approach to it. Certainly I would encourage any discussion between the companies and the communities to resolve these problems, but I am saying that I don't believe a select committee is the way to go about it.

Mr. Laughren: They tell us it is none of our business. How can we talk to them when they have that attitude?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Mr. Martel: Supplementary?

Mr. Speaker: One final supplementary on this.

Mr. Martel: In view of the fact that mining is solely within the purview of the government of Ontario, surely to God it is time the government moved—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. This is debating the question. The hon. member has been around long enough to know that is debating an answer or a question.

Mr. Martel: You are not faced with 900 layoffs.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The hon. member is debating the issue.

Mr. Lewis: How is it you move in on northern members every time?

Interjections.

An hon. member: Oh, that is not right.

Mr. Yakabuski: That is below the belt.

Mr. Speaker: Does the hon. member have a true supplementary?

Mr. Martel: I am asking the Premier, in view of the fact that the province has the sole right over mining, is it not time that the province took some leadership to head off the boom and bust economy in Sudbury?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. That is not a question of information.

Mr. Bullbrook: Do your job and we'll back you up, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Martel: You won't have anything there after the next election.

Mr. Speaker: Order.

[3:00]

NAPPAN ISLAND DEVELOPMENT

Mr. Good: A question of the Minister of Housing: Now that the minister has had time to review the background material relating to Nappan Island, and especially the reports of the Ministry of Natural Resources, the Trent Valley Conservation Authority and the local municipalities which utterly oppose this development on Nappan Island, is the minister prepared to forward this material to the OMB so that body may look at the environmental considerations in dealing with Nappan Island when it hears the zoning change application; which is next Monday, making this a matter of urgent public importance?

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: Mr. Speaker, first of all the hon. member did supply me with some information. There was more information to be gathered; and I have started to gather that information. The people in the ministry are now putting all the file together and I will have a direct answer for the hon. member in ample time before the hearing on Monday.

Mr. Good: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker: Will the minister assure the House at this time that he will not only look at the information but will review the draft plan approval which was given by the former Minister of Housing, and which to all concerned was in complete disregard of all reports relating to that area? Is he satisfied that he can, in fact, refer this to the OMB in conjunction with the other hearing?

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: Mr. Speaker, that's part of what I'm attempting to do as a result of the inquiry made to me by the hon. member. I have asked to have the draft plan brought back so it can be properly reviewed and we can make a decision, just as he suggested.

HOME PROGRAMME

Mr. Speaker: The Minister of Housing has the answer to a question asked previously.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. On Nov. 13 the hon. member for Wentworth (Mr. Deans) asked about the increased price of HOME plan lots in a resale situation, referring to initial cost of $65-a-month to the projected cost of between $200 and $250-a-month for the lot the house is located on.

Members will recall that the original HOME plan fixed the lot price for a period of 50 years, and a second or third purchaser could buy a HOME plan house and make the same monthly land payments as the original buyer. Unfortunately, this created windfall profits for those who chose to sell the land after the obligatory first five years of the lease were up; and it also led to under-the-table deals as principals sought to circumvent the programme's safeguards.

This resulted in a revision of the programme in June, 1973, which provided for the second purchaser to take over the land lease payments at the market value of the land when the property changed hands. Effective Aug. 8 of this year, the lease provisions of the programme were dropped. The HOME

plan is now a freehold programme which means resales are at full market value.

With its low downpayments and generous mortgage provisions, the HOME plan is of great assistance to families who normally could not afford to buy on the open market. I would tend to agree with the hon. member that the greatest benefit is certainly derived by the first purchaser of the HOME plan house and property.

Mr. Deans: A supplementary question: Can the minister indicate whether it might not be better to have the resale back to the programme rather than allowing them on the free market? Then the people who need the homes will benefit from them.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: I think the question is very difficult to answer. There are two ways we're trying to do this. If you want to retain the general public ownership of the homes and the property, what the hon. member is suggesting is probably correct; but if we do want to place these homes in the hands of people in the lower and the moderate income area so they can purchase them—

Mr. Deans: Right.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: —and own them, then I think we have to allow them to own them. Certainly they should be free to compete in the marketplace as any other homeowner can.

An hon. member: They should profit on their houses the way the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Lewis) did.

Mr. Speaker: The question period has expired.

Petitions.

Mr. Reid: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order.

Mr. Speaker: Yes, a point of order, the member for Rainy River.

Mr. Reid: Mr. Speaker, I want to refer to the remark made by the Leader of the Opposition that you were discriminating against northern members. I want to say that I find that remark totally irresponsible and beneath the dignity of the Leader of the Opposition. As a member from the north, I want to say to you that I uphold the job you're doing as long as you continue to do it.

Interjections.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you.

Hon. Mr. Bernier: I am with the hon. member all the way on that one.

Mr. Bullbrook: It was at best a juvenile remark.

Interjections.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. Let's get back to our business.

Presenting reports.

Hon. W. Newman presented the annual report of the Ministry of Agriculture and Food for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1975.

Hon. Mr. Parrott presented the financial report of Queen's University and Sir Wilfrid Laurier University for the year ending April 30, 1975; and of the Ontario College of Art for the year ending May 31, 1975.

Hon. Mr. McMurtry presented the sixth annual report of the Criminal Injuries Compensation Board.

Mr. Speaker: Motions.

Introduction of bills.

HIGHWAY TRAFFIC AMENDMENT ACT

Hon. Mr. Snow moved first reading of bill intituled, An Act to amend the Highway Traffic Act.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Hon. Mr. Snow: Mr. Speaker, this is the bill, referred to in the earlier statement today by the Premier (Mr. Davis), that will require the mandatory use of seatbelts in automobiles.

FREEDOM OF INFORMATION ACT

Mr. MacDonald moved first reading of bill intituled, An Act to provide for Freedom of Information.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Speaker, the object of this bill can be simply stated. As things stand now, all government documents are secret unless there happens to be good reason, in the view of the government, to make them public. This bill is predicated on the assumption that everything should be freely available to the public unless there happens to be good reason for it being kept secret. A statutory obligation to make all government documents, with legitimate exceptions, freely available to the public is a necessary and healthy corrective to the instinctive reaction of those in authority to withhold information that might prove embarrassing.

MENTAL HEALTH AMENDMENT ACT

Mr. Roy moved first reading of bill intituled, An Act to amend the Mental Health Act.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Mr. Roy: Mr. Speaker, this legislation was introduced in the last session. The purpose of it, of course, is that when individuals are arrested under the Mental Health Act this amendment in fact would force a judge or justices of the peace to have the individual examined by at least one psychiatrist within a reasonable period of time.

Hon. J. R. Smith: Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to table the answer to written question No. 11 from the hon. member for Wellington South. (See appendix, page 707.)

Mr. Speaker: Orders of the day.

Clerk of the House: The seventh order, resuming the adjourned debate on the motion for second reading of Bill 20, An Act to provide for the Review of Rents in respect to Residential Premises.

RESIDENTIAL PREMISES RENT REVIEW ACT
(continued)

Mr. McClellan: I'd like just briefly to conclude the remarks that I had started to make, I believe last Thursday. I spoke at that time of the remarkable achievement of the minister in managing to exempt somewhere between 40 per cent and 50 per cent of landlords, and to exclude between 40 per cent and 50 per cent of tenants in this province by virtue of the elimination of fourplexes, triplexes, duplexes, single-attached and single-detached dwellings and rooming houses from the Act. The minister was heard to mutter repentance during the discussion, and we look forward to amendments coming forward which will correct those serious omissions.

Today I want to speak briefly about the principle of the bill. The principle of the bill, Mr. Speaker, is very simple. The principle of this bill is socialism. The very heart and soul of this bill is socialism; the very nub and kernel of this bill is socialism; the very essence of the being of this bill is socialism: because what this bill does is remove residential housing from the forces—

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: Keep that up and the Leader of the Opposition is going to have a leadership convention.

Mr. McClellan: —of the so-called free market, and bring residential housing under the control of the state in the name of social justice. And that, Mr. Speaker, is socialism.

Mr. Lewis: He is winning them over, and he hadn't realized it.

Mr. McClellan: What this bill does is establish the principle that housing in this province is a social utility under the regulation of the state; and that, Mr. Speaker, is socialism.

Interjection.

Mr. Samis: You old free enterpriser.

Mr. McClellan: This bill is a socialistic bill in all aspects and in all respects, and the truly glorious thing is that in a few short minutes, or a few short hours, all three parties in this House are going to vote for this piece of socialistic legislation.

Mr. Lewis: And the Minister of Housing is choking. He choked in cabinet; he choked his way out of cabinet.

Mr. McClellan: And all those who are girding their loins for a holy crusade against socialism in the not too distant future are going to vote for this socialistic piece of legislation, along with us.

Mr. Foulds: Did they realize they are a part of the socialist hordes?

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: Does the Leader of the Opposition have a leadership convention coming? I hope so, he's in trouble.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Mr. Lewis: Not at all—

Mr. McClellan: The anguish this bill has generated across the floor and beside us in the ranks of the third party was evidenced in the remarks of the member, I think for London Centre (Mr. Peterson) who rose to debate the rent control bill and gave instead a hymn of praise to the free enterprise system. What kind of confusion, what kind of schizophrenia is this, that a member would be forced—

Hon. Mr. Davis: Need the member ask?

Mr. McClellan: —to speak his innermost confusion in such a manner?

Hon. Mr Davis: Listen, the member learns very rapidly.

Mr. Nixon: How can the Premier say that when he's had four positions on rent review and he may change them all.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The hon. member for Bellwoods has the floor.

Interjections.

Mr. Lewis: The Premier and his government have had four positions this week.

Mr. McClellan: I do not want to be too hard on the Minister of Housing for his incredible exemptions. He is, after all—

Mr. Lewis: A socialist.

Mr. McClellan: —a recent convert to socialism. It was unlike St. Paul, whose conversion was not sudden and dramatic and glorious. Instead, it was reluctant and hesitant; it was filled with apostasy from the very first moment.

Mr. Lewis: It was desperate.

Mr. McClellan: He entered upon the socialist path with such hesitance and mincing steps that he wandered instead onto the garden path.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: I like the member. We're going to get along fine.

Mr. McClellan: I want to assure the minister that we will rescue him from the garden path onto which he has stumbled; we will lead him back to the socialist path and he will thank us for it.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member from Kitchener-Wilmot.

Mr. Lewis: A copy of that goes to every house in the Soo.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: Through what postal system?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Mr. Sweeney: I would like to draw to the attention of some members of this House that the title of this Act is to provide for the review of rents in respect of residential premises, not the control.

Mr. Lewis: Oh come on.

[3:15]

Mr. Sweeney: This party will support rent review. This is a temporary aberration. It is not—

Mr. Samis: Right on!

An hon. member: Go ahead; the member is getting to them.

Mr. Sweeney: It is not perceived by this party as a socialist document, far from it.

Mr. Foulds: That's because the member's perception is rather dim.

An hon. member: The member is getting close.

Mr. Sweeney: It seems to me that over the last several days of debate on this, we have gone a long way toward creating an iniquitous division by suggesting that every single landlord in this province is somehow responsible for the social problems with respect to housing accommodation and rentals.

I, for one, would like to have it on the record that that is not so. May I draw the attention of the House to the following figures in my particular community: In the past 10 years rental accommodation of all types has increased between 35 per cent and 50 per cent. That is 10 years, Mr. Speaker. In the same period wages have increased 100 per cent; food has increased 87 per cent; the cost of living has increased 69 per cent.

I am not suggesting there are not some landlords—I don't know what the percentage is—in this province who are unscrupulous, who do gouge. I think there has been sufficient evidence brought to the attention of this House, and that is why a piece of review legislation is necessary; but I do want it on the record that there are some decent, law-abiding, good corporate citizens in this province who are also landlords, and I think that should be noted.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Scarborough-Ellesmere.

Mr. Samis: He's right in the middle of the whole thing.

Mr. Warner: I appreciate the opportunity to take part in this debate. The debate has centred around a rather interesting division on the basis of principle. The body Conservative, which normally does not interfere with the business community, introduces a bill which clearly displays symptoms of withdrawal.

Although I appreciate the government's reversal—in fact it should be noted it is not really reversal but rather revolving form of policy—I make note of the fact that the Conservatives remain capitalist, but compromising, in this Legislature; the Liberals capitalists, but confused; and the New Democrats socialist in a democratic and fair way.

Mr. Sweeney: It is the member's perception that's confused.

Mr. Samis: That's hardly original.

Mr. Warner: In the discussion which took place last week, there was some note made of principle and of the deficiencies of this bill. I am sure the minister is wondering precisely what is missing.

I think what is missing is a statement of principle that shelter is a basic right of human beings in our province. It is around that basic principle that one must put all of the trimmings that are needed to guarantee that shelter will remain as a basic right, without costing all of us so dearly beyond our means. That's where the bill comes up short.

We have heard about the exemptions. There are far too many of them, that's obvious. I don't understand why the government cannot come to grips with the very basic fact that shelter is a necessity, it is a right, and that it should be protected.

Quite frankly, I was somewhat confused by the Conservatives' opinion that those who are able to pay high rents should not be protected. Surely a bill that is going to provide protection should provide protection for all. I have no qualms about providing protection for those who are paying in excess of $500 a month. Surely those people, even though they can afford that amount, should be afforded protection by the government.

The arguments that were heard from the Liberal Party and from the Conservatives were that this bill—and particularly if we went to total controls—would dry up the market as far as production is concerned. I submit those statements were made in a vacuum, because had the government looked closely, at the province—

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: Is the member going to vote for it?

Mr. Warner: —of Quebec, and examined—

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: Look at Toronto.

Mr. Warner: —their policies—

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: Look at Toronto.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Mr. Martel: That is because of Inco and Falconbridge are getting away with what they want. I am going to speak on it in a moment, stick around.

Mr. Warner: The minister should take a look at the legislation in Quebec. I specifically use that because they have been dealing with rent controls for 22 years. It's an experiment of a length of time and of a nature which should reveal any inadequacies.

Interjection.

Mr. Warner: They don't have the housing problem we have in Ontario. They don't have the skyrocketing rents we have here.

Interjection.

Mr. Warner: Their controls have worked.

Interjection.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The hon. member has the floor.

Mr. Warner: Thank you. If the government is really that concerned about the market drying up, then perhaps it will lead its support, finally, to the building of co-op houses. If the owner of an apartment building is so totally convinced that he cannot exist on a guaranteed return on his dollars, such as this bill proposes, then maybe he should get out of the market; maybe the building should be turned over to co-op housing and let the rents drop.

Perhaps the hon. minister is not aware that in the city of Toronto, for example, in fact in Scarborough, a new building was constructed just a month ago in which projected rents for a two-bedroom apartment are $150-a-month instead of the market value of $250-a-month because it is a co-op building. If the government were to put some money into co-op housing that would certainly help. If after all of that, those owners are still complaining they can't get along with their guaranteed return, at their low interest, then—and all of us know that the gouging that has taken place has normally been on the older buildings, where the mortgages were 3½ to 6½ per cent—if they're still not satisfied with that guaranteed return, perhaps they should relinquish it to the government and let the government run it for the use of the people. Let's bring down the rents once and for all.

We have the basis of some good legislation and I am sure that in committee the proper amendments can be made. I urge the hon. minister to consider very seriously the roll-back date. The experiences of the people in this province show that the increases in rent began at the beginning of 1974, that the plot was hatched during January and February of 1974 and it came to fruition during April, May and June of 1974. The excessive rents were then invoked through to the end of 1974. Yet the govern-

ment insists they can only roll back to July of 1975.

I think the government owes us an answer on that, because that roll-back date, as far as I am concerned, is just not acceptable. I am also concerned about the percentage. It's obviously an arbitrary figure. I would like the hon. minister to explain the percentage of eight per cent, which is the figure used.

We have before us now the most comprehensive study ever conducted in this country on housing, commissioned for Mr. Jaffray and completed on over 5,000 rental units in the Province of British Columbia. The results of that survey indicated that the average increase in cost to the owner-landlord was in the neighbourhood of six per cent, including property taxes; property tax increase was at 2.9 per cent.

All of that is public record now, so I would like some explanation why the percentage used here is the arbitrary figure of eight per cent? In fact, I would ask the hon. minister if he could explain why we are not considering beyond 1975, looking at the cost factor as opposed to the percentage guideline? Why aren't we simply opening the books of the owners and looking at the cost factor?

It is possible, and I would concede this to the hon. minister, it is possible that in some isolated circumstances the costs would be greater than the eight per cent; in which case simply opening the books and operating on the revealed cost factor would relieve that and the owner could get his just reward.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: With the tenants' association reading the books and all that? Could we see the member's?

Mr. Warner: I am saying for public viewing, that's all.

Continuing on through the bill—and I hope the minister will bear with me, I'm simply going through it part by part because I found the document quite interesting—as a new member I was quite intrigued by the wording in clause 4 of section 10, appearing on page 8: "Members of the board shall hold office during pleasure." I don't know if that means it's a fun job or not, but it's very interesting wording.

It doesn't talk in the bill about justification; about requiring any justification on the part of the landlord. I think that can only come about by opening the books and having their contents public knowledge.

I am also concerned about the technical, mechanical aspects of this bill. In subsection 9 of section 4, on page 5, it talks about common dates for hearings. There is no reference —although I agree it could be set by regulation—that wherever possible the meetings to discuss the rent increases should be held within the building or the building complex in order to save time and money. There was no mention of this. Perhaps that could be considered for regulations.

In section 10, subsection 1, where the residential premises rent review board is established, there seems to be no specification as to a balance between the representatives of corporate interests and the tenants' interests, and I would hope the minister could supply some sort of balance there in absolute numbers.

There is a very important question in section 12 (a), exclusions from the Act, on why those buildings operated by the Province of Ontario or the government of Canada should be exempt. That deserves a direct answer from the minister.

Hon. Mr. Kerr: Just robbing Peter to pay Paul.

Mr. Warner: Another rather curious point which needs explanation is, there was an arbitrary figure of four used in section 12 (c): "situate in a residential building that contains four or fewer residential premises." Why four? My suggestion, if the minister wants to pick an arbitrary figure, would be three, provided that one of them is the owner-landlord. Because what the minister is doing is opening it up to those landlords who own, in fact, 50 or 60 smaller buildings. There are landlords in this city who own anywhere up to 100 duplexes and that opens it up to them.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: But this isn't the only city in the world. This is only one small city.

Mr. Warner: In conclusion, I must admit that I am happier with the presentation of this bill than with the presentation of that other piece of social legislation which was introduced on Sunday store closings. That particular bill, of course, would only meet one's expectations if one expected nothing from the government.

There is still a tremendous amount of vagueness about this bill. There are far too many loopholes; there are far too many things which can be set by regulations and which are not set out here.

As a final point, I would ask that the minister look very seriously at section 15, on the last page of the bill, where it talks about penalties. Again there is a maximum set and no minimum. I would suggest very strongly that

be reconsidered and we look at a minimum penalty. There is no reason why it can't be put onto a sliding scale with reference to the size of the structure we are dealing with, so as to make it fair to the landlord, but there certainly should be some sort of minimum fine if the landlord doesn't come up to standards. [3:30]

In conclusion, I commend the government for some action. I am still very saddened that it has not put in, as a principle of this, that housing is a basic right for all individuals in this province. Until that day comes we will not see a totally comprehensive bill regarding the control of rents for tenants in the Province of Ontario.

Mr. Nixon: I wish the Minister of Environment (Mr. Kerr) had not left the House. I felt by his interjections that he was about to participate in the debate. He indicated that he felt that under this law thousands of landlords would be going broke. I believe that was his interjection. Probably one or two landlords at the Burlington Golf Club indicated their apprehension in this regard. I was hoping he would participate in the debate in this connection but evidently he's not going to.

Mr. Martel: A few on Griffith Island.

Mr. Nixon: There are one or two things which may not be that productive but I feel I should draw them to members' attention. The Premier (Mr. Davis), who has also left the House, indicated by his interjection that he felt the Liberal Party had been vacillating on its position in this regard. Nothing could be further from the truth and I want to bring to members' attention the important role played by my colleague, the member for St. George (Mrs. Campbell), in the formation of public policy in this regard.

I'm sure members are aware that her private legislation having to do with rent review has been before this House for almost two years, during the time when the NDP were, let's say, dealing with their mentors in the city council of Toronto, to try to get square with them, and, of course, more latterly when the Premier himself was taking a variety of positions. No one associated with the last campaign could be anything but amused at his difficulty in achieving some sort of policy. He had at least four separate and distinct positions, all of them completely unacceptable, before his Minister of Housing got up and introduced the legislation now before us.

As a matter of fact, the minister himself—who is here and I appreciate that—indicated as he was being sworn in as Minister of Housing that rent review would delay the construction of housing in the province and that he would have to consider that very carefully. I don't know who set him straight; presumably the Premier had made up his mind by then and we have the bill before us.

It is interesting but I can predict there will be a time when the Conservatives will be blaming other political parties for the legislation before us—just like yesterday when we were talking about the unfortunate teachers' strike. He was indicating that he had nothing to do with it or was putting the blame elsewhere for the fact that the teachers were out on strike.

I think it is important that when we discuss this legislation we make sure our attitudes are well understood. I believe this is important legislation. I believe the rent review aspects of it are going to be with us permanently and, frankly, I think the control aspects are going to be with us permanently.

As one of my colleagues has already pointed out we have had rent control in other jurisdictions, not all of them socialist. The State of New York has permitted it to be applied in the city of New York and they've never been able to get out of it. I think that is unfortunate.

The review aspects certainly are important and ones which certainly both of the opposition parties were stressing. It wasn't during the election campaign that the NDP were talking about controls.

As a matter of fact, if anybody in the NDP thinks they've got a corner on social legislation, they are misinformed. Socialist legislation is what they were putting forward in their programme during the election campaign—at least it was in the printed programme—but I didn't hear them talking about it much. They said they wanted to expropriate all the developable land around all the cities. They wanted to expropriate the whole of the mining industry. That is socialism. That's what they should be pushing because certainly this sort of legislation is no different from—

Mr. Martel: Why didn't you come north?

Mr. Nixon: —the egg marketing legislation which has been put forward by Tories and Liberals. It is ineffectual. It's no different from any other legislation which is necessary and, believe me, we in the Liberal Party believe this is necessary.

We have been consistent for two years in putting this before the government and not just by the loose applications of rhetoric which is so much a part of the socialists—the second party who are trying harder and harder

and making less and less progress. It really isn't that at all.

Mr. Martel: Where do you sit now?

Mr. Nixon: But we have put it forward by legislation which has been discussed by this House in the last two years. Mr. Speaker, I wanted to be sure that you were aware of the facts in the matter and would not be swept away by the gusts of rhetoric immediately to your left and to my right.

I was quite impressed as a matter of fact that the legislation did settle on the eight per cent lid. The federal legislation for wage and price controls establishes this eight per cent for wages and it allows another two per cent for productivity, which evidently everybody is going to get because we are such a productive nation and another two per cent for a number of causes that the Anti-Inflation Board might get around to dealing with some time in the next six months. This is an area of serious delay which concerns me.

The fact that the minister brought forward the eight per cent lid is an indication that he is not without some influence in the cabinet or that there is somebody over there with a political perspicacity which is appropriate. Even though the NDP have already given notice that they think that's too high and they are going to move to reduce it, nobody is going to take them very seriously. In fact, we are not prepared to support an amendment which is going to reduce that perecentage.

Mr. Cassidy: Who is in bed with whom right now?

Mr. Nixon: I feel that it's necessary in case there's some doubt in the minds of the party to my right, that these positions should be known. I am sure if the lid had been set at four, they would have wanted to reduce it to one. If in fact it had been frozen solid, then the old phrase—

Mr. Martel: You will change it by tomorrow again.

Mr. Nixon: —roll back would have been out, because there is really no way to satisfy a party which is trying harder, and that is the basis of their interjections.

Mr. Cassidy: We made our decision clear and we are sticking to it.

Mr. Nixon: Yes, but when did you make your decision? You weren't even talking about rent controls. You were talking about rent review and you know it.

As far as we are concerned on this side, the part of the bill that does concern us is the exclusions which have been put before you, Mr. Speaker, by members, not only of this side but which I have seen discussed in the electronic media by the Minister of Housing. I believe he now feels that he has made a mistake with these extensive exclusions, but surely there has to be an inclusion of public housing in this regard.

This whole concept of rent-geared-to income being something that is aside from rent control is unacceptable. The minister knows full well from his experience as mayor of Sault Ste. Marie, as all of us as members of this House have experienced, that the increase in rents in the rent-geared-to income in public housing area is something that does require the sorts of controls that we are talking about. I would hope the minister would reconsider this exclusion as he has reconsidered some of the other exclusions.

I heard him indicate on TV that he might bring forward an amendment which would remove the present exclusion under the terms of the bill which would apply to accommodation in houses or apartment buildings of four or fewer units. Certainly I think this is a matter which must concern us because many communities have rental accommodation of that type almost to the exclusion of the kind of highrise cliff-dwelling facilities that one finds here in Metropolitan Toronto. I have even had a letter complaining about the $500-a-month exclusion. I know that there's a number of people in the party to my right who may be concerned with that as individuals, but even they are not prepared to bring that forward as one of the list of complaints that they are trying so valiantly to wave as a red flag. That's the colour that they seem to like.

Mr. Cassidy: No, we defended the rich valiantly. We defended rich and poor alike.

Mr. Ferrier: Did that letter come from South Dumfries?

Mr. Nixon: I think we are prepared to maintain that exclusion but I would hope that the others would be removed by the committee. We give notice to you, Mr. Speaker, and to anybody else who might be interested that we are prepared either to put forward ourselves or support amendments of that type.

It concerns me that that noted Liberal, Barnett Danson, Secretary of State for Urban Affairs, indicated quite clearly that he felt a review procedure should not be a part of provincial legislation, that it would tend to frighten developers away from building be-

cause they would feel that they faced a morass of red tape, but that some kind of a ceiling exclusively would be sufficient as long as those people who went forward with their investment would be exempt for four or five years following. I don't agree with them, of course, because I believe that it is a misunderstanding on the part of anybody—

Mr. Martel: No flexibility, no flexibility.

Mr. Nixon: —who is not prepared to support the review concept. When we're talking about review, we're not talking about the rent payable by an individual, but the rent payable on a dwelling unit. Surely this is the sort of procedure which is going to be with us, not just for a period of months or a couple of years, but permanently. Anyone who thinks that this sort of legislation is going to be sloughed off with the resurgence of the free enterprise system is, of course, in error.

As a matter of fact, I personally would like to see some provision where rent controls would be removed from those communities where there was a vacancy rate of something between three and four per cent. But it appears—

Mr. Laughren: Twenty and 30.

Mr. Nixon: —frankly, from the experience in other jurisdictions, socialist and otherwise, that once the tender hands of the bureaucrats—

Mr. Martel: This bothers you, doesn't it?

Mr. Nixon: —get on these matters, it's very difficult for them—

Interjections.

Mr. Nixon: —to release their grasp. I would suggest, that whether the present minister continues in his responsibility or not, that rent review with teeth in it, that is roll-back powers as far as rental payments are concerned, will be with us on a permanent basis.

I regret it, but it seems that with the growth of the communities, particularly urban communities, that this is a responsibility which this House must accept and which we must examine very carefully in its administration by whatever facilities are set up by the government of the day. I am also prepared to predict that while the free enterprise system must be given encouragement to invest in housing—

Mr. Germa: Subsidize it. Yes, that's the free enterprise—

Mr. Nixon: Well, we are now and you know that. That's the first time I heard your voice today. I thought you would get involved in that Sudbury exchange. We are subsidizing—

Mr. Germa: That's free enterprise.

Mr. Nixon: —the building of houses now in a very big way. But it seems to me that the private sector had many years of opportunity to use this wide variety of programmes in which public funds were available to them. We have still come to the position now where this House is required to take the steps that we are discussing. So that while we must rely on the private sector, there is no doubt in my mind that one of the realities that the Treasurer (Mr. McKeough) will face this coming year and forever in the future, is a growing responsibility to use public funds and more public initiative to meet the housing problems that have assumed crisis proportions in the last few weeks, few months, few years. It appears that the solution is not as simple as some politicians and some developers have said. But we must be sure that these Draconian solutions are not going to be—It is important that we recognize that all communities do not have the same problems.

In the city of Brantford, for example, it is possible to go out and buy a single-family dwelling now for a price of about $36,000. I am told that there are those available on that basis right now, if anybody wants to move into that charming city with all sorts of jobs available. So the problems differ from one part of the province to the other.

I reject the comments made by some that this is socialist legislation. I consider it to be important social legislation. I call to your attention again that we have supported this concept consistently for the last two years. I say again, a good deal of the credit for the development of public acceptance of this concept must go with my colleague, the member for St. George, who will be active in the committee offering amendments on behalf of my party.

Mr. Martel: People from Toronto didn't believe you.

Mr. Nixon: More of them voted for us than voted for you.

Mr. Martel: People in Toronto didn't believe you.

Mr. Gaunt: We got more votes in Toronto than you did. Oh, yes we did.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Mr. Gaunt: That's all right. We know how that happened.

Mr. Nixon: Most of the seats are empty.

Mr. Roy: Elie, in 1971 you were talking percentages.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The hon. member for Etobicoke has the floor.

[3:45]

Mr. Philip: If I might have a couple of minutes, Mr. Speaker, after the oratorical sonorosity of the last speaker.

Mr. Nixon: Take as long as you want and try to be sonorous. Otherwise we won't listen.

Mr. Philip: No doubt the hon. member for St. George managed to summarize their position with greater brevity, and perhaps if the last speaker had listened to her he wouldn't have needed to give his long and ponderous speech in the first place.

Mr. Sweeney: Where were you when the guy in front of you spoke?

Mr. Nixon: Another typical tight halo that goes with the NDP.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I wonder if we could get to the principle of the bill?

An hon. member: They'll never learn.

Mr. Philip: I am concerned about two exceptions in the bill. In my riding many small manufacturers and service industries are feeling the pinch. The cost of renting space is skyrocketing at a pace that makes it extremely hard for them to be competitive with industries in other parts of the province, and indeed in other provinces. I find that more and more of the businessmen in my community are coming to me with the problem of how to remain competitive if something is not done regarding the rental space of industrial and retail operations.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: They do what they have been doing all along—they raise their prices.

Mr. Philip: They raise their prices and then they are not competitive; that's the problem.

The other problem that I am concerned about is the Ontario Housing units being excluded. Over the years we have constantly been labelling these people; we have been setting them apart as people who are somehow different. The implication of this singling out is more serious, I would suggest, than are the dollars and cents issues involved.

Many of the Conservative Party members I have talked to are concerned about the whole process of labelling through management training. Many of them who have undergone programmes will tell you that people live up to the kinds of expectations and self-images that other people give them. Yet what we are constantly trying to do with people who are so-called poor is to tell them they are a part of this society. Here we have taken a group of them, labelled them as something that is somehow different and put them once more in a ghetto—once more set aside from the rest of society. I think it should be reconsidered.

Mr. Good: The matter of doing something regarding the rental situation in Ontario, I think, has been brought about basically by two conditions: First, the peculiar rental situation in Metropolitan Toronto and, second, the general inflationary conditions that have affected all prices and wages across Canada and particularly in Ontario.

I think it is significant that we must be dealing with the rental situation in Ontario at a time when anti-inflation legislation is being put in place all across Canada. I think we must look at this legislation, because the bill deals with increases made during the period July 29, 1975, to Aug. 1, 1977.

I think we should all work towards that end, in spite of the position of the federal NDP. They feel the anti-inflation legislation and the programmes put into place federally will do something toward containing the high cost of living in Ontario as it relates not only to other commodities but also to rent.

Some will argue—and I must agree—that in many parts of Ontario this legislation will not be necessary, and could do more harm than good.

I would like to elaborate a little on the words of the member for Kitchener-Wilmot (Mr. Sweeney) as to the situation in our own area. We have a free marketplace in rental units. When students leave the university at the end of May we have a 10 per cent vacancy rate through June, July and August in the twin cities. People can move at will and find the best accommodation. True, the situation does get tight when the university students come back in the fall. Only in those conditions have I heard of any cases of rent gouging. Here you have a small minority, a small group of people who want to take advantage of a particular situation. Therefore I feel strongly that legislation to deal with particular and specific cases such as

that is most important. However, contrasting the situation in my own area is the situation in Metro. I would like to review a few of the figures in the "twin cities" area.

Last June, there was a 10.4 per cent vacancy rate in the Kitchener-Waterloo area, while the survey of December, 1974, showed that there was a 7.5 per cent vacancy rate. I have listed before me various apartment buildings and I would like to just give a few of the increases that have occurred.

The increases in highrise have been somewhat lower than those in the solid walkup; in other words, the rent variation seems to be less in the higher rental units than those in the lower rental units. In the period from 1966 to 1975, rent increases in various apartment buildings have varied from a low of 10 per cent to a high of 40 per cent over a 10-year period. There must be added to those figures an across-the-board increase of about $20 that was put in last fall.

We find that at Surrey Place, a rather distinguished apartment building in Kitchener, the rents were $160 for one bedroom and $180 for two bedrooms. They will have attached to that a $20 increase, which would bring them beyond the limits of this bill. Even at that, the rental increases with the additional $20 over the past 10 years would have been only 41 per cent and 38 per cent, respectively, on the one- and two-bedroom apartments.

So, we see that many landlords in our area, by applying an eight per cent annual increase, will be able to raise rents more than they have during the past four-, five- or 10-year period.

I think our position on rent review, which would have dealt with unconscionable increases, or complaints from landlords, would have been more practical than any separate and straight freeze.

That is a situation where the marketplace has been free and where it has kept rents down. Constrasting with that, look at the report of the Metropolitan Toronto Social Planning Council. They show explicitly that the rent increases in Metro are not related to return on investment, they are related to the ability of certain landlords to get larger rents because there just isn't the rental accommodation.

In 1968, there were 30,000 dwelling unit starts in Metropolitan Toronto. This number decreased and in 1972 was down to 21,000; in 1973 down to 20,000; in 1974 down to 16,000. In 1975, the predicted number of dwelling starts in Metropolitan Toronto is down to 9,000 units.

That is where the Minister of Housing's problem is. It has been the lack of direction of this government to move some of these 50,000 or 60,000 people a year who come into Metropolitan Toronto, to create incentives in other parts of this province so that people don't flock to Metropolitan Toronto. This was what was promised in 1971 when the government brought in the Toronto-Centred Region Plan.

This government was to disperse the population of Toronto, start growth in other centres where it was needed and bring vitality to industrial areas of the province other than Metro. But we still have the 50,000 or 60,000 people a year trying to crowd into Metropolitan Toronto. Government statistics show that the dwelling starts have gone down and the population has increased. There is such a tight rental situation that there is no free market.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: How do you make people move?

Mr. Good: There is no free market. The government hasn't done anything to encourage people. It doesn't make people move.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: How do you do that? You have all the easy answers.

Mr. Roy: Through incentives, taxes and so on.

Mr. Good: Carry out some of the promises that were made back in 1972 when the government introduced the Toronto-Centred Region Plan.

Mr. Laughren: The member for Waterloo North wouldn't interfere with the free-enterprise system, would he?

Mr. Good: This government has failed in its responsibility—

Mr. Riddell: People will move where the jobs are.

Mr. Good: —because this government has failed in its responsibility to do something about the conditions—

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: How do you do it?

Mr. Roy: They've done it in other areas. You start with a provincial plan.

Mr. Good: —because this government has refused to do something—

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: How do you do it?

Mr. Good: —about the problems of Metropolitan Toronto and everyone moving in. You end up with a Band-Aid solution to a problem which should never have existed. There are in my view, some inequities in the bill being imposed upon the province when it really should have been designed for Metropolitan Toronto and other municipalities where it was required or wanted or needed. Certainly, the matter of the freeze from last July until the end of the year, allowing an eight per cent increase, is not going to solve the problems that have arisen by unconscionable increases. I would sooner see what has happened up to now dealt with on a review basis where people who have had terrific increases could complain. I think the section which would allow the put-through of additional costs in the bill, if used properly, could be adequate where increased costs can be justified.

One apartment owner has shown me how his costs have increased; he has had to refinance a seven per cent mortgage on a 10-year term, and one can only imagine that the refinancing of a seven per cent mortgage is going to require at least an additional five or 5½ percentage points of interest to be paid. That's got to reflect on the rents alone close to the eight per cent increase; when you add that to the price increase of fuel oil for this winter of 4.5 cents a gallon, there is no equity, there is no fairness in the method of dealing with increases from last July until this December. The minister must know this.

It's a brave move. You say, "Let everybody, whether it's right or not, come under this one umbrella." There will be more equity starting Jan. 1, and I dare say that the roll-back of the starting date is not the solution. You are just going to create more inequities to try and catch a few other rent gougers. That's not the solution.

The approach up until the end of this year, in my view, is very poor. It's a Band-Aid solution, it's typical of the way this government reacts to crises. They did it with the farm tax rebate. Rather than figure out what the real inequities were in the taxation system relating to farmers they suddenly said: "Give them a quarter of their taxes back." The next year they said, "Give them half their taxes back." And up to now, no one's even interested in figuring out what is a fair and equitable solution to the problem.

This government reacts suddenly with Band-Aid solutions which are neither thought out nor fair in their application.

I think that the matters spoken on previously are of great concern. The matter of fairness is non-existent when it comes to the past few months up to the end of this year. The old wartime prices and trade board controls were fairer than this legislation. And I was a renter in the services at that time. It was great, because many landlords would go down and say: "What is a fair market value for my suite or my apartment?" And the board would measure up the square footage, look at the cost of construction and everything else, and set the rent. And in many cases the rents were larger than was being charged where the rent was unusually low; in other cases they were rolled back in those areas.

Even though we wouldn't want that situation in peacetime, people adhered to it, and there was, at least, equity in it. In many instances there is no equity in this.

We can't leave out units under four. Look at the townhouse situation. Will they be considered as single units and be exempt from it? Many large builders had rows and rows of townhouses which are perhaps, according to this, going to be excluded. I don't think that should be the intent. If you want to really do an anti-inflation job, limit the increases to eight per cent according to federal guidelines—and that's how I think we have to look on this legislation—that part of it at least —as anti-inflation legislation.

[4:00]

I don't think the minister can limit triplexes and fourplexes just because they have those units. It will distort the whole picture. The big builders don't usually build that type of unit; they build highrise. In our area it takes a year and a half to fill a highrise after it's built. I can show you one, two, three which I know of in the Waterloo area which have been renting for a year now and I don't think they are more than three-quarters filled. It takes time to fill those units.

I think to bring some equity in the minister will have to look at some of these peculiar situations in which he has to make it fair and equitable to all landlords so everyone is competing on an equal basis. I think it could well have an effect on future building. I am not too concerned about that because I have heard people complain before but they go ahead and live with it.

I remember when we passed the old Landlord and Tenant Act back in 1969 the landlords were all going to go out of business then. Well, they didn't. Mind you, housing starts went down in Metro. I think they can live with the new regulations if they are fair and equitable.

I support this bill. I think it is going to make people realize that we have to live within the federal anti-inflation guidelines. The people over here in the NDP think they have a corner on everything which is good and reasonable. They are so tied up with their own rhetoric and their own emotionalism on these issues.

Mr. Cassidy: You are finding that third party status awfully hard to bear.

Mr. Roy: It is just a temporary situation, Mike.

Mr. Good: They can't even see the validity in this. I don't suppose there is one of them over there who has ever embarked on a business venture for which they have had to borrow money or raise money by mortgage and things like that to try to make a deal and to make things go.

Mr. Cassidy: Of course, there are.

Mr. Good: They are so enthralled with any legislation which will bring control to government—

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: They are all teachers and preachers.

Mr. Good: That's about it. Or union holler guys.

Mr. Ferrier: Your customers never talk back to you.

Mr. Good: We support the legislation. I hope some of the inequities will be cleared up in committee.

Mr. Young: Mr. Speaker, my heart bleeds for the people who have just been talked about by my hon. friend from Kitchener.

One thing I think this legislation ignores completely and, perhaps, must ignore if we are going to move ahead with any system of rent controls, is the capital gains situation over the past dozen years in the whole apartment field. I was talking to an apartment developer not too long ago and he admitted to me that he had built a building for a certain amount of money, $1 million or so. It was now worth twice that, at least $2 million.

This original rent was based upon the $1 million valuation but now he is able to go into the market and raise another mortgage for $800,000 or so and that is incorporated into the rent structure of that same building. With the $800,000 he is now building another building and he is incorporating—

Mr. Warner: Milk the tenants.

Mr. Young: —that $800,000 into the rent structure of the new building; in other words, twice.

Mr. Good: Terrible inflation and your people oppose the anti-inflation guidelines. You ought to be ashamed of yourselves.

Mr. Young: All I am saying is that over the years—

Mr. Good: You are opposing the legislation.

Mr. Laughren: Because it is discriminatory legislation, that's why.

Mr. Warner: Milking the tenants.

Mr. Young: All I am saying is that over the years inflation has been very kind to the landlords and has been a little tough on the tenants.

Mr. Good: What's your house at? Has it gone up or down in the last 10 years?

Mr. Young: I am not concerned that we try to roll values back to 10 years ago; I don't think that is possible.

I think we have to keep in mind, when we shed the tears, that that increase in value, that inflation, has been very kind to the man who built some years ago; it's not so kind to the fellow who is building now, I agree. It's very kind to the man who built some years ago and who, over the last 10 years or so, likely has written off the capital he put first into that building. He is still charging rents based on today's values. I think this is a thing we have to look at and something we have to recognize.

Other members here have talked about the drying up of the market and the member quoted figures about the drying up of the market. Sure, we have seen a drop in the construction of new rental units. That's true. If you go to a garage and the mechanic says, "I've got your car fixed"—he has ground the valves—and you try it out and say to him, "Somehow or other the car doesn't work very well," if he hasn't put in new sparkplugs when they were obviously worn out, then you're trying to drive that car which had a valve job, while ignoring the sparkplug problem. When it comes to building, to rent control, to apartments, rent control by itself is a futile gesture unless we also embark on an overall programme of planning for production of housing. This is the thing, I think, the minister must realize.

Mr. Roy: Now you are starting to see the light.

Mr. Young: I read the other night in the Toronto Star an article by that great socialist Jack McArthur entitled, "Housing crisis: Economists say controls cause it."

Mr. Martel: It's right on.

Mr. Young: Right on.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: Okay, I am not arguing.

Interjections.

Mr. Young: Among other things, he talks about the drop of housing construction and he blames rent controls for it. He's saying to the minister that he has to recognize that if he is going to put this bill into effect, then he's going to see a diminution of building.

He quotes Sweden as part of this picture. He quotes a certain writer as saying:

> The gradual abolition of rent control since 1958 ... has meant a gradual reduction in the housing shortage ... replaced by a surplus.

This is the old argument that's always trotted out, that in countries like Sweden rent controls were tried and housing diminished. Then gradually controls were abolished and now there was a surplus of housing. A surplus is something new for Sweden because it used to be that the figures showed a very great shortage.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: All the Swedes left that socialist country. They are in Australia now. They left. They couldn't afford the taxes.

Mr. Young: Oh, is that so? For some reason the population has gone up in Sweden. Maybe there's been a lot of activity there at home. In any case, the population has increased.

Hon. Mr. Bernier: You haven't checked lately what's happening in Sweden.

Interjections.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The hon. member for Yorkview has the floor. Order, please.

Mr. Young: It used to be, Mr. Speaker, that when youngsters in Sweden got to be 16 they registered for housing, because by the time they were married and needed housing they might be in line by that time. The housing shortage was very desperate.

Interjections.

Mr. Young: McArthur says they've now turned it into a surplus because they have abolished rent control. What he doesn't say is that since the early 50s and before, the Swedes have very carefully prepared building of housing. They had had careful planning ahead for five, 10 and 15 years. They have had economic and planning controls. They have gone ahead with the whole idea that in so many years time, they're going to have enough houses for their people. They deliberately set out to do that.

Within the planning structure about one-third of their housing is built for the well-to-do, those people over the $500 rent. They leave that to the private sector as long as they build within the plan, for it's a social and economic plan within which they must build and they must observe the guidelines. About a third is co-operative housing, housing in which the government plays a major role in financing and direction. The other third is public housing built by public authority and financed by public authority.

In other words, this kind of planning over the years has resulted in their ability now to gradually reduce and eliminate the controls on rents. This is a lesson, I think, all of us have to learn, that there shouldn't be rent control without planning for the future—without looking ahead and outlining what we want in the way of housing for the people in Ontario 10 and 15 years from now and then deliberately setting up the machinery to build those houses. Our trouble has been that while we talk about rent control, we pathetically are leaving the construction and planning of housing, in too large a measure, to what we call private enterprise. No country in the world has succeeded in building housing for its people when it left it entirely to the private market to do it. It has had to enter this field constructively, with long-term plans to do the job.

I am saying that the rent control legislation —good as it may be now—without the other plan is like trying to fix a motor which needs a new sparkplug by simply grinding the valves. You can't do one without the other and hope to succeed.

I want to add my plea to other members who have spoken here on this bill in respect to Ontario Housing—I think I have in my riding more Ontario Housing units than any other single member in this province. I know the argument is that Ontario Housing is already controlled in that it is pegged to something like 25 per cent of the income of a person, so we say he is going to be protected. With the federal wage control—those wages likely can't go up more than eight per cent to 10 per cent over the next year or two or whatever. Then, within that protection, we

say they are protected. But, the fact is that these people want to feel that they are part of the total community; they want to feel that protection of a rent controller, even though it may not be as important to them—and I admit it—as it is to many others outside the Ontario Housing field. But I think they should come under this umbrella, that they should feel secure that the rent control provisions apply to them as well.

There are a couple of things I want to mention to the minister too. I ran into two instances the other day which rather disdisturbed me—they are simply illustrative of what is happening in this field.

First of all, I had a tenant speak to me about an increase in his rent from $190 to $235. But there was a stipulation in that, that if he paid on time he would get a $10 discount. In other words, the landlord was establishing a base rate of $235 when he should have been talking of $225. So, that when the minister's rent review comes into effect his base rate is now $235 not the actual $225 which in the ordinary course of events is paid by the tenant on time.

The second one was a lease which I have in my hands where the landlord, up to this year, has been looking after the repairs to the various amenities which he provides and which he owns and which should be his. But, in the new lease it says that this person is to pay a certain amount of money—$361 per month, up by about 35 per cent from his former lease—but, it also writes in these words: "The tenant agrees to pay for following services applicable to the rented premises: electricity [that is understandable]; other repairs to washer, dryer, and furnace." The tenants must now keep the furnace, the washer and dryer in repair. This is an expense he did not have before and is a smart way on the part of the landlord to raise the rent. This is the effect of it.

I also had another complaint where a chap forgot his key and asked the superintendent of the building to come up and open his door. That's perhaps an inconvenience to the superintendent, but it was the regulation in that building—and I have found since that it is also the regulation of many others—that the tenant had to pay $5 for that service. It took the superintendent, I suppose, 10 minutes to open the door, and for the forgetfulness there was the penalty of $5 levied against the tenant. Perhaps it's a no bigger fee than the proverbial plumber gets, or the TV repairman, but it's another smart way by which the landlord is able to raise the levy on his rents. [4:15]

I think that is about all that I wanted to say today. I think these are important things which must be taken into account by the minister, particularly the fact that along with with this legislation must inevitably go the long-term planning, which I hope he is undertaking, to build housing and not leave it entirely to the private sector of the economy, He himself must give leadership and this government must give leadership to see that massive homebuilding is undertaken and that the people of Ontario are properly housed within the foreseeable future.

Mr. Sargent: I know that the minister himself is against this legislation, but I understand he rapes very easily and he's going along with the government's need to acquiesce to the needs of the day. I, too, am against gouging.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: It's the Lone Ranger.

Mr. Sargent: Pardon?

Mr. Hodgson: What was that big deal that was announced this morning on the radio?

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: That is the Lone Ranger. Who are you?

Mr. Sargent: John, are you in favour of this bill?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I wonder if the hon. member would return to the principle, and the other hon. members give him the courtesy to listen?

Mr. Roy: He is being interrupted by the minister.

Mr. Ferrier: Don't let them intimidate you, Eddie.

Mr. Sargent: We have in our area a gouging of 20 to 30 per cent increases in rent. We have landlords posting notices to tenants—

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: And that's just in the hotel.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Room rent.

Mr. Sargent: —that they will get a $20 penalty if they are one day late paying their rent.

Mr. Martel: That isn't even for the room.

Mr. Sargent: I am also against, and I decry the fact, not only that hundreds of thousands of our young couples coming into the home market today will never own their own homes—

Mr. Martel: That's the mortgage rates charged by Ottawa.

Mr. Sargent: Right on, Elie. But they will never even have an apartment because, with this legislation, I firmly believe that there is no incentive for the private sector to build apartments.

Mr. Roy: That's right, isn't it?

Mr. Sargent: I happen to know. I had approval myself to build 240 apartments on land I owned; I had approval for the complete go-ahead to build apartments. When I went to the financing of it I found out that at the current price of money at 12 percent, if I built 240 apartments to rent at $200 a month I would be losing money. It would be all for nought.

This is a fact, and I tell you that there will never be any more apartments built in the private sector from here on in. There is not an apartment project on in this whole city by the private sector because, realistically, it's a dead end street. You cannot get by on it.

Mr. Martel: You should fire Trudeau who allows the mortgage rates—

Mr. Sargent: I'll get back to you.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Mr. Roy: You ran in the election against him, and you didn't make out too well, Elie.

Mr. Martel: We did well in our area.

Mr. Sargent: My colleague from Waterloo North (Mr. Good) put this point, and I will enlarge upon it. The fact is that a man who has apartments and has a five-year term, no-interest deal to launch, and then has to refinance seven per cent money at today's market of 12 per cent has to refinance it at a five per cent increase in financing. The going rate is $15,000 per apartment, so it's five per cent, or $60 a month more. He has to refinance that for each apartment.

The eight per cent guideline here is suicide for the people who have their money invested in apartments when they're doing refinancing. This is a fact—I'm not going to get into any argument about whether or not I am right or wrong. This is a fact.

Mr. Lawlor: It is a good idea to get into an argument. Provision is made for that in the legislation.

Mr. Sargent: Oh, yes, they have a chance, Pat. They have a chance in clause 6 to cry hardship. I want to tell you, sir, we project 200,000 or 300,000 appeals immediately. And the member for Lakeshore knows the time lags involved here in appeals. What will happen will be complete chaos.

Mr. Cassidy: Is the member supporting this legislation?

Mr. Sargent: We have to support it, because in the interim, this is the only answer we have. We have to support it and everyone will have to support it. The minister doesn't want it, but even he has to because the gun is to his head.

I think you fellows have got a hell of a good horse here and ride the hell out of it. In this city, 60 per cent of the votes are in apartments, and they are all your votes because this is your horse.

Mr. Worton: They've got no saddle.

Mr. Sargent: It won't work. We have good memories in Owen Sound.

Mr. Cassidy: If you disagree with it, then vote against the legislation.

Mr. Laughren: The Lone Ranger knows.

An hon. member: Are you aware of our bill for 18 months, Cassidy?

Mr. Cassidy: Can't the member speak against it?

Mr. Sargent: I don't have to take the member's advice all the time.

An hon. member: I wouldn't take it any time.

Mr. Lawlor: Is it a dray horse or is it a thoroughbred?

Mr. Sargent: I think this legislation would have more chance to work—it would fill a void. What we need here now is a multi-programme, of the type my friend from Yorkview (Mr. Young) was talking about. We have to have a crash programme of low rental housing, and how are we going to do it?

A few months ago, Mr. Meaney, the head of the AFL-CIO, had been telling how to get America back on track. His answer was three per cent money. After the meeting the reporters gathered with all the media there and said: "Mr. Meaney, you are a responsible man. How could you say such a stupid thing as that?" He said: "Gentlemen, you should know that over the years America has given away millions of dollars across the world—in forgiveness loans and the like—$500 billion

for nothing, to other countries across the world. Then why can't we put America back on track by giving three per cent money for a crash programme in housing?" And they agreed he was right.

The other parallel here is this. The Ontrio Development Corp. has, as we all know, given millions and millions to American firms to entice them into this country. They invite these firms, in the excess profits brackets in the States, to take over our economy. The Premier says if we are going to do a meaningful job in housing here, we have to subsidize it by doing a high speed, crash programme on modular housing and low rental. But this is a two-edged sword.

It could be meaningful to activate all the vacant plants across the province, to give people work and give us modular housing. This is the only way it's going to work, until the government realizes that this legislation is only stopgap. It will not solve the problem in the long run. You must have a mammoth programme of low-rental housing with three per cent money available to the private sector or do it yourself on the government programme.

Mr. Speaker: Does any other hon. member wish to take part in the debate? The hon. member for Peterborough.

Mrs. Sandeman: I enjoyed the equestrian motif introduced into the debate by the previous speaker. He reminds me of the famous gentleman who galloped off in all directions. Hearing him speak, as I understand, against the bill and yet saying he would support it, I became increasingly uncomfortable with the trauma he must have been suffering. It gives me great pleasure, speaking on this side of the House—

Hon. Mr. Davis: You can't say anything, she's a lady.

Mr. Sargent: I can't hear her, Mr. Speaker.

Hon. Mr. Bernier: It's a good thing.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The hon. member for Peterborough has the floor.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Would you repeat it for the member? I think he should hear that.

Mrs. Sandeman: Oh, I can't be bothered—no. I think it is a little easier for me to speak on this side of the House. You have heard in the rhetorical flourishes of some of my colleagues that we are wholeheartedly in support of a bill—

Mr. Roy: Dedicated socialist.

Mr. Nixon: Your more sonorous supporters aren't in the House to hear it.

Mrs. Sandeman: There are enough. We are in support of this bill, but we are not—

Mr. Nixon: The member for Etobicoke (Mr. Philip) is busy on the business of the riding.

Mrs. Sandeman: We are not in support of the exemptions that presently stand in the bill and I'd like to confine my remarks to the exemption which appears under 12(c) of the bill, the exemption applying to residential buildings with four or less units.

One of the reasons we need a bill such as this at the moment is that the vacancy rate in this province is very low. There is very little public housing available, either in family units or senior citizen units, and many families in this province, many senior citizens and many single people, cannot afford the rents in newer highrise apartments.

In ridings such as my own, we do not have many highrise apartments nor do we have many Ontario Housing units. We have enormous waiting lists for those Ontario Housing units which do exist and consequently much of the rental accommodation is in buildings with four units or less. The people who live in these smaller homes, in the old homes which have been changed into three or four rental units, in the duplexes, the people who live in those small apartments are, traditionally, people who cannot afford large, new apartment buildings. They are the people who find that their rents have increased just as fast—and recently faster—than the rents of the bigger apartments.

The tenants in ridings such as Peterborough—and I'm sure this is common across the province—who live in such houses—the older homes subdivided or the duplexes—are, in many cases, on low or fixed incomes. They are the students who cannot afford the $30 or $40 a month increases they have been faced with in September, this year. They are young married couples on very low incomes who are equally unprotected. They are, in increasing numbers, the people who are in receipt of the Ontario disability pensions; who are trying to live or, perhaps I should say exist, on amounts of money out of which as much as 50 per cent already goes in rent. They are the people who are renting small apartments in houses, or in some cases, are struggling to maintain a small rented house on their own.

They cannot possibly afford the kind of increases they have been seeing recently in their

rents. The calls about housing which we have been getting in our riding office and here at Queen's Park from my riding have been, almost without exception, from people who have seen the outline of the bill, are living in homes with four or less units and are appalled that they are not covered.

They are people on disability pensions who have appealed unsuccessfully to get the GAINS pension, who are struggling on all levels with the legislation of this government and feel themselves abandoned by this exemption. I understand the minister is giving some serious consideration to amendments which would remove this exemption and I hope he will consider it is worth doing.

Mr. Roy: I rise to support, with my colleagues, the principle of this legislation as being necessary legislation in the context of the market and the rent and apartment situation not only in Toronto but in many large centres across the province. I feel very privileged as I'm speaking now to have before us the Premier of the province who's gracing us with his presence here. I suppose that's further evidence of the conversion which has taken place on the other side and we see it every day.

Mr. Cassidy: Hugh Segal sent him in.

Mr. Roy: Yes, I was wondering—is that Hugh Segal's influence?

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: That has nothing to do with the principle of the bill.

Mr. Roy: There was a good story about Hugh in the Ottawa Citizen yesterday.

Mr. Cassidy: He's talking about Ottawa Centre.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. minister.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: On a point of order, I wish the hon. member would get back to the principle of the bill so I could take notes. I can't take notes on what he's saying and I'd like him to get back to the principle.

Mr. Nixon: It would do you good.

Mr. Sargent: You don't even know the principle of the bill. What are you talking about?

Mr. Roy: You're probably against the principle of the bill. You're just being forced into this.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The minister didn't have a point of order, but would the hon. member return to the principle.

Mr. Roy: It's nice to see the Premier here and to see that Hugh Segal does have some influence.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: He is always in the Legislature.

Mr. Roy: The reason he's here is apparently that Hugh unfortunately—

Hon. Mr. Davis: You are being very nice to him these days yourself.

Mr. Roy: —does not have that much experience in winning elections; he's not done that well there.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: Mr. Speaker, get him back to the principle of the bill.

Mr. Roy: He's been close to power, as he said, in Ottawa, with Stanfield from 1972 to 1974—

[4:30]

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. Would the hon. member return to the principle of the bill?

Mr. Roy: Don't get too close to heel, because you saw the results of his influence in what happened in the 1974 general election.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. Would the hon. member return to the principle of the bill?

Mr. Roy: Don't cramp my style, Mr. Speaker. I mean, let's ramble a bit, let's have some fun in this place. The exchanges are going across the way here.

Anyway, the other point that is interesting is that the Premier should be here on this type of legislation, because what a painful process they went through before they made up their minds in arriving at a decision on this.

Mr. Sargent: Right.

Mr. McClellan: He should know.

Mr. Roy: What a painful change of mind. In fact, on some days during the last campaign there was a change of mind about three different times on the same day. This is what we had to go through during the full election. Let's talk about some of the positions taken, not only by the government, but by the poor, unfortunate member for Carleton-Grenville (Mr. Irvine).

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I wonder if the hon. member would get to the principle of this bill?

Mr. Roy: I'm right on the principle of the bill. First of all, you recall, Mr. Speaker—

Mr. Ferrier: He doesn't know what it is.

Mr. Roy: —having sat in the last Parliament, the replies that we received from the member for Carleton-Grenville, the Minister of Housing at that time, the predecessor to this present minister. In fact, his reply to any suggestions that we or other members across the House made is that you would see rent control over his dead body. This is basically the approach that he took—

Mr. Cassidy: Where is he now?

Mr. Roy: —and the position hardened from day to day. Yet, as we kept getting closer to the election, we started seeing a shift. Then we heard something from the Premier talking about getting at the gougers of the tenants, and they were going to do it by way of the Unconscionable Transactions Relief Act —a statute which has been picking up dust on the shelf for many many years. All at once this legislation was going to be resurrected and that was going to be the answer to the gouging by some of these landlords.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: You were going to make a stand.

Mr. Roy: Then the next step was the announcement by the Minister of Housing at that time that they were going to shame the landlords. This was beautiful; what they were going to have were boards which were going to look into the question of increases and the names of landlords who had unconscionable increases would be published, and this would do the job for the tenants. The shaming of landlords publicly—what a stand that was. In fact, this was the stand taken in the Tory pamphlet during the last election. As I read it, the pamphlet said:

> To keep rents from soaring and those who rent from being gouged, the government announced rent review boards to hear tenants' complaints and bring to light unjustified and excessive rent increases.

So this was the famous policy, this was the third policy by the government based on the position that it was going to shame the landlords. Then the further position taken by the Premier, and taken by the government again during the election, was that the process was going to work through rent review boards and then through the courts. This was something that the Premier talked about on many occasions. In fact, I should point out that in very close proximity the position changed radically. In a rally in Hamilton on Sept. 15, the Premier said:

> The rent gougers don't like our rent review boards and providing tenants with protection by the courts. But I am sure tenants will approve of it.

So the protection at that point was going to come from the courts. We felt throughout that the court process did not have the flexibility to deal with the problem as it existed in this province. Then, in a speech the following day in Sudbury, we get a new approach again:

> Third, we are going to provide necessary legislation to support our rent review boards. This legislation will protect tenants against excessive rent increases, while allowing tenants a right of appeal to their rents to review boards, which will take their case to the courts without cost to the tenants.

So, another switch in position. First, they were going to shame them, then the tenants were going to go through the court process, now the tenants were going to go through the rent review boards, which would take the case to the court process. This was how the process evolved.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The Chair finds the review of the past election campaign most interesting, but I fail to see how it deals with the principle of this bill.

Mr. Roy: Yes, you find it very embarrassing. I'm getting to the principle of the bill.

Mr. Cassidy: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. As someone who occasionally gives discursive speeches in this Legislature—many of the points being made by the present speaker were made by me last Thursday night. If it was in order then, I'm sure that a review by a Liberal critic is equally in order.

Mr. Speaker: I wouldn't say that it was in order at that time—

Mr. Reid: That kind of help you don't need.

Mr. Speaker: —but we're dealing with it at this point.

Mr. Roy: The member for Ottawa Centre is very kind to put in his word, but the fact that he got away with it does not make it more in order. I do want to make this comment to the Chair. I feel that we're talking about the principle of the bill and how we

arrived at the principle of the bill. If you were to apply the rules strictly we might just as well start reading the bill itself. I'm saying to you that I'm right on on the principle of the bill—

Mr. Cassidy: That's garbage. Mr. Speaker, he might be out of order for being repetitive.

Mr. Roy: —and if it will make you feel any better, I'm arriving at the end of my frolic into the government's position prior to the enactment of this legislation.

The next step happened after the election. Then, the position of the Tories was not a success in the last election, so there was a change of Minister of Housing.

Mr. Hodgson: Neither was yours.

Mr. Roy: The first comment of the new Minister of Housing (Mr. Rhodes), in walking out of the cabinet meeting, was that he didn't believe in rent review boards at that point—a new position then taken by the government. This shocked the Premier himself; that his new minister should shoot from the hip, walking out of a cabinet meeting. Again, this was a different position taken. Finally, we have the baby here; we have the birth of the baby right now, where you have a mixture of controls, limits and the question of review.

Hon. Mr. Davis: I could say something but it would be misunderstood.

Mr. Roy: I say to you, Mr. Speaker, you should take pride in that kind of leadership, that kind of tough government action, because you really waffled on this one. You were all over the rink.

Hon. Mr. Davis: So should you. I tell you this, if there is any group in Ontario that knows about waffling it has to be you people. It has to be you.

Mr. Roy: You really didn't know what you stood for. I suggest to you that if you were to get up and talk about the legislation you, yourself, wouldn't be too sure of what you stand for or what the legislation said.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Mr. Roy: You've changed your position so often on this that you really don't know where you're going. You really had to rely on the opposition to tell you what to do, to tell you what to put—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Mr. Roy: We've had a further example of this today, Mr. Speaker, when they accepted my legislation in relation to speed limits and seatbelts. How's that for a conversion?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Tremendous.

Mr. Kennedy: Just follow through with the bill, Albert.

Mr. Roy: As far as the legislation itself is concerned, some of my colleagues have expressed some concern about certain aspects of the bill. I, and my colleague from St. George (Mrs. Campbell) have talked about the question of the exception made for the question of boarding houses. We're concerned that they are not covered by this legislation. We are concerned as well, and many people, especially from smaller communities and many parts of my own riding, are concerned that apartments with fewer than four units are not covered by this legislation.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: The other leadership candidate didn't speak that long.

Mr. Roy: Yes; that's why his aspirations are limited.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes. I see.

Mr. Roy: I've got higher aspirations. To get back to my point—when in many communities of older-type apartments or older-type housing, the exclusion is made for apartments of fewer than four units, you're really excluding a large sector of suburban or central areas of cities. We should look at this legislation. We should consider receiving representation from various groups about considering amending that aspect of the legislation.

We're concerned, as well, that this type of legislation, in fact, appears to penalize more the landlord who has been responsible over a period of time, a landlord who has had a long-term lease for instance. His base rate is not going to be July, 1975; the base rate is going to be going back to 1972 on a two- or three-year lease. I think there is some merit in looking at this, because the landlord who is a gouger, the landlord who is the swiftest, the guy who is prepared to break his lease to get an increase in rent—he's okay under this. In fact, he's better than okay.

Many landlords—and that's a further concern of this legislation—had put in a hefty increase prior to July, 1975. Now, with the eight per cent, they are just going to slap it on over and above the increase that they

had before July. It is going to be legal under our legislation because there is no right of appeal between July and January, 1976, according to my reading of the legislation. I see one hon. minister shaking her head on this. As I read the legislation, this is the way it exists. Maybe you can talk to your confrère to convince him that maybe he should have more flexibility in that area.

We are concerned, as well, about a further aspect of the legislation. In view of the 60-day notice that is involved here, for all intents and purposes, there is no appeal from July—there will be no appeal from January, 1976, to March, 1976—if you require a 60-day notice, as I read the legislation for an appeal. So there is no appeal from July to March, as I read the legislation. I would like some clarification on this possibly when we discuss it in committee.

In my closing remarks, I find that again the government, having waffled on its position on the legislation, not really knowing where it is going, compounded the error by bringing this type of legislation without accompanying programmes to build houses. I think we all know why we have got into this situation. We got into the situation because the free enterprise system, as we know it, was a bit off kilter in this. It is a question of supply and demand. The equation had become unbalanced and it had become unbalanced, in fact, by many of your programmes and I suggest many of the federal government's programmes.

We could talk about the tax on building materials; we could talk about the increase, I suppose, in labour costs in various areas; we could talk about the long delays in planning, in giving approval for buildings, for houses and for developments and so on. The Hon. John White, who was the Treasurer at the time, said he was going to reduce it to six months. I don't see any evidence that reduction has taken place. These are the type of things which really frustrated people who are interested in building accommodation in this province.

The sad part about the approach taken by this government is that there are no accompanying programmes to build accommodations in this province. We all agreed that the long term solution is certainly not this legislation and in fact may not be the legislation which is going to be accompanying the changes in the Landlord and Tenant Act. Because, if the supply is plentiful, that is the best protection the tenant could have; when he has the choice. Of course the supply is not there because of various factors and I don't limit it to this government. I say that the approach taken and the taxation policy of the federal government, or maybe even the lack of planning as a matter of urban policy on the long term basis, may have contributed to this.

I suppose all governments fail to realize the fantastic increases that were going on in urban areas. They fail to adjust to this. I recall comments by my colleague, the hon. member now for Armourdale (Mr. Givens), who was taking about the federal government getting involved in cities. Trudeau said at that point: "No, constitutionally we can't get involved into this. That is a provincial matter." We know that they are involved in it now but it seems that for constitutional reasons or whatever, the federal government policy in the past—in urban planning and assistance, because of their taxing powers and the moneys that are coming in there; they have the money. The fact remains that they have been lacking. And this government has been lacking through its overall policy.

It seems to us that at least this government, when it is bringing in legislation like this, should make it clearer that this is the type of social legislation which is necessary at this time. Surely, on a long-term basis, the sooner we don't need this type of legislation the better it is going to be. It is not going to go away by itself.

This government is compounding the error by having no positive policies of how we are going to get out of this type of legislation. We find this hard. The Tories, unfortunately, are suffering from what we call hardening of the arteries. They really don't know where they are going. They just react and don't really lead. Of course, this puts them in a position where they are changing. When they are under pressure during an election campaign, their position changes every second day.

I'm concerned as well by the approach taken by some of the hon. members to my right. These members seem to be content to have this type of control for control's sake. We're building a bureaucracy again, a further bureaucracy. That government has all the answers.

Mr. Laughren: The private sector sure doesn't.

Mr. Roy: Surely in this country, in this province, the answer in the long term is to build more houses.

Mr. Laughren: Exactly.

Mr. Roy: And the answer in the long term is to make it possible that we don't need this type of legislation.

Mr. Laughren: Yes, like mortgage rates.

Mr. Roy: But your approach seems to be that controls are great in themselves, more government power, that government has all the answers, that in fact you're building up bureaucracy.

Mr. Laughren: That's your government.

Mr. Roy: You seem to relish in that. Your colleague, the hon. member who spoke this afternoon, was talking about "these socialist principles and these socialist policies." What kind of an approach is that? You're really showing your true colour. What happened to your leader's approach about sweet reasonableness, as we might call it?

Mr. Ruston: That's the act their leader was putting on.

Mr. Roy: Surely, as a matter for the long term, the sooner we get out of this type of legislation, the sooner we get out of all types of control, be it rent control, be it anti-inflation policy—

[4:45]

Interjections.

Mr. Roy: In fact, my friends to the right seem to be—

An hon. member: Not your right, your left.

Mr. Roy: —highly inconsistent. On the one hand, they're prepared to control rents and yet they're not prepared to support the anti-inflation policy as enacted by the federal government.

Interjections.

Mr. Roy: To me that is inconsistent.

Mr. Cassidy: We want a socialist policy, yes, but not what we have from the Liberals.

Mr. Roy: And I hear the member for Ottawa Centre stand up and say: "Great, controls. We're going to have controls across this province, controls for controls' sake. We're going to build up bureaucracy." You know, that's typically your policy, that government has all the answers.

Mr. Young: Who said so?

Mr. Roy: I recall during the campaign that when you were on the platform, along with the Communist candidate, your policy in the area of housing and in government controls was very similar when you were saying that government has all the answers.

Mr. Cassidy: Boy, is that ever slander.

Mr. Moffatt: Also Liberal policy, too.

Mr. Roy: As a matter of long-term policy, we have to get government, in co-operation with private enterprise, to work under this legislation. It's not going to be easy. Some builders, some developers, are taking a very negative attitude.

Mr. Cassidy: A typical Liberal position—the government takes the risk and the corporations take the profits.

Mr. Roy: But we, as a party, must get them together to work—

Interjections.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Mr. Roy: —so that we can build housing. The sooner we can do away with this type of legislation the better it's going to be for the people of this province—

Interjections.

Mr. Roy: —and the better it's going to be for the tenants.

Mr. Cassidy: Tell the tenants about that.

Mr. Martel: All right, I'll take a few cracks at the hon. minister.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: Are you going to be very long?

Mr. Martel: Mr. Speaker, I couldn't help but be impressed by that noise—

Mr. Ferrier: He's cowering in his chair over there now.

Mr. Martel: —that noise who started out by decrying that the free enterprise system had failed and ended up by saying that socialism shouldn't get involved in housing. Now that's possible—

Mr. Roy: I am not saying that. I say governments don't have all the answers.

Interjections.

Mr. Martel: You know, what that member did, of course, was typify the Liberal philosophy: everything to everybody all the time, depending on where you're at. They call it flexibility.

Mr. Ruston: That's what you people did in the last election.

Mr. Martel: I don't know how you can have it both ways, to cry that the free enterprise system has failed miserably leading to this type of legislation, crying for subsidies and then saying that government shouldn't get involved in developing sufficient housing.

Mr. Roy: You didn't understand. As a socialist, you didn't understand.

Mr. Martel: All right, I didn't understand. That's right, I didn't. I have been around here for eight years and I have never been able to understand your position on a hell of a lot.

Mr. Roy: If you would only listen and come to the House once in a while—

Mr. Martel: You know the problem around here. It used to be confusing before. In the last Parliament, there were 23 ideas, or 24 or 25. The NDP position, the Conservative position and 23 Liberals with 23 positions.

Mr. Roy: That's not what Morty said. Morty Shulman didn't say that.

Mr. Moffatt: Is he one of your disciples?

Mr. Martel: Now it's gone a little higher. Now we have—let me see—38 positions, and you can understand my difficulty. There's a Conservative position, the NDP position, and 36 Liberal positions.

Mr. Singer: I am glad I came upstairs to listen to this debate. It's right on the Act.

Mr. Martel: It becomes more confusing, Mr. Speaker, every time.

Interjections.

Mr. Speaker: Would the hon. member come to the principle of the bill?

Mr. Singer: Good idea.

Mr. Roy: What I want to know is, is the member going to support the legislation?

Mr. Cassidy: Of course he is. You know with us. You never know with you.

Mr. Martel: Mr. Speaker, I am sorry to see that the Premier (Mr. Davis) left. When I came in earlier the Minister of Housing (Mr. Rhodes) wanted to know if I was going to speak to the situation as it pertains to Sudbury and I fully intend to.

It is divided into two parts—pre-1972 and thereafter. In 1971-1972, the minister will recall that we raised considerable Cain because of the tremendous housing shortage in Sudbury. There was a vacancy rate of zilch. This afternoon as we tried to question the Premier, the Speaker ruled us out of order. What we were talking about was a policy which this government has allowed to develop which creates that sort of dilemma for the Sudbury region—the boom and bust economy, with the government of Ontario turning its eyes away from the real situation.

An hon. member: Shameful.

Mr. Martel: The Minister of Labour gave us an answer this afternoon—there was no collusion. Certainly there was collusion, bad faith bargaining, the whole business. You don't bring back 650 men who have left the area to go and work somewhere else—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. Would the hon. member return to the principle of the bill?

Mr. Martel: The minister will let me finish. You don't bring back 650 men who have taken work somewhere else, bring them back to work for a week and lay them off. That's what Falconbridge did. They have laid 439 men off—

Hon. B. Stephenson: Four hundred and thirty-eight.

Mr. Martel: Yes, but they brought back over 650 who had jobs in other communities. So you have the boom and bust. We were booming in 1971. We had a vacancy rate of zero. We couldn't get Ontario Housing, nor could we get the Ministry of Housing involved in anything in the way of construction of homes.

The public was gouged. It cost $200 a month to rent a tent in those days in the Sudbury area. Thereafter Inco, as it's wont to do, with the blessing of the Ontario government and the Premier, laid off 3,500 men and there was a mass exodus.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: And they all went to work building your big house.

Mr. Martel: That's right. That's why I have an estate. It's not just a house, it's an estate.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: That's correct.

Mr. Martel: Right. The hon. member doesn't begrudge me that little estate, that little palatial suite?

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: The hon. member didn't pay union wages, either.

Mr. Martel: In 1972 they started out with the concurrence of the government of Ontario. With the refusal of the government to look into Inco's little game at that time, and its policy of licensing and permits and contracts, they were allowed to move out. There was a bunch of people who were requested by the company to build apartments. I hope the hon. minister is listening. They were requested by Inco to build some of the apartments and then they were left empty—a 40 per cent vacancy rate.

What is happening now? It took two years to get a little upturn. The apartment buildings are filled at last, and Falconbridge plays its little game, and it lays a thousand off. The minister might say 439. I want to tell the minister—she's here now—that within a month another 400 men will be laid off.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. I understand the hon. member's concern for his riding but I would like him to discuss at this time the bill before us. I am not trying to suppress his right of free speech but not on this bill. He can do that during the Throne Speech debate or the debate on the budget, but now let's get back to the bill and save us all some time.

Mr. Martel: Mr. Speaker, I remind the hon. minister that other people have talked about the other part pertaining to this legislation—the necessity to construct accommodation—and that's what we are getting to—

Mr. Speaker: The Chair will recognize some brief comments as to the need, but we would ask the hon. member to keep them fairly brief.

Mr. Martel: Mr. Speaker, I guarantee I am going to be right on topic.

Mr. Laughren: As always.

Mr. Martel: I want to get back to where I was before the hon. minister so rudely interrupted. I would like to tell the Minister of Labour that within a month—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Mr. Martel: —there will be another layoff.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Mr. Martel: —and what will happen, Mr. Speaker, is that you will have more vacancies in the apartments in the Sudbury area. That's because of the policy of the government to allow these layoffs without ever investigating what the corporations are doing. So you have the boom and bust mentality—with the concurrence of the Government of Ontario. And when you ask the Premier—as we did this afternoon—to look into it, he says no, it's left to the region. Well, that's nonsense, that's total nonsense.

The minister had a delegation in from Sudbury—and I want to speak to that because he suggested I wouldn't—that that group who built after 1972 are in the bind I talk about—on the request of the companies they built apartments, and then saw a 40 per cent vacancy rate.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: We are talking about the rent programme.

Mr. Martel: A 40 per cent vacancy rate. Ultimately they had their apartments filled, and are now into a bind again because we are going to have another mass layoff with 1,000 workers leaving the Sudbury area.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: What has that to do with rent control?

Mr. Martel: And that is going to affect the whole of the economy of the Sudbury area, and it is going to affect the number of apartments that are going to be confronted with going under.

Mr. Speaker: Would the hon. member come to the principle of the bill?

Mr. Martel: In the process, Mr. Speaker, the rents have increased rather tremendously—

Mr. Singer: It's a waste of time listening to that guy.

Mr. Martel: —in the last couple of months.

I just want to put a letter on the record if I might—Well, we'll find out if I am wasting the time of the Legislature.

Mr. Singer: You haven't once talked on the bill and you have talked for 10 minutes.

Mr. Roy: The member for Sudbury East does it so well that people can't tell.

Mr. Martel: Well, only certain people. It depends on what your IQ is—if you've got one.

Mr. Speaker, this letter is addressed to me. It's concerning housing—Cambrian Village to be precise. Let me put it on the record:

> To recap our conversation we submit the following: On or about May 7, 1975, Cambrian Village was sold to Michaud Enterprises Ltd. in Sudbury.
>
> Effective that date our monthly rental was adjusted from $225 to $235. [That was June.]

In August, 1975, we were advised that all tenants would be responsible for their own hydro from Sept. 1, 1975. This of course necessitated our making initial deposit to Sudbury Hydro of $20 plus the rental. It will also mean an additional approximate outlay of $10 per month.

On Oct. 4 we received "Letter No. 5" advising that tenants would be billed for natural gas, effective March, 1976. This would result in approximately $25 to $30 per month at today's rate, but we must bear in mind the 52 per cent increase in natural gas in the immediate future.

So in fact it will be higher than that. To top it all off there is a $10 levy if you get your apartment painted, and there is a $20 levy if you are one day late with your rent. It doesn't take much of a mathematician to realize that we're talking approximately $95 a month in Cambrian.

Mr. Laughren: What if you are a day early?

Mr. Martel: That's a good point. If you are a day early you don't get a $20 rebate. No, no, you only pay $10 extra if you are a day late. That's called the free enterprise system.

An hon. member: That seems fair.

Mr. Martel: That's right. It depends on who is in control.

Mr. Mancini: If you are late with your taxes you have to pay a penalty.

Mr. Laughren: That's because we have a Liberal government in Ottawa.

Mr. Mancini: What about municipal government?

Mr. Martel: Mr. Speaker, we are in fact talking about an increase that ranges from $75 to $95 for that group of people in that particular development, so you've got two different types of problems in the Sudbury area. Cambrian was there before 1972-1973. Possibly that is the reason why—as some of my colleagues have said before me, if you got into the act early enough you are in pretty good shape, if you got into the act after 1972, at least in Sudbury, you are in trouble.

It amazes me that when I try to speak to this the minister says, no, we're not on the bill, because we are.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: You are now.

Mr. Martel: What my colleague from Yorkview (Mr. Young) has said previously is that unless you build an accompanying number of accommodations you are not going to get out of this problem—you're never going to get out of being the policeman until we have sufficient accommodation.

Of course the reason the Liberals aren't too happy to talk about such things as mortgage rates—12 per cent—is because anybody worth his salt would realize that we could find moneys at a lot less to provide that type of accommodation. One might look at the railroaders' pension fund, which I am told is worth about $3 billion, and on which most railroaders will tell you they get about 4½ per cent on the buck.

[5:00]

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. This has nothing to do with the principle of the bill.

Mr. Martel: It has to do with providing the funding. You have allowed other people to speak to this point all afternoon.

Mr. Speaker: The Chair would draw to your attention that the hon. member for Yorkview made his point very briefly. We recognize that point; we will do so again. But we would ask you when you are commenting on points relative to the bill, but not right on the principle, that you do so briefly.

Mr. Martel: All right, I appreciate that opportunity to make my comments briefly, Mr. Speaker, and I will continue. The money is there. If you want to provide accommodation, the minister himself, through Ontario Housing, might use some of the funding that the government is spending for the purchase of land to drive down land costs. In my municipality, as the minister knows, we are selling serviced lots for $8,400, where five miles away they are selling at $10,000 without services, and in the city of Sudbury—thanks to free enterprise — at $22,000 to $26,000 in the latest subdivision, on the rock.

Mr. Shore: Where are you getting the $8,400 from?

Mr. Martel: In the town of Capreol.

Mr. Shore: Free enterprise?

Mr. Martel: No, developed by the town. Property owned by the town, developed by the town.

Mr. Cassidy: You guys want the free enterprise.

Mr. Martel: That's socialism.

Mr. Laughren: That's right.

Mr. Martel: And that's what you should be doing with Ontario Housing money. You should be driving prices down by fully developing lots and competing. The free enterpriser likes the competition. You should be competing with him.

Mr. R. S. Smith: I'm talking about the cost of services—the one on the rock and the one in Capreol—

Mr. Martel: You should be competing with those free enterprisers and reducing the cost of land—Valley East has no rock—

Mr. R. S. Smith: That's what I mean. That's why—

Mr. Martel: I don't live in Valley East. I live in Capreol. I am telling you that there are ways that you should be using your ministry and the money there to drive down the price of land—one of the major components in the high cost of homes. But you don't. You get in there and you play their game. You sell at their level because in the city of Sudbury, OHC lots are going for $20,000. You play the game with them. You are part and parcel of the system. You are not really sincere about bringing land down so that you can provide housing at a cost that people can afford.

I suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, that the minister could play a very useful role if he would just move in those areas, such as decent mortgage rates and a decent cost for land. I might ask the minister if he will indicate whether he intends to get rid of this type of policy which prevails for the people at Cambrian. Rent will be $245 if paid after the first of the month; before that date, rent will be $225. I hope that the minister will add to the legislation, that these people cannot charge $20 if tenants are one day late with the rent. That's ridiculous.

I would ask the minister to clarify this—and I have read the bill very carefully—can rents be increased in the various ways that the owners of Cambrian Village have attempted to do—through utilities, gas and so on; even painting the house for $10 a month. I think there have to be protections. At the same time, I want to say that this minister from northern Ontario—to prevent any more serious erosion of housing as has occurred in the Sudbury area—has got to sit down with the Premier and talk about the boom and bust economy that faces the entire north. Otherwise, we are going to have continual problems with people who construct apartment buildings, whether they be large or small. This minister, as the minister from the north, realizes that problem and should do something about it.

Mr. Swart: I rise to say a few words on the rent control bill, just for two reasons—first, because I think it is such an important matter, that it should be emphasized in this House; second, because it seems to me that the debate, to a very large extent, at least while I have been here, has been revolving around the issue of free enterprise versus socialism or something of this nature.

I am rather intrigued by the attempt of the Liberals, particularly the Liberal leader and the hon. member for Ottawa East (Mr. Roy).

Mr. Martel: The would-be leader; that's the would-be leader.

Mr. Swart: —to try to dissociate themselves from anything connected with socialism. I am sure the members on the opposite side of the House, if they speak on the issue, will do the same thing. I think it points up a fault in their two parties that they somehow or other feel that they have to speak against anything that can be construed as socialism. I just tell them that they should move into the NDP—

Mr. Mancini: Have you been listening all afternoon?

Mr. Swart: —because in this party we don't have that fear. We don't have to examine everything in the context of whether or not we are supporting doctrinaire free enterprise. We can examine something like this is on the basis of whether or not it is good for the public—whether or not the public interest comes first. So we don't have to fit it within the context of either doctrinaire socialism or doctrinaire free enterprise.

My few remarks on this bill will be made within that context, because that is just what we want to do within this party: put the public interest first and not the interests of any special vested groups. We believe there should be some democracy in the marketplace—that the tenants should have a right to some say, through their elected representatives passing legislation which gives them some protection. We believe that democracy should be extended to that degree—so that they would have some say about what they pay and the conditions of the accommodation in which they live.

I want to say, in answer to one of the previous speakers, that we in this party don't

think that all landlords are gougers. We are not supporting rent-control legislation which we think should go substantially further than this bill because we think they are all gougers. We do think there is a substantial amount of gouging going on.

Most legislation is passed, not to control the majority, but to control the minority who would attempt to abuse society and their fellow citizens in some manner. We pass laws against speeding although perhaps not the majority of people speed. We have a Criminal Code, but it was not developed because a majority of people are criminals. So, we need rent legislation because there are, within our society, a substantial number of owners of apartment buildings and other accommodation who will take advantage of the people. They will gouge their tenants and otherwise cause them to live under conditions they should not have to.

In answer to the hon. member for Ottawa East about this party being a party that likes controls, let me say to him that we are not a party that likes controls. We are a party that recognizes there are controls being exercised by someone, and we think they should be exercised by a legislature in the public interest—not by the owners of the accommodation just in their interest. Make no mistake about it, there are rents that are controlled today. Somebody is setting rents and they are not setting them in the public interest.

In any event, I would point out, Mr. Speaker, that the need for rent controls today is primary because the Liberal government at Ottawa and the Conservative government in Ontario have not taken the steps that they should have to provide housing for the public. We now have a condition where rent controls are an absolute necessity if we are going to keep any fairness in the housing situation in our society.

It is because we believe that the public interest should come first that we say the retroactivity in this bill does not go far enough. Any examination will show that there are huge increases in rent taking place, certainly in the Metropolitan Toronto area and in many other parts of Ontario, at least back to the first of last year, perhaps before the first of this year, perhaps before that. If we are going to make this fair, if we are going to deal in the public interest, then we should go back at least to Jan. 1 of this year in our retroactivity.

In our party we have seen no indication that the eight per cent allowable increase in this bill is justified. Our examinations show that approximately six per cent is the increase in the cost to landlords. If this is the case, and it is true in Quebec, it is true in British Columbia and—

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: You didn't study it here.

Mr. Swart: The minister may have studied it here; I've seen no evidence presented here, no evidence presented in this House, to show there have been average increases of eight per cent in the cost—

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: Your group didn't study it here in Ontario.

Mr. Swart: —of providing accommodation in this province. Our figures show six per cent, and in the public interest, we think it should be six per cent.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: Now be honest. You didn't study it in Ontario.

Mr. Swart: I don't know just how one does study it. But I think it is the responsibility—

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: Your British Columbia figures say that.

Mr. Swart: —of the government of this province, which brings in a bill, to justify that type of increase within this province. I've seen no justification for that.

Interjection.

Mr. Shore: Wages aren't being held to eight per cent.

Mr. Swart: We believe, in this party, that the increase in rent should be based on the increase in costs to the landlord and that's part of the principle of our bill. The exclusion of the four units—and I understand the hon. minister is willing to reconsider this—but the exclusion of those units, those properties that only have four units, is certainly not in the public interest when it excludes 40 per cent.

I mentioned in this House on Friday, I believe, the case in Welland of accommodation where the rats had infested a property. Pictures were shown on the front page of the paper where these people had killed seven rats in the last two days, that had come into the house. They had been attempting to get into public housing. There was no public housing available. So they had to continue to live in these conditions. The other part of that coin is that that landlord owns many properties in the city of Welland—two or

three units—of the same classification. The bill which we have before us, put forward by the government, would exempt rent controls on those type of properties. In the public interest, we can't accept that.

We also believe in the permanence of this type of legislation. At least the bill should not be going to terminate at a given date. If conditions should arise, at some future time, that we no longer need rent control, and it can be proved, I suggest this party would be the first one that would be glad to see the rent control legislation eliminated. I doubt very much if that day will come within our time.

Mr. Shore: What is the definition of that date?

Mr. Swart: There is a very substantial difference on whether it terminates at a given time or whether it is put in, as most legislation, that remains law until action is taken to terminate it. It makes a very real difference in the matter of the amount of housing that is going to be built. They are going to wait. They are going to wait until the rent controls are lifted, and it's going to deter housing construction during the next two years.

You asked the question and I'll try to answer it: It is going to make it very difficult to get good rent control officers, to get people who are willing to take a job that is only going to last for two years. I suggest that the success, the public acceptability, of the rent control programme will depend to a large extent on the type of rent control officers you have in the various places.

[5:15]

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: You are going to make the bureaucracy grow.

Mr. Swart: If they are just going to be political appointments, or somebody who wants to get a little extra money for a couple of years, I've suggested it is not going to be very acceptable and not going to be working very well. Therefore, I think, there should be permanence to this bill.

That concludes the remarks I want to make with regard to this bill except, perhaps, to reiterate that I think we should put this in the perspective not of whether it's socialism or private enterprise but whether it meets the needs of the public. We in this party think the amendment which we will propose and which we hope the government will accept will be the minimum which will meet the needs of the public. We hope this House will approve the rent control bill with those amendments.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Nickel Belt.

Mr. Haggerty: Stand up.

Mr. Laughren: I'm on the chair already.

It is with much pleasure that I enter this debate. I'm enjoying this afternoon more than I've enjoyed an afternoon in this Legislature for a long time. I've enjoyed the way the debate has swirled about and really broken down into a question of whether or not we think this is creeping socialism in Ontario. Any time we can debate in this Legislature the virtues of socialism versus the inequities of the free enterprise system, we're quite happy to do so with the other two parties.

I would say it's really strange to hear the Liberal Party decrying socialism in Ontario while at the same time unanimously supporting the legislation. Of course, the Conservative Party would be the first ones to support the Liberals on that principle but they're the ones who are introducing the legislation. It's with considerable pride that we take part in this debate. We know for sure that we had a major role in ensuring that this legislation was introduced in the first place.

The debate over review versus control is really not important. I would quote my colleague from Welland (Mr. Swart) who said, "What's really important is what it does for people and whether or not in protects tenants." Of course, that is why we are here and why we raised the issue in the first place.

We know there is going to be considerable debate over the percentages, whether or not the allowable increase should be eight per cent or six per cent. Others will say, "Why would you pick six per cent?" I suppose we could ask the government why it picked eight. I suspect there is no magic figure which is absolutely right. We suspect that six would be a more just figure than eight because we know there have been substantial increases over the last few years and we think there was considerable surplus generated over those years.

The whole question of exemptions has been talked about. We are certain that there are too many exemptions and I gather that the minister—I didn't hear him say it—has indicated that there will be amendments to improve that. I certainly hope so.

The retroactivity date, I suppose, is another question just like the percentages. What date is absolutely right? I feel, and the rest of my party does, that Aug. 1 is not the proper date and it should go back to the beginning of the year. I think there were lots of landlords who

anticipated some form of rent control or rent review in Ontario and consequently built it into increases during the first six months of 1975.

In Nickel Belt there is one highrise. I think it is nine storeys. There is another one which may be five or six storeys. The question of rent control as it applies only to highrises certainly doesn't affect the small communities in most of northern Ontario and that's why we will be most anxious to pursue the necessity of removing those exemptions for fourplexes, triplexes, duplexes and rooming houses.

My colleague from Sudbury East (Mr. Martel) raised the whole question of what happens when we have a tremendous change in vacancy rates. In Sudbury in a matter of about two years we went from the lowest vacancy rate to the highest vacancy rate in all Canada. Those, I believe, are Statistics Canada statistics. That, surely, puts a community through the wringer and there is danger that it's going to happen again. I suppose that's the logical extension of the free enterprise system in which they do as their balance sheets dictate to them. That is one of the reasons rent control is necessary in communities such as Sudbury. It's strange that the population of Sudbury in the last year or so has actually declined in absolute numbers and yet we have a housing crisis—at least it's getting severe. With the latest layoff that may be altered.

When the Minister of Labour (B. Stephenson) was here a few minutes ago, she scoffed at the figure of 1,000. But we are certain that there is going to be close to 1,000 men laid off at the Falconbridge operations. They have already announced 439 and there is going to be a phase 2 of the layoff which will probably see just as many go. And then of course there is the related trade. So that is going to play havoc with the housing situation in the Sudbury area.

I agree with my colleague from Yorkview (Mr. Young) who talked about a rent control programme by itself not being enough—that surely in conjunction with rent control we need a massive public housing programme in Ontario, we need a massive land banking programme in Ontario along with rent control legislation. In a community like Sudbury there are people working in the mines at wages that are probably in the neighbourhood of $10,000 to $12,000. The thought that they are paying $12,000, $16,000 or $22,000 for a serviced lot is just ludricrous. I know it's no better in other large urban centres in Ontario either. But what is happening in northern Ontario and other parts is that people are being driven out into the outlying areas. That's causing long-term planning problems, and so forth.

So we will be supporting this legislation, Mr. Speaker, partly because it is a logical intervention of government into the private sector when the private sector has failed to meet the needs of people.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Lakeshore.

Mr. Lawlor: Mr. Speaker, I feel terribly biblical—not bibulous, biblical—this afternoon.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: You look biblically terrible.

Mr. Lawlor: I think that once upon a time in a place called Asia Minor a certain man riding on horseback fell off that horse and said, "Now I see." What kind of a donkey was the minister riding on when you hit the turf?

Mr. Good: Saul of Tarsus.

Mr. R. S. Smith: He is not Paul, he is Peter.

Mr. Lawlor: Conversions come late, don't they? It is all right though, I tell the minister. He can go out to his friends in the community and to the landlords, wring his hands a little, weep slightly, dampen his eyelids, and say "It was all those socialists that did it."

Again, as I say, it is biblical. You haven't, I wouldn't think, the decency of Adam who, turning to Eve, said, "Lord, she made me do it." We are not that cheap. It's more the condition of Eve saying to Adam, "How did it come about?" And he says, "The serpent spoke to me, tempted me, and I fell." We are all serpents in the New Democratic Party; we speak rhetorically and we tempted you. And, Lord help me, the venom has infected the system and you have come to this noxious, toxic task that you find yourself in today.

Mr. Good: You have been crawling on your bellies ever since. That is what happened to the serpent.

Mr. Bullbrook: Do you know what St. Patrick did to you people?

Mr. Good: You know what happened to the serpent?

Mr. Bullbrook: There are none left in Ireland. No socialists.

Mr. Lawlor: All the chagrin, all the terrible, almost dervish-like, twirlings that we put up with through the hearings of Bill Pr33—the longest single interval, Wednesday after Wednesday, that the private bills committee of this House ever underwent. It was under the auspices of Mr. Irvine, who on most occasions didn't dispose himself to appear. But innumerable delegations, representing a diversity of interests, did appear. We sat through these things meeting, on the part of the government and the members sitting on that committee at every stage of the way with resistance, suppression and total blockage on every count throughout a period of six, seven or eight consecutive weeks in the spring. The election was called and it never did come to fruition or to any particular understanding.

In that particular debate, the city of Toronto's propositions etc., were scouted, explored, and worked out very thoroughly and the ramifications of this measure were brought to light in a way I have never seen previously in the Legislature. It was a most hopeless piece of business because of the obtuseness on the part of the powers that be throughout that thing.

The one conclusion one came to was the argument used by the Urban Development Corp. and their lackeys that places were not being built because of the threat of this legislation fell flat. It was simple to point out that they weren't being built in any event. There was a question of getting the cart before the horse or some kind of casuality feature worked in—which came first? It was the failure of the industry itself to go ahead and build despite the carrots held out to that donkey. Enormous benefits were conferred upon the housing industry in this regard and still could be and still are and still they are not being built.

I think, for instance, of the insurance and trust corporations of this province with very large sums of money indeed sitting and being diverted into common stocks where they are losing for their shareholders—their investment money is coming out their ears —instead of putting it into something very solid, something which has virtually a guaranteed return on the investment.

In this particular area the trust corporations and the insurance companies took part of the equity in new apartment construction. They weren't content to take the mortgages. They wanted a part of the action. And even with that, the thing has dried up. Is there no end to human invidiousness and to the reaching out, the acquisitiveness in this regard? Is there no end to fallacious arguments that we don't build because we haven't got sufficient return? They work themselves into the central feature; it has nothing to do with rents.

They simply share in the overall investment dividends which flow from the thing. They can share in whatever proportion they see fit according to their investment of client's funds. If they want 15 per cent or they want 25 per cent, they simply demand it. Nevertheless in face of all this the market has dried up. Through a radical failure on the part of the people who complain most in their own house—or in their unbuilt house—we are driven to this particular kind of legislation.

The legislation is defective on two counts which I wish the minister would take under consideration or at least consult on with his colleague, the Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations (Mr. Handleman). One would have to do with a model lease arrangement which we are bereft of and for which I see no move being made to provide. Secondly, a tenants' bill of rights, which other jurisdictions have devised and constructed and which, in the hang-back, hang-dog atmosphere of this House, has not been forthcoming.

The retroactive feature in this legislation must bear; it is the pivotal feature of the legislation. We are going to ask the minister to back up a little bit on this. Many of our people think the thing should be backed up back to June, 1974, and even before that because the escalations were manifold and multitudinous at that particular time and before that. In a kind of compromise solution to the thing, holding out, I suppose, some form of olive branch we say it is unpalatable to us unless it goes back to Jan. this year. They all anticipated in the spring of the year such legislation coming into being. Despite the government's resistance it was in the cards and these people are shrewd; they are business people. They know the score. They could feel the winds blowing over them and moved in anticipation of the legislation so that the minister must move as a counteracting force, in this regard, to rewrite the balance in the area of increased rental.

[5:30]

I wonder if the legislation is not also defective insofar as escalation clauses of all kinds are concerned. The minister may argue, and he no doubt may argue in committee, that the breath of the definition in the legislation, as it is at present, is adequate to cover that contingency. Personally I do not believe

that it is. I think of the numerous leases in which there are special clauses with respect to say, separate school supporters, who must make up the difference between the mill rate and the amount of assessment made in the public school area over again. That is a constant recurring and deeply endemic feature of leases in the Province of Ontario, and particularly in the city of Toronto, for a long time past.

But those are not the escalation clauses that I'm overtly concerned with. The minister makes no mention of those sort of things: The ones in which, on the side of the lease, they have now come to type on a clause which gives them the power, for instance, in one of its features, if there is any increase in municipal rates of taxes, that increase, the differential between a certain base date and the date of which the assessment is made, will be borne by the tenant entirely.

It doesn't seem to me that that's proper. I don't understand why landlords do that, in any event, because the full amount of the taxes that they pay to the municipalities is deductible on their income tax. Why would they seek to levy that burden upon their tenants when they get the full alleviation thereof elsewhere? Do they, in that particular context—I would love to investigate this—take the full benefit of the deduction under the income tax and nevertheless derive the usufruct of the benefit from the tenant without mention, having got a double benefit within the purview of the single clause? I suspect there are a good many of them who do that. While one admits that they could get themselves into very severe difficulties with the tax department, nevertheless this is a feature that is also within the ambit of the minister's authority and is not specifically provided for within the terms of the legislation itself.

The courts are the wrong place to have hearings of this kind. Through long processes of government there has been the detestation, the hostility toward courts—I am sorry—toward administrative bodies of all kinds. It's an ongoing deeply endemic concept in English law and among conservative minds that administrative agencies are somehow suspect, that they must be avoided if possible, that the courts have some kind of a priority, that their prestige and that their position in society is such as to warrant an addiction to them and attention upon them. That, I thought, had largely dissipated and disappeared since certain reports written around 1925-1930 castigated all governmental utility agencies and administrative bodies saying that they were outside the democratic purview. We've come to accept them. We find that they work rather well. Within specific areas of expertise as have to be developed in this area in a jurisprudence, the courts prove themselves largely otiose, out of date and not particularly receptive.

Secondly, the courts of this province, down here in the courthouse on University Ave., are so overloaded that the Attorney General (Mr. McMurtry) himself has to admit that he is going to have to appoint new judges specifically to handle matters of this kind. The costs of judges are very high indeed, and provision of facilities to operate in are very scant indeed. It's obvious that this sort of thing is a job for an administrative agency where individuals do not necessarily have the legal temper, all the formalism, all the legalism that goes into that, which prolongs the hearings, which sets up nice points.

This doesn't need nice points. This needs an across-the-board adjudication to be reached as quickly as possible at the least expense with the greatest access. That's what administrative bodies were designed to fulfil and to do. Yet teh minister scouts them. I have no objection to an appeal from such a body to the devisional court of this province in cases outreaching the jurisdiction or in cases of the breaches in natural justice that sometimes flow from people who are not trained in law. That is the safeguard that the ministers fall back upon. And why he should go off on a particular tangent and involve bodies which are not well equipped to handle this sort of thing, quite bemuses me. But it shows that thin edge of resistence that typifies the legislation throughout. It is permeated by discontent—the minister's discontent. There is no generosity of feeling and there is no forthright approach to this legislation, accepting something as not only necessary but possibly beneficial to all concerned. This is a fallacy, and the major failure in the legislation with the minister's innumerable exclusions, etc.

I shall wind up by simply saying that the government puts its emphases—and has put its emphases for a long time—in the wrong place. It is worried about money for housing. Yet it has been pointed out to the government that there are pension funds available, that there are very considerable pools of financial resources in this province and country for this business. But it has never arrogated itself on to that point. It has never given consideration.

The priorities of the Conservative government for the past 50 years have been on highways. If I had anything to do with it, I would divert some of that money out of highways. There is too much money being spent on 401. We don't have to widen it every 10 days and spend $50 million a mile. I would think that a third to a half of that highway budget, which would represent in the region of $500 million, could be arrogated, at least for an interim period, into the housing market.

This building has to be done under public auspices, if the government is going to do it at all, both with respect to the highrise, in conjunction with the trust companies and the insurance companies, and with respect to the housing market, to row housing—

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: Don't you want highways in the north?

Mr. Lawlor: —and to condominium housing, housing in the environs of the city. The government has the land—

Mr. Speaker: It seems to me there are too many conversations going on. The member for Lakeshore has the floor.

Mr. Ferrier: He is just worried that the highway for Northumberland will be cut back.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: Mr. Speaker, I just suggested I would move the money out of the Thunder Bay and Port Arthur ridings into—

Mr. Lawlor: The hon. minister doesn't have to be narrow minded about it. He doesn't have to start nitpicking or pinpointing or trying to threaten or do any of that nonsense. Just investigate that budget.

Mr. Foulds: What kind of blackmail is that?

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: I wouldn't threaten him for the world, although I think it may be—

Mr. Lawlor: There is money there. I would divert it for two or three years. Put a moratorium on the highway development, particularly around the major cities. The government would accomplish enormous things.

Mr. Stokes: It is very easy for a member who has more highways than he can use.

Mr. Lawlor: In any event, it holds the lands in vast tracts around the city. It should bring in the Ontario Water Resources Commission or some similar agency, peculiarly and exclusively within government auspices, to put in the services on that land. It is the only way it is ever going to be done. Then call in the private developer, then call in the private builder on terms, on contracts and on conditions. They would be pleased to do it. It gives them a guaranteed income on one side.

Mr. Good: That's what you people voted against the other day. You voted against it the other day.

Mr. Shore: You'd better get together with the rest of your friends.

Mr. Lawlor: The minister takes the basic rate off and builds the houses. And that is perfectly within his purview. If he did that on any scale, in three years he would have alleviated the condition.

Mr. Good: That's exactly what you voted against in Bill 6.

Mr. Lawlor: Why doesn't he have some forthrightness? Why hasn't he got some imagination in this particular case, instead of a hangdog, pessimistic, woebegone attitude possessed by his predecessor and, so far as I can see from this minister's general demeanour and deportment, possessed by him too.

Mr. Cunningham: I have just listened to this recitation of what might be called Canterbury Tales and it is with a great deal of interest that I hear this dichotomy that exists within his party—that being the problem of the socialists and the private enterprisers. I am sure that I sympathize—and I know the members opposite me do sympathize with them too—with their dilemma, as it would relate to the possibilities of the next election.

I am glad to hear that a majority of them still adhere to this great principle of socialism that they talk of, and that in fact we won't be hearing any more of this great attribute of private enterprise—at least from them.

I would ask them to think sincerely about the ramifications of a reduction of supply, which is going to force the legitimate private enterpriser—who is in fact becoming a rarity in this province of ours, almost as rare as Conservative members—I would ask them to think about the ramifications of this legislation.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: Who is sitting in third place?

Mr. Cunningham: You lost Wentworth North, my friend.

Mr. Ferrier: They are an endangered species.

Mr. Gaunt: We picked up 13.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: God knows, you couldn't go much lower.

Mr. Speaker: Order. Back to the principle of the bill. The member for Wenthworth North.

Mr. Cunningham: I would ask them to think about the ramifications of this legislation which I support in principle. What about the legitimate landlord who hasn't raised his rent in good faith, because he hasn't needed to for a number of years.

Mr. Warner: He's not affected by the legislation.

Mr. Cunningham: I can assure the House he will raise his rents to the limit, and that will be inflationary. What about the landlord who contemplated massive improvements to his buildings? In travelling around Toronto, I see some buildings that could use such improvements. They won't now. What about the various services—cleaning, gardening, landscaping, snow-ploughing? I would suggest that these services will be reduced. We only have to look south of the border to New York City where they have had rent controls for 20 years—25 years—and look at the tenements that have resulted from this type of legislation.

Mr. Germa: Try Chicago where it is free enterprise.

Mr. Cunningham: I would think that if my associates in the NDP had their way, there would be no such thing as private enterprise. I listened with interest to Mr. Laughren say that he would have been pleased to see this percentage—

Mr. Speaker: Will you refer to the member as the member from so-and-so?

Mr. Cunningham: From so-and-so? That's how we refer to him in caucus—as a so-and-so.

Mr. Speaker: No. The member for Nickel Belt please.

Mr. Cunningham: He suggested six per cent, why not five, why not four? How about zero?

Mr. Germa: That's all right. Why not zero?

Mr. Cunningham: Where's the money going to come from—the United Appeal?

Mr. Moffatt: No, we take it out of your pocket.

Mr. Cunningham: What about the landlords who were interested, I am sure quite sincerely and legitimately, on a private enterprise basis, in constructing new developments? I rather doubt they will now, and I wouldn't think that we will find—

Mr. Young: They were?

Mr. Cunningham: I am sure they were.

Mr. Warner: They haven't been.

Mr. Cunningham: They have been terrified by your party for the last six months.

Interjections.

Mr. Cunningham: The question I would put to my socialist friend is, who is going to build these buildings? We heard, with a great deal of respect—

Mr. Foulds: Who hasn't built them for the last several years.

Mr. Cunningham: —all during the last election the results of the famous Comay report. I enjoyed listening to my opposition candidate in the NDP tell me how we were falling short in Ontario, how people needed places to live. I agree with him.

I would question again, who is going to build these places that we require for people to live in? Where, in fact, are they going to live? Is the government going to get involved in this activity?

Mr. Germa: Why not?

Mr. Cunningham: Mr. Speaker, and through you to the minister, what we need is rent review, nothing in excess of that.

If I could use an anology of the situation —as a result of the greed of maybe one tenth of the landlords of this province, we are seeing a situation where the Province of Ontario is buying the whole cow rather than just getting the milk.

Interjections.

Mr. Cunningham: The real problem, I would submit to my socialist friends—and I should hope the people of Ontario won't forget that posture of theirs regardless of how timid they appear to be in elections—the real problem, my friends, is one of supply.

And I would say through you, Mr. Speaker, to the people of Ontario, that this solution which is offered by the members of the New Democratic Party—or as they say in my riding,

the No Down Payment party—is a problem of supply, and I would encourage you to remember that it is private enterprise that is going to build these buildings. It is private enterprise that has the financial—

[5:45]

Mr. Foulds: Why have they failed for the last 15 years? Answer that question.

Mr. Cunningham: Because they have been afraid of, I think, the posturing by your party.

Mr. Foulds: Oh, I thought private enterprise was aggressive and unafraid.

Mr. Cunningham: I shouldn't think anybody would want to put their money in at six per cent or four per cent or three per cent or two per cent.

Mr. Foulds: Why hold it at that rate? Why not put it up, in your view, to 16 per cent?

Mr. Cunningham: I should think that the traditional methods of supply and demand would afford the people of Ontario, if reason shall prevail, more housing starts.

Mr. Grande: It doesn't work.

Mr. Cunningham: And I would hope that this would not be the long-term approach by the Province of Ontario, but rather a temporary method of ensuring that fairness and equity would prevail—especially in the city of Toronto, where people have been, unfortunately, at the mercy of some rather unscrupulous landlords.

Mr. Foulds: Free enterprise.

Mr. Cunningham: Again, I would encourage my socialist friends to remember that not everybody is in that situation and that we must get on with building more new houses, more developments. I think the time has come to realize that government shouldn't be involved in these activities unless they have to.

Mr. Warner: Now they have to.

Mr. Cunningham: We just have to listen to those fellows in question period and we know that government tends to screw up everything it gets involved in.

Mr. Cassidy: What's this anyway?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Mr. Cunningham: I am ambivalent about anything that would reduce the supply of housing in this province. And I would go on record as supporting that theory of private enterprise—I know that members opposite me share that view and the members of my caucus share that view. It will be a view that will be continued to be expressed in this House.

Mr. Speaker: Any other hon. members wish to speak to this bill?

Mr. Nixon: The minister is next.

Mr. Samis: Is he sure he is on the right side?

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: I am always on the side of right.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. Could we just have one member speaking?

Mr. Mackenzie: I am pleased to be a member of this House when this bill is on the floor of this House and being debated. I trust a few amendments will be accepted and the bill will be passed. I think I am particularly pleased to be on the floor following the previous speaker. I understand some of the dilemma of the Liberal Party.

Mr. Foulds: It is an easy act to follow.

Mr. Mackenzie: It's a situation where there is probably no real threat to the members across the House any more. It would seem to me that they have moved far to the right—at least a good number of the members of the Conservative Party in this province.

Mr. Foulds: Is it true that they are financed by the John Birch Society?

Mr. Mackenzie: The rapid expansion of our major cities, coupled with the increasing costs of single family homes, and a growing awareness of the shortage of good land and the need to protect some of our agricultural land, simply means that apartments are going to be a way of life with us from now on—probably an increasingly important part of our housing mix in this province.

I know in my own riding there are in excess of 7,000 families in apartments and over half of this number in the last five or six years in the east end of Hamilton.

I think the people that are in the apartments make this bill doubly significant. I find most of them are older people, seniors, or young couples starting out and trying desperately to save a bit of money and somehow or other move into a single-family dwelling of their own. Unfortunately, I think this is

a hope that is less and less likely in society today.

In my riding, like the member for Yorkview (Mr. Young), I have an awful lot of single-parent families and people who are on welfare in these units. It's precisely because of these kinds of people that we desperately need some control on the rents they are going to pay.

It's because of these kinds of people that we've got to do something to protect them.

Not only have there been unwarranted increases—and I think every one of us has heard of them if we have been keeping track of our phone calls. I don't know what's happening to the other members, but I know that half of my calls to this day are housing problems. We've all got increases or examples of gouging. I can think of a series of townhouses on Woodland Dr. where the rents in half of the units went from $210 to $275 as of June 1. The rest of the people in those units were informed in the last two or three weeks that they were getting their rent increased at the same rate. I think it had to do with when their leases came due. I suspect that the rest of them are going to get some protection—that's if townhouses are covered and that's obviously got to be part of the bill. They are going to get some help but what about the people in the same row of houses who had their rent increased as of June 1 from $210 to $275? There's got to be something done, I think, in a case like this.

I can think of other examples of why we have to have some control on rents—of what we're up against.

I think of a family on Tisdale Ct. who have had a rough time and have been a good number of months on UIC drawing $170 every two weeks and paying $185 a month rent. That's well over 50 per cent of their income.

I think of a single girl on welfare. The social worker says it's advisable that she be out of her home environment at the moment. She is drawing $196 welfare but, at the moment, is in an apartment because she hasn't been able to qualify for an Ontario Housing unit and she is paying $140 a month. You start questioning where the rest of the money is going to come from to live on.

Or I think of a woman on welfare in Glenburn Ct. receiving $347 a month from welfare plus her family allowance and paying, today, $222 a month rent for that particular unit.

There is a separated woman in the Lady Cochrane apartments in the east end of Hamilton who is receiving $269 welfare. According to anybody who has investigated the case, she is not in a poition to be taken off it in any way. She is paying $181 a month for the rent of her unit.

All of these people are fearful of further increases. These people alone, and there are many like them, are one of the reasons why we have to do something to protect them.

I worry about some of the subterfuges that are used to get around rent increases as well. One of the cozy little things I found in the last short while concerning people putting down a $50 deposit supposedly for some damage to the apartment. They have left, leaving the apartment in better shape than it was when they moved in, or in as good shape, and have been charged $30 for the paperwork involved, and the handling of the money that they deposited. I find that one really hard to swallow.

There is a chap in a unit on Melvin Ave. in Hamilton where the apartment has been sold three times since February of this year. The last purchaser, one of the big outfits in Toronto, demanded a $100 deposit once again from him because at that time he wasn't able to produce his deposit slip. When we dug it up through his trust company we got the cancelled cheque. It went back a couple of years and only after we waved this in front of their nose did they get off his back. They wanted an extra $100 deposit for that particular unit.

I think that we have to consider, when we look at the rents, whether or not we can knock some of the rents down in some of these amazing free enterprises we hear about. I can think of the Granville, a four-unit structure in the east end of Hamilton, and the utter disgrace most of those units are in in that city. There are cockroaches, non-working fire alarms, and not one or two but dozens of calls to the health authorities, to city inspectors, about the unsafe conditions, the lights out in the corridors—

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: Get a new city council.

Mr. Mackenzie: That's one of our problems. They are all Liberals and Conservatives on the city council; almost entirely. I can think of all of these particular units—

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: That's your problem. Have you no power over there?

Mr. Mackenzie: —and incidentally, I'd like to talk about the play of the marketplace, that my friends on the left over here like to use. In one of these units at least—I'm not sure what kind of a game the owners are playing, but when I was canvassing there during the election there were about 40 vacant units. There are now 72 vacant units

out of 150 units. It's an utter disgrace and yet they've increased the rent three times over the last year. The last increase brought the rent to $198. It's 50 Violet Ct., the Granville Apartments. These kind of things point out to me that we're just not going to get justice in this field.

I think if any of these owners had any sense at all they would also encourage tenant committees. Maybe we'll get into that during discussion of security of tenure. It seems to me that one of the squawks I get from these same landlords who have let their buildings go to blazes is that they say they've got two or three bad apples in the building. It might be that that can be verified. Those people, if that's the case, should be moved out. The only way you are probably going to do it, though, is with a committee of people who are helping to police that building themselves.

I want to say to the members and to the Liberal members in particular that I do feel this is a form of socialist legislation. Unlike them, I don't get hung up about it. I really look at it to see if I think it is fair to people; what kind of a break they want; whether they feel they are getting a fair shake from government and from the agencies which represent it. Really, to me, that is basically what socialism is all about. Let me tell members they can put a label on it any day and I'll march with it and be damned proud to march with it.

I want to say I agree with my colleagues who have said to the minister that we are in this mess—and I think it is a mess—because we haven't got the doggone housing in this province. We are not likely to get it unless we take charge of some of these tracts of land around the major cities and I see nothing wrong with that at all. I'd be as tough as heck and if that makes one a raving socialist, then we are raving socialists.

One of the members pointed out the situation in Sweden where about one-third of the houses were being built for the lower income section by the government of that country. I might also point out to him there is almost no private land allowed around any city of any considerable size in Sweden. The last time I saw the figures it was less than six per cent around any city of more than 50,000 population in Sweden. The state has moved in there very clearly and it is one of the reasons they are improving their housing situation.

I think we have to have exemptions for units with less than four apartments and we have also got to make doggone sure that an owner can't have 50 or 60 single-family dwellings and be allowed to boost the rents. I want to be sure of the controls in this bill on that. He can't be allowed to boost the rents because those are single-family dwellings. If it is one landlord—and we happen to have a few slum landlords even in Hamilton—he's got to be controlled.

I think we've also got to be sure that we have some kind of training for the superintendents of these apartments. It should be one of the things they are paying for with the rent they pay for the apartments. Legislation is desperately needed to set some standards, some training, and some proper salaries for superintendents of these buildings. I think the people who rent the buildings—we have an obligation to them to see they get this kind of protection and these things are provided and that they can appeal their rents on the basis of poor management, poor conditions in that apartment building and a poor superintendent. I also find that unfortunately the superintendents become the joe boys for many of the big landlords in many of the cities in this province. I think it is unfortunate.

I have to say, really, in closing that, as one of my colleagues said, this has been a joy to me—this particular day and some of the epithets hurled at us. I have enjoyed it very much.

I find the position of my colleagues across the House one that I can understand. I don't think they believe in rent control. I don't think they ever have. I don't think they really wanted to bring it in but I think the sense of fairness or the public scrutiny finally got through to them. They brought a bill in.

I really find the Liberal position a joy to behold. I find this very right wing position which says "Damn any kind of controls and any of these restrictions on private or free enterprise" is really trying to come out. Yet, at the same time—

Mr. Roy: Are you misconstruing our position again?

Mr. Foulds: It's not hard to do.

Mr. Mackenzie: —a much more—I guess the other wing of the Liberal Party is that cunning, political organization which knows what they've got to do to play to the people and be all things to all people.

Mr. Roy: Cunning?

Mr. Mackenzie: Boy, it is a real joy to see the conflict in that party. I now understand why there are 36 different positions.

Mr. Gaunt: You want to rethink that one.

Mr. Roy: Who wrote your speech?

Mr. Mackenzie: I think basically this really is a good bill. I am hoping, as I say, for some changes and amendments but it is a good bill because it begins to recognize a problem people have and that's what we've got to deal with in this particular bill.

Mr. Foulds: There are 38 different positions, and only eight members in the House.

Mr. Speaker: Other people wish to speak on this bill so it being 6 o'clock I do now leave the chair and we will resume at 8 o'clock.

The House recessed at 6:00 p.m.

APPENDIX

(See page 672)

Answer to a question was tabled as follows:

11. Mr. Worton—Inquiry of the ministry:

1. What are the terms of the agreement between Essex Packers Ltd. and the Ontario government (Correctional Services)?

2. Was there any investigation of the financial position of Essex Packers before entering into the agreement?

3. What is the total amount of money involved in this project?

4. What is the balance still owing to Essex Packers Ltd.?

5. Who had the responsibility of purchasing the equipment?

6. What percentage was charged for the rental of equipment?

7. What amount was paid for the rental of the abattoir?

8. Are there any outstanding rental payments on the equipment or the building?

Answer by the Minister of Correctional Services:

1. In brief, the licensing agreement between Essex Packers Ltd. (the licensee) and the Ministry of Correctional Services (the licensor) provides for:

(a) A term of 10 years which may be extended a further five years subject to mutual agreement.

(b) The licensee engaging a properly qualified engineer to supervise necessary modifications and alterations subject to prior consent by the licensor. The licensee would be repaid by the licensor for these alterations.

(c) The employment by the licensor of as many inmates of the Guelph Correctional Centre as is practicable, having regard to the efficient operation of the abattoir, at wages for packinghouse workers prevailing in the Guelph area. When possible, the subsequent employment of suitable individuals after their discharge in other plants owned by the licensee.

(d) Maintenance and repair of the plant and equipment by the licensee, subject to a provision that items over $500 may be reimbursed by the licensor and included in the repayment agreement.

(e) Payment of business taxes by the licensee.

(f) Compliance by the licensee with statutes, by-laws, regulations, etc.

(g) Payment by the licensee for electric power, water, steam, etc.

(h) Provision for termination for various causes, including complete or substantial destruction of the abattoir, bankruptcy, insolvency, or assignment to creditors.

(i) Access to the abattoir by the licensee.

2. Essex Packers provided certain background information in its proposal documents dated May 27, 1974, including financial statements for the years 1972 and 1973. This information was satisfactory to officials of the ministry.

3. The total cost of converting the abattoir to provide a much more extensive operating capacity was $965,053.93.

4. The balance owing Essex Packers is $167,764.88. The legal position regarding the receivership and other financial obligations of the company will be clarified prior to remittance of this balance.

5. Under the terms of the agreement Essex Packers have responsibility for purchasing the equipment, subject to prior agreement by the ministry.

6. Repayment of the cost of the alterations and equipment and use of the capital employed is at 12½ per cent annually, payable monthly.

7. Rent for the abattoir plant is $68,000 annually, payable monthly.

8. Payments for the months of September and October have not yet been received by the company.

CONTENTS

Tuesday, November 18, 1975

Highway Traffic Act amendments, statement by Mr. Davis 657

PCB control, statement by Mr. Kerr 658

Oil and gas prices, questions of Mr. Timbrell: Mr. Lewis, Mr. Nixon, Mr. Deans, Mr. Singer 659

Toronto teachers' negotiations, questions of Mr. Wells: Mr. Lewis, Mr. Nixon 663

Tobacco auction, questions of Mr. W. Newman: Mr. Nixon, Mr. Moffatt 664

Egg Marketing Board quotas, question of Mr. W. Newman: Mr. Nixon 665

Griffith Island hunting lodge, question of Mr. Davis: Mr. Nixon 665

Falconbridge layoffs, questions of B. Stephenson: Mr. Germa 666

Canadian Westinghouse, question of Mr. Davis and Mr. Bennett: Mr. Deans 666

Anti-inflation programme, question of Mr. McKeough: Mr. Bullbrook 667

Olympic Games, questions of Mr. Davis: Mr. Yakabuski, Mr. Roy 667

Paperworkers' strike, questions of B. Stephenson: Mr. Ferrier, Mr. Reid 668

Kitchener courthouse, question of Mrs. Scrivener: Mr. Sweeney 669

Inco/Falconbridge business policies, questions of Mr. Davis: Mr. Laughren, Mr. Martel 669

Nappan Island development, question of Mr. Rhodes: Mr. Good 670

HOME programme, question of Mr. Rhodes: Mr. Deans 670

Report, Ministry of Agriculture and Food, Mr. W. Newman 671

Report, Queen's University, Sir Wilfrid Laurier University, Ontario College of Art, Mr. Parrott 671

Report, Criminal Injuries Compensation Board, Mr. McMurtry 671

Highway Traffic Amendment Act, Mr. Snow, first reading 671

Freedom of Information Act, Mr. MacDonald, first reading 671

Mental Health Amendment Act, Mr. Roy, first reading 672

Tabling answer to question 11 on order paper, Mr. J. R. Smith (also see appendix) 672

Residential Premises Rent Review Act, Mr. Rhodes, on second reading 672

Recess 706

Appendix, answer to question 11 on order paper 707

SPEAKERS IN THIS ISSUE

Bennett, Hon. C. Industry and Tourism (Ottawa South PC)
Bernier, Hon. L. Natural Resources (Kenora PC)
Breithaupt, J. R. (Kitchener L)
Bullbrook, J. E. (Sarnia L)
Campbell, M. (St. George L)
Cassidy, M. (Ottawa Centre NDP)
Cunningham, E. (Wentworth North L)
Davis, Hon. W. G. Premier (Brampton PC)
Deans, I. (Wentworth NDP)
Ferrier, W. (Cochrane South NDP)
Foulds, J. F. (Port Arthur NDP)
Gaunt, M. (Huron-Bruce L)
Germa, M. C. (Sudbury NDP)
Good, E. R. (Waterloo North L)
Grande, A. (Oakwood NDP)
Grossman, L. (St. Andrew-St. Patrick PC)
Hodgson, W. (York North PC)
Irvine, Hon. D. R. Provincial Secretary for Resources Development (Carleton-Grenville PC)
Kennedy, R. D. (Mississauga South PC)
Kerr, Hon. G. A. Environment (Burlington South PC)
Laughren, F. (Nickel Belt NDP)
Lawlor, P. D. (Lakeshore NDP)
Lewis, S. Leader of the Opposition (Scarborough West NDP)
MacDonald, D. C. (York South NDP)
Mackenzie, R. (Hamilton East NDP)
Mancini, R. (Essex South L)
Martel, E. W. (Sudbury East NDP)
McClellan, R. (Bellwoods NDP)
McKeough, Hon. W. D. Treasurer, Minister of Economics and Intergovernmental Affairs (Chatham-Kent PC)
Moffatt, D. (Durham East NDP)
Newman, Hon. W. Agriculture and Food (Durham North PC)
Nixon, R. F. (Brant-Oxford-Norfolk L)
Philip, E. (Etobicoke NDP)
Reid, T. P. (Rainy River L)
Renwick, J. A. (Riverdale NDP)
Rhodes, Hon. J. R. Housing (Sault Ste. Marie PC)
Riddell, J. (Huron-Middlesex L)
Roy, A. J. (Ottawa East L)
Samis, G. (Cornwall NDP)
Sandeman, G. (Peterborough NDP)
Sargent, E. (Grey-Bruce L)
Scrivener, Hon. M. Government Services (St. David PC)
Shore, M. (London North L)
Singer, V. M. (Wilson Heights L)
Smith, Hon. J. R. Correctional Services (Hamilton Mountain PC)
Smith, R. S. (Nipissing L)
Smith, S. (Hamilton West L)
Snow, Hon. J. W. Transportation and Communications (Oakville PC)
Stephenson, Hon. B. Labour (York Mills PC)
Stokes, J. E. (Lake Nipigon NDP)
Swart, M. (Welland NDP)
Sweeney, J. (Kitchener-Wilmot L)
Timbrell, Hon. D. R. Energy (Don Mills PC)
Warner, D. (Scarborough-Ellesmere NDP)
Wells, Hon. T. L. Education (Scarborough North PC)
Worton, H. (Wellington South L)
Yakabuski, P. J. (Renfrew South PC)
Young, F. (Yorkview NDP)

No. 18



Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT — DAILY EDITION

First Session of the Thirtieth Legislature

Tuesday, November 18, 1975

Evening Session

Speaker: Honourable Russell Daniel Rowe
Clerk: Roderick Lewis, QC

THE QUEEN'S PRINTER
PARLIAMENT BUILDINGS, TORONTO
1975

CONTENTS

A list of the speakers taking part in the debates in this issue of Hansard appears, in alphabetical order, at the back of this issue.

Daily contents of proceedings also appears at the back of this issue. Reference to a cumulative index of previous issues can be obtained by calling the Hansard Reporting Service indexing staff. (Phone 965-2159).

Hansard subscription price is $15.00 per session, from: Sessional Subscription Service, MGS, 9th Floor, Ferguson Block, Parliament Bldgs., Toronto, M7A 1N3. Phone 965-2238.

LEGISLATURE OF ONTARIO

The House resumed at 8 p.m.

Mr. Speaker: Before we proceed with debate on Bill 20, I think the member for Oriole would like to introduce a group.

Mr. Williams: I would like to welcome to the House this evening scouts from the Toronto 142nd Scout Troop, located in the fair riding of Oriole. With them this evening is their scout leader, Mr. Ron Cameron, and I would like the members of the House to give them the appropriate recognition.

Mr. Speaker, also with the scouts, as you can see, is a group of girl guides from the Agincourt area. I believe they are from the riding of the member for Scarborough North (Mr. Wells); perhaps, in his absence, I could welcome them here this evening as well.

RESIDENTIAL PREMISES RENT REVIEW ACT
(continued)

Mrs. Bryden: This bill on rent control is a sign of the times. It's a sign of minority government times, because I don't think it would be here if there wasn't a minority government. It's also perhaps a bill which may restore the faith of voters in their power to effect change. I just hope that they go on and make the change complete in the next election—

Mr. Laughren: Hear, hear. How could they resist?

Mr. Good: No chance.

Mrs. Bryden: —and turn out the government and bring in Her Majesty's Loyal Opposition—

Hon. Mr. Bennett: Never!

Mr. Laughren: Especially in the Ottawa area.

Mrs. Bryden: —which usually happens in the fullness of time anyway.

Interjections.

Mrs. Bryden: The Conservative position on rent control has certainly been a series of amazing transformations. I'm not going to go back to 1968 as did my colleague, the member for Ottawa Centre (Mr. Cassidy), but even looking at what has happened since May, the transformations are really remarkable. If one wanted to find something to compare it with, one might go to the natural history world and consider, without any pejorative sense, the snake which sheds its skin and transforms itself periodically.

Back in May, when the city of Toronto rent control bill was up, there was a headline in the paper which said: "Irvine Says Toronto Rent Curbs would be Disaster, Urges Rejection." That was May 31. Then on July 31, "Ontario Plans Rent Review Board"—the next transformation. Then on Sept. 2, they shucked off that skin and went for the Unconscionable Transactions Relief Act, because the previous rent review boards had no teeth. Then things were really turning over fast. Six days later, on Sept. 8, they were suddenly converted to rent review boards with teeth. And, finally, when Bill 20 came in they adopted most of the NDP proposals for genuine rent control.

Hon. Mr. Henderson: Just one.

Mr. Speaker: Can we have some order, please?

Mrs. Bryden: So there has been a very significant change. However, I don't want the government to sit back in euphoria and say that this solves our housing crisis. Because this bill is not going to help the people who are paying 40 per cent and 50 per cent of their income on rent already. It's not going to help the people on fixed incomes who are finding it very difficult to find accommodation within their means. It's not going to help the families who cannot find enough family accommodation at moderate rentals. It's not going to help people who have been priced out of the housing market and have no hope of ever owning a home.

That's why I think that the government must make a commitment. I hope that the minister, when he rises to reply, will make a commitment that he is prepared to bring in the complementary measures that must go with any rent control bill to make it work. The pressures on the administration of rent control will be intolerable if there is not strong action to bring in these complementary measures and to solve the housing supply.

You can compare rental control to something like a wonder drug. You use it in a case of a very serious illness even though you know that it has side effects. I think most economists will agree that rent control does have side effects, that it may discourage demand and that, therefore, you must take counteracting measures to counteract the side effects.

Mr. Mancini: Say it again.

Mr. Good: Say it again. Did your colleagues hear that now?

Mrs. Bryden: That's what you do with a wonder drug. You take the drug, you also take counteracting measures. The sort of counteracting measures that must be taken are, of course, a vigorous housebuilding programme.

Mr. Sargent: This isn't the Ministry of Health estimates. What's going on?

Mrs. Bryden: I think it's time that we stopped relying on the private sector to build moderate-rental housing.

Mr. Good: That's not the way your colleagues have been talking all day.

Mrs. Bryden: We must acquire land. We could use existing serviced land and we could acquire land held by speculators and take the speculative element out of it.

We must get more mortgage money into the housing sector, and this could be done by requiring the financial institutions to put a percentage of their money into mortgages.

We could use the existing developers on a contract basis to build more public housing.

The second thing that we must do in order to make rent control work is to enforce maintenance standards and improve maintenance standards. I know this is mainly a municipal responsibility, but the province can bring in—as part of its rent review guidelines that the rent review officers will administer—the enforcement of maintenance standards. We know that rent control has brought a deterioration in maintenance where there is not such enforcement. That's the second complementary measure that must be brought in.

Third, there must be stronger security of tenure laws, and we will be dealing with that under the Landlord and Tenant Act. I hope that the law that comes out will be a strong one. Fourth, there must be stern measures against abuses under rent control. Key money, finding fees and that sort of thing must all be considered part of the rent if such are discovered to have been charged, but they should be considered illegal.

Fifth, we must undertake land banking for future needs immediately but not on prime agricultural land as has been done in the past.

Finally, we must undertake decentralization of development so that the housing pressures do not keep building up in the municipalities where there are real shortages of housing.

Those are the sort of complementary policies that I am asking the minister to make a commitment to undertake if he wants his rent control bill to work. There are two or three things in the bill itself that I would also like to mention, which must be changed. I don't want the government to get euphoric about the fact that it has a rent control bill that we might consider good; we certainly don't consider it perfect.

The biggest change that we would like to see in it is the removal of the exemption for units of four and under. I recently heard of a single detached house in my riding where the rent was going to go up from $200 for the tenant who was leaving to $300 for the new tenant who was coming in. They have no protection under the present bill and that must be changed.

Second, the rollback period must go back before July 30, because there certainly were a great many rent increases in the early months of 1975 and it is completely unconscionable to suggest that landlords should be allowed to add another eight per cent on top of some very large rent increases that occurred before July.

Third, I question the eight per cent. I don't think there is sufficient evidence to prove that rental costs have gone up by eight per cent. The figures from BC indicate it's closer to six per cent out there. I think we must have more information on Ontario's rental increase rates, but for the first year, I would suggest we try six per cent and if it proves inadequate then the landlords can get an adjustment next year if they wish to apply for an increase over the guidelines.

Finally, the other major change that I would like to see is a very definite commitment in the bill that the rent increases that are allowed will be based solely on operating costs and that the operating costs will be defined very carefully. There should be some renovation costs included—whether you would call those operating or not—but there should not be the costs of financing new mortgages and things like that.

These are some of the changes that we want to see in this bill before we will consider that we have adequate rent control in this province.

Mr. Germa: I am pleased to rise and say a few words on Bill 20, a bill to introduce rent control in the Province of Ontario. This bill came through a very tortuous procedure in order to get to its present form. We have also gone through four Ministers of Housing in the past four years. We started off with a Mr. Snow, then a Mr. Handleman, then a Mr. Irvine and now a Mr. Rhodes. It all indicates that none of these Ministers of Housing has been able to deal adequately with supplying people in Ontario with the housing which is so necessary. I don't hold out much hope for this minister surviving any longer, because we know him as a rabid free-enterpriser. In fact, he was formerly in another party which is possibly the most rabid free-enterprise party in Ontario, which is the third party in the House, sitting to my left. It is quite obvious that the minister is choking—he is choking when he introduces this bill and it must feel like swallowing fish hooks by the sounds I hear coming out of the third party in the House.

[8:15]

These free enterprisers who are totally afraid of the slightest bit of socialism are beside themselves. They are pressed on the one side by public demand to get control of rents in the Province of Ontario, and on the other side by political repercussions if they don't support this bill. I would suggest that if they stood on their principles they would have to stand against this bill. No way do I see that they can accept what is in this bill. It is an interference in the free enterprise system, which has failed to supply the people of Ontario with adequate housing.

The minister and this government have to stand condemned for allowing the situation to deteriorate to its present deplorable state. It is only as the result of people of Ontario having spoken on Sept. 18, by reducing this gang to a minority, that they saw fit to bring in this legislation. We know the problems that this government went through during the election campaign and the various idiotic announcements which came from the Premier (Mr. Davis). The most idiotic one of the bunch was that he was going to introduce rent control under the Unconscionable Transactions Act. Some joke that was. It took us about three days to catch this one and to hold it up to ridicule in front of the people.

Anyone who suspects that the people of Ontario are not aware of what's going on in the House here tonight, that they are accepting a little bit of socialism, is just not thinking properly. You may rest assured that all of the people of Ontario are waiting in anticipation for this legislation to pass. I'm sure they are going to welcome it. I am quite proud to be able to stand here tonight knowing that I participated in bringing this about during the last election campaign.

You may recall, Mr. Speaker, that I was running against two of the most rabid free-enterprisers in the Province of Ontario. Yet the city of Sudbury turned their backs on those two free-enterprisers. They wanted a little bit of socialism in the city of Sudbury. And to think that this problem only exists in the major metropolitan areas is not thinking properly, because there is no community in Ontario which suffers more from shortages and inadequate housing than the city that I have the honour of representing here.

It is quite evident to me that—

Mr. Riddell: You are a little wild, Bud.

Mr. Germa: —free enterprise has failed us absolutely and that we now have to turn to some sort of control and intervention in the free market system.

Mr. Speaker: I want to remind the member for Sudbury that there is nothing about political ideology in this bill. Would you return to the principle?

Mr. Riddell: You waited a long time to tell him that.

Mr. Germa: I was reading between the lines, Mr. Speaker, and I detected that there is a bit of socialism within the content of the bill.

Hon. J. R. Smith: Go easy on those northerners.

Mr. Germa: Whenever any piece of legislation intervenes in the free market economy, I think we are talking about socialism. I do not fear that, Mr. Speaker. The intent of the legislation is to control rents on a graduated basis effective July 29, 1975. At that retroactive date rents will be reduced according to the bill to a point not to exceed eight per cent. We don't agree and the minister has supplied us with no verification of how he arrived at this, unless he has a secret ouija board.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: A which? A ouija board?

Mr. Germa: Ouija board, yes. Or do you have a fortune teller there who divined this eight per cent figure? On what basis did the minister figure that eight per cent was an inequitable increase in rents?

Mr. Laughren: The size of his hat.

Mr. Germa: The size of his foot. That probably has more sense than a lot of things that come out of this ministry.

I was surprised to hear the leader of the third party criticizing the bill, despite the fact he said he was going to vote for it. The leader of the third party suggested that we should pump more public funds into subsidizing private profit in order to meet our housing needs. This is a clear indication that the free enterprise system has not supplied us with our needs. And these parties who adhere to the free enterprise philosophy have been all too quick to pump public dollars into private profit in order to try to shore up a faltering system which is not supplying us with any of our needs, let alone housing.

The free enterprise system will function as long as there are people that can be exploited. This bill is an indication of the times that people are no longer willing to sit idly by and continue to be exploited. The government understood this during the past campaign, that people who are forced to rent accommodation will no longer tolerate the gouging that has been going on in the rent field. This is precisely why the minister was brought in here kicking and screaming, with such a piece of legislation. To suggest, as some members of the House have done, that this is not a widespread phenomenon, that gouging occurs only on a hit-and-miss basis, I would like to read into the record a few of the cases I have brought to the minister's attention. How many letters, I ask him, has he got from me regarding rent gouging in the city of Sudbury? How many petitions have I given him in the past two weeks?

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: Mr. Speaker, I want to reply to that. I received a number of letters from the hon. member for Sudbury; he's been writing me a number of letters. I don't think any of them involve rent gouging; many of them are rent increases.

Mr. Germa: Let me present some facts, Mr. Speaker, and let the House decide what is rent gouging. Case No. 1 has to do with an apartment at 131 Adie St.

Mr. Shore: Could we have an understanding of what the survey is based on?

Hon. Mr. Bennett: Give us the facts.

Hon. B. Stephenson: No facts.

An hon. member: No facts—something else.

Mr. Shore: First of all, what was the initial rent?

Mr. Germa: All right. On Jan. 1, 1975, this lady suffered a rent increase of $10, bringing it to $180 per month. Notice has been received, effective Nov. 1, 1975, of an increase of $40, increasing her rent to $220. So in the space of less than one year—in fact, in 11 months—her rent has gone from $180 to $220, which is an increase of 22.2 per cent.

Mr. Shore: Do you have the two years previous?

Mr. Germa: If the minister doesn't describe that as rent-gouging, then his yardstick is a lot different to mine. We did not suffer an increase in the cost of living at the rate of 22.2 per cent over the past 10 or 11 months, and yet this person has to face that kind of an increase in rent.

I have another one from 1770 Paris St., Sudbury. This will involve a 17.5 per cent increase in rent. The present rental is $169 monthly, and the new total is $199, for a 17.5 per cent increase.

Hon. Mr. Bennett: How long was the lease for?

Mr. Germa: Hon. members can judge for themselves whether 17.5 per cent is a justified increase.

An hon. member: There is no lease.

Mr. Germa: Here's one at 1730 Oriole Dr. in Sudbury: An increase in the amount of $30 on a present rental of $180 to a new total of $210 monthly. This will represent a 16.6 per cent increase in rental charge.

The minister will find none of these less than 15 per cent.

Interjection.

Mr. Germa: Here is another apartment at 131 Adie St. This particular complex was recently taken over by a new landlord, and this man—

Interjection.

Mr. Germa: The minister is familiar with this fellow, is he?

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: Well, the member wrote me enough letters about him.

Mr. Germa: Let me tell the minister how this landlord acts and he can tell me his attitude towards the public.

Interjection.

Mr. Germa: This landlord already controls more than 1,100 units in the city.

Mr. Sargent: Eleven hundred and four.

Mr. Germa: When people go to him to complain about their increase in rent and they tell him they are going to move out rather than accept his notice of increase, he tells them, "There's no use in your moving because I'm buying all of the apartment buildings in Sudbury." He has effectively got control of the largest portion of the market in the city of Sudbury. In fact, he controls more units in the city than does Ontario Housing Corp.

Mr. Laughren: Free enterprise.

Mr. Germa: This is a free-enterpriser.

Mr. Sargent: Sounds like a Tory bagman.

Interjections.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: Does he have a hotel in Owen Sound?

Hon. Mr. Bennett: Can't afford it.

Mr. Germa: This particular tenant of 131 Adie St. suffered a $10 raise, effective Sept. 1, 1975. Notice has been received that, effective Nov. 1, 1975, she will pay a further $38 per month. So that's $48 within 30 days on two increases. What's going on when they give two increases within 30 days, one of $10 and one of $38? Then when you go and complain, he says, "There's no use moving because I'm going to buy the building you are going to move into as well." Here's a good one. This one is from 1770 Paris St. in Sudbury.

Mr. Hodgson: What was the figure to start with?

Mr. Laughren: Is the member Lorne's new parliamentary assistant?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Mr. Germa: This constituent has received notice—

Mr. Speaker: Order please. Will the member for Nickel Belt stop inciting discussion of—

Mr. Laughren: Merely seeking information, Mr. Speaker, that's all.

Mr. Germa: This constituent, who lives at 1770 Paris St., has received notice that effective Dec. 1, 1975 the rent will increase from $190 to $235 monthly for a two-bedroom apartment. That's an effective dollar increase of $45 monthly or 28.9 per cent.

The minister cannot sit there on his apathy and say that this is not rent gouging, when a person suffers a 28.9 per cent increase in rent. For what justification?

The cost of maintaining this building did not increase at that rapid rate. The only reason it is going up is that these people are playing games by acquiring a large corner of the market in a very tight housing situation. You know that the vacancy rate in Sudbury is less than 1.5 per cent.

My colleague from Sudbury East (Mr. Martel) tried to detail to the House, even despite the interruptions of the Speaker, the problems that we face with the boom-and-bust economy, and the lack of concern by the major industry—decisions on what happens to the people in the city of Sudbury made in a foreign land. They care not about planning for the city, whether we have housing or whether we don't have housing.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: The bill will take care of it.

Mr. Germa: This one here is not quite as bad, Mr. Speaker. It's only 12 per cent on two stages, and is from 1284 Dianne St. in the city of Sudbury. Here's another one of 12.5 per cent, 47 Bloor St. in the city of Sudbury.

It goes on and on. Here's one for 15.2 per cent at 1287 Grenadier Dr. in the city of Sudbury. This one here is a two- stage jump of 9.3 per cent in May, and another 9.9 per cent effective Jan. 1, 1976, at 1147 Ramsayview Ct.

By the way, I haven't received any response from all those letters I wrote to the minister. I hope he will be responding in the affirmative—that he is going to take action and will immediately send these to the rent review officer once he gets one in the field.

Here's another one from 127 Adie St., that's a neighbouring apartment block to the one that Lorne Investments owns. He bought two on that street on the same day—he collared about another 36 units in two jumps there. Listen to this one—July 1, an increase of $10, or 6.6 per cent, effective Nov. 1. Another, 18.7 per cent for a total increase since July 1 of 25.3 per cent. I call that rent gouging.

Here's the beauty of them all. This is at 356 Elgin St., Apt. 1. If you know Elgin St., you know it is not a high-class area in the city of Sudbury.

Mr. Nixon: That's Shouldice's area.

Mr. Germa: It is directly across from the CPR station, which by no stretch of the imagination could be considered luxury living.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: Elmer Sopha owns that one.

Mr. Nixon: That's your friend, Shouldice.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: Elmer Sopha owns that one.

Mr. Nixon: He's trying to sell it to you.

Mr. Samis: They call it the Fabbro building.

Mr. Nixon: Not Fabbro, surely not.

Mr. Germa: "The present rental at the above noted apartment is $190 monthly, effective Oct. 1, 1975. This constitutes a $50 increase in rental from the $140 on this effective date." That rent went from $140 to $190 effective Oct. 1, 1975, for a 35.7 per cent increase. Did you know that one of the bedrooms in the two-bedroom apartment doesn't even have a window? It doesn't even have a skylight. One would consider it to be a dungeon.

[8:30]

Mr. Eakins: Is it a dungeon?

Mr. Germa: Yet people have to pay at the rate of $190 monthly for a two-bedroom apartment with one bedroom without a window.

I also sent the minister two petitions which were forwarded to me. They are addressed to the Hon. John Rhodes.

Mr. Speaker: Excuse me, will the Minister of Revenue (Mr. Meens) keep his voice down? I can hear his conversation from here.

Mr. Germa: This is a petition dated Oct. 22, 1975, addressed to the Minister of Housing. It is signed by the tenants of 131 Adie St. in the city of Sudbury and it contains 28 signatures. There were a few people in the complex who were intimidated and afraid to sign the petition for fear they might be found out and receive eviction notices.

It is a fine state of affairs in Ontario in 1975 that people are intimidated so much that they cannot even lodge a complaint. You know, Mr. Speaker, if you do get evicted in the city of Sudbury there is just no place else to go. With a vacancy rate running at a little over one per cent these people are really up against it, and I can understand their fear of complaining. So, despite the fact that I have brought to the minister probably 30 or 40 cases of rent gouging in the city of Sudbury, the intimidation and harassment that these people fear precludes hundreds of them from coming to the surface and making their cases public.

I have another petition which is addressed to the minister dated Oct. 21, 1975, and it is signed by the tenants of 127 Adie St. This is a small complex of four units, and this deals directly with the bill, whereby it excludes four-unit complexes. So this is a case in point which would encourage the minister to make the necessary amendment. I understand he is going to do this to include all residences in the Province of Ontario and for that I have to give him credit.

I have several other letters here and I have some more on my desk that I haven't given to him yet—they are coming as fast as I can get them out. I think the minister understands what we are facing in my riding and I support this legislation wholeheartedly, because I know that even despite the fact that everybody in the city hasn't come to me there are hundreds out there who would like to come but are inhibited from coming for fear of being evicted.

I listened with interest to some of the objections raised by various members in the House, in that some landlords would take advantage of the eight per cent allowable and this would automatically encourage them to go for an eight per cent raise. Despite the legislation, I am not aware of any apartment owner who has not increased at least at the rate of eight per cent over the past year. If someone has that information, maybe he can bring it to the attention of the House. If anyone in this House or within the sound of my voice knows of a rent which went down in the past year, please come and tell the House, but I suspect that every unit in the Province of Ontario has gone up at least eight per cent, so I think we should not be afraid of the eight per cent as enunciated in the bill.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: That ties in with the rest of your thinking.

Mr. Germa: Also brought to our attention were various tricks that landlords have used

in the recent past, contemplating that there might be some rent control.

I have one case in point where formerly the electricity was supplied within the structure of the rent of the unit. This person has gone to the trouble and expense of installing meters in order to lift that responsibility from him and put the responsibility for electricity on each of the unit owners. That constitutes an increase in rent, but I don't see anything in the legislation which will prevent that from being added to the present rent.

There have been comments made that rent control will cause a reduction in supply. I think that could not be correct. What is going to happen here is that when people are not called upon to spend so much of their income on rent they will therefore have more disposable income. It stands to reason that there are going to be millions of dollars left in people's pockets which was formerly spent on paying these exorbitant rents.

What would one suggest these people are going to spend the money on? There are various things they could do. I would suggest that one of the things that they might do—and very many people want to do—is acquire for themselves a place in which to live. It will accommodate people more and encourage them and make it more feasible for them if they have these extra dollars in their pocket to go out and build themselves a house. I would suggest then that quite the reverse will be true—that instead of being a curtailment of supply there might even be an increase because people are going to have the financial means, the financial wherewithal, maybe to supply themselves with their own housing.

I am also concerned about the provision in the bill which calls for the repeal of this legislation automatically on Aug. 1, 1977. I don't know what crystal ball the minister was gazing at to assume that the present problem we face is going to be gone by Aug. 1, 1977. I would suggest that this rent legislation is going to have to be on the books much longer than that because the backlog of housing shortages in Ontario is just not going to be solved by Aug. 1, 1977. And also it gives a signal to those speculators who are waiting in the wings. They know at what moment in time they are going to be able to pounce. Like a lion or a tiger hanging in the tree, they are going to pounce on Aug. 2, 1977.

I would also suggest that in order to increase our housing stock there should be a minister of co-operatives in this government, one of the obectives being to encourage the production of more co-operative, non-profit housing. It is my opinion that people who make profits on housing are no better than those people who, like jackals eating a cadaver, make a profit on nursing homes. To make a profit on that kind of a situation is just abhorrent to me. I don't think that the necessities of life should be subjected to the vagaries of the marketplace and that for the sake of profit people should have to do without housing or medical services.

Mr. Lewis: You are getting some tough ideological stuff tonight.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: Hello, glad to see you.

Mr. Lewis: You absorb it. Nice to see you choking it back.

Mr. Germa: He's choking on the fish hooks.

Mr. Lewis: Fish, lions, tigers, jackal, cadaver—this man's metaphors are worth listening to, my friend.

Mr. Germa: Yes, I split a metaphor once.

Mr. Lewis: Well, at least it wasn't an infinitive.

Mr. Germa: No, I am very careful not to split an infinitive; metaphors I do.

Let me tell the minister about one more situation which I think is serious.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: Get serious then.

Mr. Germa: I have been: It is the subject of nursing homes.

Interjections.

Mr. Germa: The subject of nursing homes is an exemption under this Act, as far as I read the Act. Take the case of two senior citizens occupying one room in a profit-making nursing home. That is their home but they are paying rent, despite the fact the house is heavily subsidized by the Ministry of Health. They are paying their $5 or $6 per day from their own pocket. When you consider that two senior citizens occupying one room in a nursing home are paying an effective rental of $1,200 per month, how can you justify that as being an equitable rental?

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: You had better explain your math.

Mr. Germa: You know what the rates are per person in a nursing home. It's $5.90 a day plus $15 from OHIP. It's about $20 a day per person. Part of it is subsidized by OHIP certainly. But who is making the benefit? It is

the profit-maker who owns the nursing home. That is, in fact, a rental and I think that should be taken into consideration.

Interjection.

Mr. Germa: I suggest $1,200 a month for the rental of one room in a nursing home is a little bit too much. The minister should take that into consideration.

Mr. Gregory: I have been sitting here listening to this harangue coming from the official opposition—

Mr. Lewis: Harangue?

An hon. member: He is being complimentary.

Mr. Gregory: It is a harangue. They seem to have forgotten all about the small businessman entirely in their wholehearted attempt to make sure that rents are the only thing at issue. If they would examine the majority of small apartment buildings with four units or less they would realize the majority of them are owned by retired persons, small businessmen, and they would deprive them of a less than six per cent increase on their costs, their rent increases. They say it should be less than that—four per cent—and yet the majority of tenants who live in those apartments have probably had increases in salaries of 10, 20 or even 30 per cent per year and they would deprive—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Mr. Gregory —the small businessman of making a substantial profit in order to be able to make his business run. He's a businessman, too. He depends on that for his income.

Mr. Lewis: That is fair. He can go before the review board.

Mr. Gregory: They talk in terms of rolling back to Jan. 1, 1974. Would they then agree to have the large wage settlements rolled back to Jan. 1, 1974?

Mr. Lewis: No, because they were catch-ups

Mr. Gregory: No, that's different. Oh, they were catch-ups; right. But they cannot see that the owner of an apartment unit, following the expiration of a three-year lease, is also entitled to a catch-up. They can't see that.

Mr. Lewis: Well, he can go before the board.

Mr. Cassidy: It is all in the bill; have you read it?

Mr. Gregory: Yes, I know it is in the bill.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Mr. Gregory: It seems to me the NDP is pretty myopic in its views. If you want to examine the true problem—

Mr. Cassidy: It is your minister's bill. You should have had a look at it.

Mr. Gregory: I am firing at the NDP right now—I will fire on him later. If you want to examine the true problem, the true problem is the shortage of buildings created by people, like yourself, who sit on local councils and won't let anything be built.

Mr. Lewis: We don't have anybody on local councils.

Mr. Gregory. Yes, with similar attitudes to the NDP.

Interjections.

Mr. Grossman: Go down the street and look.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Mr. Gregory: They operate with an attitude of, "Pull up the ladder, Jack, I'm all right."

Mr. Speaker: Will the member for Mississauga East refrain from reacting to interjections?

Mr. Gregory: I will be glad to, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Grossman: Just stand there and take it.

Mr. Gregory: I would suggest that if the members of the loyal opposition were to dedicate themselves to encouraging their friends on local municipal councils to build more rental accommodation and to be of some assistance in that way, there would be a greater contribution to a solution to the problem.

Mr. Samis: I am rather disappointed to see that the minister isn't in his seat. I was going to lead off my remarks by first of all congratulating him publicly upon his appointment. Here he comes.

Mr. Shore: Here he comes.

Mr. Samis: I think it was rather well known how ardently all the members of the cabinet were seeking the Housing ministry. I

think after the election they were all just waiting for that special telephone call designating them as the minister for this dynamic portfolio. I can just imagine the delight of the member for Sault Ste. Marie (Mr. Rhodes) when he was selected to receive this divine call from the Premier. Anyway, I congratulate him upon this appointment.

Obviously, I have to congratulate the minister for introducing a bill of this sort. It represents a total change from the government policy enunciated here last spring by the previous minister. It is almost a total change from the policy enunciated here in the summer time before the election was called, and during the election campaign.

[8:45]

Although I am sure it will be taken otherwise, I would like to pay special tribute in a non-partisan way to two members of this Legislature who, before this issue ever became popular or even politically acceptable in this province, were standing up on the floor of the Legislature defending the rights of tenants, the whole question of rent control and the question of tenure for tenants. Those were my colleagues, the member for Ottawa Centre (Mr. Cassidy) and the member for St. George (Mrs. Campbell). I would like to pay tribute to those two members who both brought in private members' bills and fought for these issues early in the game. Neither of these members looked at the Gallup poll or any public opinion poll to see if it was popular. They stood up on principle and now we're acting upon their efforts.

In terms of the principle of the bill itself, obviously we on this side support it. This has been stated by my colleagues many times and I don't intend to go into any detail as to why we do. The one thing I would say to the minister, and I think it's extremely important for the tenants of Ontario, now that he has brought in this bill, whether he had to be bound and gagged or whether he had to swallow it, whether he liked it or not, the most important thing is that he commit himself, his ministry and his government to making sure that this bill works for the tenants of Ontario.

Don't just bring it in to appease the opposition parties. Don't just bring it in to save this government or give it another six months of political life. Bring this bill in to make sure it works and eliminates the injustices that have appeared in the rental scene in Ontario. I think every member in this House, including our own people, would agree that rent control is not necessarily the be-all and end-all to the problem.

I'm sure if the minister read the speeches of our leader during the campaign when he said this over and over again—and I'm sure he has with great delight as we have read his predecessor's speeches—we need a housing policy.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: No, I didn't read the speeches.

Mr. Lewis: We talked many times during the campaign as we planned the rent controls.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: But I didn't read the speeches.

Mr. Samis: Can I butt in, Mr. Speaker?

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: Only when the member gets to be leader.

Mr. Samis: May I suggest that it has been clearly enunciated by the spokesman of this party on several occasions that we need not only rent control but we obviously need to expand the supply of housing units in this province. This is just a partial solution to an overall problem.

I was very pleased to see the Attorney General (Mr. McMurtry) introduce his accompanying legislation. I'm sure for some members on the back-bench of the government side this was almost revolutionary for them to accept. It will be very interesting to see them vote for it and go out into the hustings and defend this in case the far right party in this Legislature attacks it publicly in the hustings.

Mr. Warner: The Liberals.

Mr. Samis: I won't mention their name. They know who they are.

Mr. Warner: Are you sure?

Mr. Samis: In terms of the actual provisions, I am glad to see that the minister has agreed to make amendments on the question of exemptions. What the original bill did was to create two classes of tenants in Ontario: those who were protected and those who were left unprotected. Those who'd be left unprotected are those who by misfortune would be renting from someone who had four or less units.

I was rather interested in this this weekend in my riding. On Saturday I had three separate complaints about rent increases. I won't go into any great detail, as the member for Sudbury (Mr. Germa) documented examples in his particular riding. In each case I asked the people how big a unit they lived in. In all three cases there were less than four units.

Prior to the minister making some indication that he would modify the bill, I had to tell them under this bill they wouldn't be covered; they could be gouged by landlords. It's obvious that the original bill in the original form was unfair, and I'm glad to see that the minister has seen the light of day. Again, I think it proves that in a minority Parliament the opposition can have considerable input and it's the people of Ontario who benefit.

I would also like to point out that I think it was the member for Cochrane South (Mr. Ferrier) who first brought to the attention of the minister that in small towns, whether it be Cornwall, Timmins, Brantford or Kitchener—you name it—housing is frequently on a much smaller scale than in Metropolitan Toronto or Ottawa or Hamilton. In my particular community, the vast majority of the rental units have four or less dwellings within, and those people would have been excluded, so I'm glad to see that the minister has backed down on that one.

As my colleagues mentioned earlier in the debate, it seems to me that if we're going to have rent control in Ontario, we shouldn't just do it arbitrarily in the middle of the year. In all fairness it should be extended back to Jan. 1. This is the beginning of the calendar year. If you bring in legislation for 1975, you should cover the whole span of 1975 and not just six months.

I think back to when the home buyers' grant programme was introduced and the number of complaints I got from constituents: "How come I don't qualify?" How come we were cut off then?" "They get it and I don't"—this sort of thing; I think it was very unfair. The fairest way of all in terms of rent control would be to begin at the calendar year. I think most people accept that, and I think most people would want it that way.

As has been mentioned, the question of restricting this legislation makes me wonder about the motives of the government, whether they're really sincere about it or they're just buying political time. I noticed in other jurisdictions in Canada where rent legislation's been brought in, Quebec and BC, they didn't bring in any particular time restriction such as this government is, and I ask myself why. Obviously, I would suspect they know an election is coming up next year, and my deepest suspicions tell me they would love to remove, abolish or dissolve the restrictions within this bill, assuming they were to come back here with a majority, which I doubt.

Anyway, it seems to me that if we're really serious about helping the tenants of Ontario, this legislation can't have a fixed duration. It should be legislation introduced, period.

As has been mentioned by numerous speakers, to exclude public housing in a sense is unfair. It's obvious that their rents are calculated on a different basis and we accept that. But whether it's government housing directly, OHC housing, we shouldn't create different classes of tenants in Ontario, and by making those exclusions, we're creating different classes. At the same time, I'd also like to mention to the minister that the question of calculating rents for those people in OHC housing is still highly questionable. I think other members in my caucus have mentioned this already. If a household or family unit gets an increase in salary or income, OHC immediately grabs a chunk out of it, and you really have to ask yourself what incentive is there for those people to improve themselves.

Another question that might be of interest to the member for Ottawa East (Mr. Roy)—since I think he has some in his riding—is the question of luxury housing. I have no brief for those who build, live in or make profits from luxury housing, but if there are no controls there whatsoever I am somewhat worried that investors, seeing that there are controls in other types of housing and now we bring it down to zero limit in terms of units, some of these people would much rather divert it into luxury housing and dry up the other forms of accommodation. I think that could be disastrous to low and middle income families, and I would suggest to the minister that he amend this particular section and remove the idea of excluding these people.

Another thing that concerns me is the whole question of roomers, people in hotels or flop-houses, people who have accommodations who are rather transient by nature because of their lifestyle, their job or their particular situation. Again, by excluding these people we're creating another class of tenants who are excluded from the provisions of this bill. It seems to me it's not their fault necessarily that because of their job or their nature or their background they are living in this particular lifestyle; they have the same rights as other tenants in this province and therefore they should have the same protection as other tenants in this province.

The question of the ceiling being eight per cent has already been mentioned by my colleagues. It seems to me that it should be

six per cent, based on studies done by our research group, in British Columbia, and apparently the majority of judgements by the rental commission in the Province of Quebec have ruled that six per cent is the more reasonable figure in terms of increases in operating costs. Why can't Ontario apply that figure instead of going beyond that?

On the question of the rebate procedures, I am somewhat worried by the fact that the tenant must bear the onus of getting the rebate, not the landlord; he will have to go to the board, go to the review officer and sometimes even extract it from the landlord, whereas the landlord is under no specific obligation beyond the moral guidelines of the legislation.

One thing I would hope that the minister and his officials incorporate in the bill is that there be a guarantee of an extensive publicity programme, once this bill is passed, whatever form it's in, so that every tenant in Ontario knows what his rights are under this legislation. It seems to me that last spring we were dealing with a fairly good piece of legislation brought in by the former Attorney General—Bill 55, the Unfair Business Practices Act—which covered an awful lot of situations that deal with the average working man, woman, family situation, and consumer, and yet I would dare say that less than one per cent of Ontario has any idea whatsoever what that bill's about or what their rights are as a result of that bill.

Whether it's consumer law or housing rights, it's not enough just to pass a bill to make it law. You have to inform the people what their rights are especially those people who don't frequent university panels, and don't read the Globe and Mail. The average working man has to be informed of his rights and that's the government's obligation.

In BC when they brought in consumer rights, I believe a pamphlet explaining the rights of the individual was sent to every consumer in BC. They also had government sponsored travelling trailer exhibitions, public displays and school speakers to explain what this bill was about, so people knew their rights. Well, in housing, surely we in Ontario can do the same.

The question of fines concerns me somewhat. For a big corporation like Cadillac or Fairview or some of the others, to be fined $2,000 is a licence to violate the law, a licence to exploit, a licence to get around this bill. I think one of the greatest concerns the average person has is that there is one law for the rich and one law for the poor. When they see how white-collar crime is treated by our courts, how white-collar crime is sometimes treated by our law officials, they are rightly cynical. They are right in their belief that the little guy ends up in Kingston but the big guy never sees the place. If he does, as in the case of Harold Ballard, he sure gets his swimming pool and log cabin thrown in. Obviously he is cynical.

Interjections.

Mr. Samis: So I would like to see the minister toughen that particular section of the legislation.

Another one is the enforcement mechanism. It seems to me that every rent should be registered—available to the public. The rent officer should have a registry of every rent in his community or within his jurisdiction, available for public purview.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: I would like to make public everything the member has said and done over the last few years.

Mr. Samis: That's a different issue altogether, otherwise we will go back to the radio station days and some of the things the minister said.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: They would be rated X, I will tell you that, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Samis: But I think that the public have a right to this because these are public documents. As soon as they become private we get the lawyers in there, we get developers; and these people can all play hanky-panky with the bureaucrats. Rents should be public information.

I would like to say that the basic change the minister has to make is that it applies to all tenants—which I am glad to see he has done—and set the coverage date back to the beginning of 1975.

The final thing I would say to the minister: If he is bringing this in, for God's sake let him enforce it, not just do it because of ritual.

Mr. Burr: I should like to speak briefly in this debate. It's one of the disadvantages of our multi-committee system that members often have to be in two or three places at once—or try to be—and keep tabs on two or three issues at once and therefore may be repetitious when they finally do arrange to speak. However, I wish to support the six per cent increase rather than eight per cent. I wish to favour the—

Mr. Reid: Based on what?

Mr. Burr: On the experience in British Columbia—and the retroactive date earlier than July—

Mr. Reid: That's good experience.

Hon. Mr. Bennett: Have you paid rent there, Pat?

Mr. Reid: They increased it 10.4 per cent.

Mr. Burr: —or based on any information the minister may be able to produce for us, and to reduce the number of exemptions that are permitted under the Act.

I should like to ask the minister two or three questions. How is this Act going to prevent some of the tricks that are played by some of the more notorious landlords? For example, having a key deposit of $50, which is returned at the end of the tenancy, without interest, of course, because they are not required to pay interest on it. How will the regulations prevent the final month's rent from being merely $5—the first month at least twice the usual, minus $5—another device for avoiding the payment of interest on the final month's rent?

[9:00]

I should like to point out that single-family units should not be exempted because many of the tenants who use single houses have considerable expense when they move. They have a complete houseful of furniture, including the very heavy units such as the refrigerators and stoves. Many apartment tenants don't have to contend with the movement of these heavy articles and therefore can move more easily. This means that the tenant of a single-family dwelling is often more at the mercy of a landlord, in his ability to move cheaply, than most apartment tenants.

There is a certain corporation in Windsor which has raised rents about 10 per cent last year, allegedly because taxes had gone up 10 per cent. Again this year the same corporation has raised rent about 10 per cent because the taxes have gone up 10 per cent. But when one looks into the actual dollars and cents increase we find that for some of these houses belonging to this corporation the actual increase of taxes was $2.25 a month, but the rent increase was $15. This year, another $2.50 tax increase, but a $20 a month increase in the rent.

Although this corporation owns at least 75 houses of this type—single-family dwellings—the bill, as at present constituted, would enable all of these houses to be exempted from the provisions of the Act. If you exempt four-apartment buildings you will inevitably find the owners of some buildings, which contain five or six small apartments, knocking out a wall or two to make four-apartment buildings. This way, they exempt themselves from any restrictions that the Act provides as protection for tenants.

Finally, I'd like to speak on the retroactive feature. The past spring I was a member of the committee that heard the city of Toronto ask for special legislation to control rents. The committee sat for about six Wednesdays and heard submissions from tenants, landlords and the city of Toronto itself. The only ones to benefit from that whole series of hearings were those landlords in Toronto who were of the greedy type. They had lots of time and lots of incentive to raise the rents. As members probably recall, rent increases of 30, 35 and 40 per cent were common during that period. That is one very good reason for having a retroactive date earlier than July. If the minister can't bring himself to put it back to Jan. 1, let him try sometime around Easter; that will catch a lot of people.

Mr. Breaugh: First of all I really want to say that this is a pretty dramatic turnabout. I think it is a very good one, and frankly I don't really care how this legislation got in front of the House. The fact is that for a great many of the people in my riding, and I'm sure in many of these ridings, it will help to some degree, compared to the previous position of totally abdicating any responsibility towards those people. In fact, I believe it was in June of this year when the then Minister of Housing spoke in Oshawa to a development society meeting and said: "There will never be rent controls in Ontario as long as there is a Progressive Conservative government."

I want to thank him for that great turnaround and I want to thank his successor for placing this bill in front of the House. One of the things that fascinates me about the bill is the fine print, all the little words that are here and there. I would like to list some of these so that when the minister offers his summation to the House he could perhaps give us some reasons for it.

The first one has been mentioned many times. Where did that date—the July 29 date—come from?

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: Where did your Jan. 1 come from?

Mr. Breaugh: Is that the day when the Great Pumpkin spoke? Is that the day when the great Pooh-Bah decided that after July 29 people get some care and some respect

and a government that looks after them? Is that the day when the gouging started? Is that the mid-point of the gouging, so that you are kind of fair to some and not fair to others? Where did that date come from? What is the rationale that produced that one particular date? I would like to find that out. I think that presenting legislation gives us the responsibility of having some criteria established.

There are some things here I want to ask some rather blunt questions about. One section of the bill says that the landlord will pay to the tenant anything that was in excess. How? In what way? What happens if the landlord does not, does the sky fall? Does he get arrested? What is the penalty clause in there? How does that happen? Do we take him to jail for three years? What is the process there?

In one section there is an appearance of rent control for two years. It offers one magic number, the eight per cent, and we won't go into that because everyone else has. We all pick our magic numbers and we would like to think they are related to costs, but sometime next April, by an order of the Lieutenant-Governer, we'll have a new number put out. How will that number be arrived at?

What kind of things would come out of that number if, for example, we had an election in between? Would that be used as a mechanism whereby the government might, for six months, treat the tenants with some respect and say there are rent controls? Then if they win an election with a large majority and say to the landlords who traditionally curry their favour—which, I suppose, is a polite way to put it—would they then say to the landlords: "Well, listen boys, we put it to you for six months, now it's only fair we turn around and put it to the tenants." If the rate struck next April is 20 per cent or 40 per cent or whatever, what is going to happen then?

Really, this bill puts in front of the House the invitation that sometime next April another magic number will pop up. What will that be? Is that going to be directly related to the costs that are increased? Is that the way that it comes out?

One of the things that we ought to be concerned about is whether this process will work. How long will it take? It makes mention in the Act of some 60 days' notice. Does that imply that giving 60 days' notice really means that there will be a workable solution found in 60 days? Or does that simply mean we give the notice 60 days prior to the increase? How long is the minister anticipating that process will take?

Let me put it to the minister in a slightly different way. He will notice, in terms of a rent review officer, it states that the case will be heard. He is to give 10 days' notice. I wonder how practical that is for many people? I wonder how many tenants, for example, could actually appear at that hearing? Will that hearing be held in the evening? Will it be held in the morning? Will somebody have to take the day off work to appear as a tenant in front of that review officer? How is that process going to come out? I would like to hear that explanation a little bit finer than it is in here.

The legislation rather carefully avoids stating emphatically that there will be some kind of group decision. One of the things I am concerned about is the person who is a little bit shy, who perhaps has some rights under this legislation, but is unwilling to go before a rent review officer and speak against his landlord. What is the mechanism there? If one person has the intestinal fortitude and ability to make that case, does that case then apply to everyone in that building?

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: No.

Mr. Breaugh: What does the minister do then? Since we are putting, I hope, some legislation before the House which will work.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: The leases change every month. What is the member talking about? They are not all leased the same date.

Mr. Breaugh: Okay, the minister takes offence. Let me put it to him in a very blunt illustration. I know several little old ladies who will not take this to a review officer. What are you doing for them to see that they are protected? How will that happen? Can a review officer take cases where he knows the same thing has happened in the apartment next door and apply the same criteria? Or does that tenant in fact have to appear before that review officer? How will that happen?

It skirts about the issue of maintenance. Depending on how you read this Act it addresses itself in part to that, but not directly. Nor does it really say anything about what we might consider basic essentials—except in the Landlord and Tenant Act or related pieces of legislation—things like heating and lighting and normal repairs and painting processes and things like that. Are we inviting, in this legislation, landlords to cease doing that?

Do we have some protection for the tenants in this Act. If so, where is it and could we highlight that and make that just a bit more clear? Or are we going to attempt to deal with that through, if you like, regulations?

What, in particular, can a tenant do—let me take this at its worst aspect, I grant you—where the whole thing might bog down and where a tenant may have something withheld for something like, say four or five months, where the increase was substantial? After the rent review officer and the review board have made the decision, are you expecting the tenant to come up with $200 or $300 in back rent in short order? Are you allowing him some process whereby he might get that money?

I see some practical problems there. People might think that they are protected by this legislation, that they have had their rent held down. Then four months later, or three months later, or whatever it might suddenly turn out to be, they, in fact, owe the landlord a couple of hundred dollars that might be rather difficult to come by in some circumstances.

The converse of that: What does the landlord do when he has a substantial number of units and he might have to come up with a substantial amount of money? Does he get hit in one fell swoop or is there a time-payment plan? What's that process? Could the minister elaborate on that?

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: Excuse me, Mr. Speaker. The hon. member has asked a number of questions and I'm attempting to get them down as quickly as I can. Perhaps I could try, which I have not done up until now, to answer some of them. Do you want to continue?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I think the debate should be on the principle of the bill. The question and answers can be clarified in the committee, which I understand it's going to anyway. If it's to illustrate a point of principle, you may pose a theoretical question. Your opinion as to the principle of the bill is really what we should be talking about.

Mr. Breaugh: Yes. In fact, Mr, Speaker, what I am attempting to do is address myself to the real principle of whether this bill is going to work or not and inviting the minister to respond, in his summation, to many of these questions. I anticipate that he will and then we'll deal with the clause-by-clause thing, if you like, or the nuts-and-bolts of it in committee. Is that acceptable to the House and to the Speaker? Very good.

I found a word in here. I always find these things extremely attractive for some reason. In one of the sections it refers to a "thing." It says that it will cover "all kinds of things" and it uses that word "thing." I was really at a loss to find out what we mean by that. Are we talking about doors and windows or what?

There are portions of this Act that rather defy logic, just in spots. I accept wholeheartedly the principle of the thing and that the attempt has been made, but I think some clarification of those portions of the Act really needs to be put in.

I have some reservations about the make-up and nature of the rent review boards. Frankly, that perhaps would not be the case had I not seen similar boards appointed by the Province of Ontario trundling about the province, at 100 bucks a day or so, plus expenses, in operation. I would like the minister to address himself to how those boards actually will be set up, where they will meet and how they will work in order to give the House some clear idea of whether that in principle, is a workable concept and what he has in mind.

I think too I'd like to put the case that some other members have touched on and that is the smaller units. That is one where perhaps all of us overestimated: The extent that they are prevalent; the kind of people who own these buildings; and the kind of people who live there. In fact, one of the things that surprised me the first weekend after the minister announced this legislation was the number of people who took the time to call me and to write to the minister in some form, either a night letter or whatever, who were in exactly that situation, in triplexes or small old houses that had been split up into three or four apartments. They asked the question why they, sitting on one side of the street, don't have rent controls and people across the street, in a larger building, do have controls, And they made a rather firm case that it wasn't an owner-ocupied situation, that many of those buildings had been subject to the kind of little financial games that go on in the real estate business. A lot of them were owned by absentee landlords.

I think the minister has at least addressed himself to that question and I will be very interested in the kind of response he makes to the House when he actually does that.

Finally, I want to make the plea—I think this is important—that there are some loopholes in the proposed legislation. Let me quote one example. In terms of giving notice to the tenants, this Act says: "The landlord can give notice by handing it to an apparently adult person on the tenant's premises." Is that really "an apparently adult person on

the tenant's premises"? I have to question whether that is legislation that is actually going to work. That strikes me as being a rather large loophole, even for this government to put out.

What happens in terms of a strike? There doesn't seem to be provision for that. In fact, it says in here that they would have five days. After the fifth day that is considered to be formal notice. I defy anybody to get five days' service out of the post office these days—or even on their best day.

What I am concerned about, in summary, Mr. Speaker, is that I really want this to be effective legislation. I want it to work. I want to have a clear understanding that the bugs will be ironed out, and that it is not just rent control legislation in name and that it will not have the mechanism—whether that is money, whether that is people, whether that's resources—to actually do the job. I want some assurances from the government that they are quite prepared to take that on.

Although I welcomed the legislation initially, I have some doubts about whether that government is really prepared to make it work. It would seem to be a drastic reversal of form if that is the case. I accept at face value that they do intend to make it work, and I am simply inviting the minister to respond in kind and to assure us all that it is good workable legislation.

Mr. Grande: During the last provincial election my Conservative opponent, when asked in a television programme whether he agreed or disagreed with rent controls said, "I'm against rent controls. I've been in cities like Chicago and they don't work." Well, I am enjoying my position here and my opponent is out there eating his words.

In the last four or five months this government—there is no need for me to repeat it, the member for Beaches-Woodbine (Mrs. Bryden) has stated it very well—must have gone through a tremendous amount of psychological pain in order to have the turnaround in this particular policy that it is showing. It also must have gone through a fantastic philosophical split, because in a sense they are stabbing their friends in the back.

I just have three points to make. One of them is that approximately 50 per cent of the people in my own riding of Oakwood are tenants, and approximately 20 per cent of those are tenants in duplexes or triplexes. If the exemptions in the present bill stand, it simply means that 20 per cent of the tenants in the riding of Oakwood have no protection whatsoever.

The second point that I would like to make is that it is obvious by the government bringing in this bill that rent gouging exists. I have tabulated the cases that I have before me—there is a tremendous number of them—and it seems that the increases range from 20 to 35 per cent. Who are the people that these rent increases hit the hardest? Of course, they are the people in the low-income brackets. As a matter of fact, as of 1971 approximately 68 per cent of the people in my own riding earned salaries of less than $10,000.

The other point I would like to mention is that it seems to me that there is a relationship here between the large rent increases and the applications that are made to Ontario Housing Corp., because once again the increases drive the low wage earners out of accommodations and these people are trying to get into Ontario Housing.

When one tries to find out whether some Ontario Housing places exist for these people, the answer one gets is that there are no vacancies and there is a tremendous waiting list; we just have to put their names in, give them a number and wait two or three years. As a matter of fact, I would like to read one of the letters that I received from one of my constituents. It starts very apologetically. This is what the letter says:

> I know that this is only one of the many letters you have received concerning housing but I am in a desperate situation and would like your help in obtaining a low-rental apartment.
>
> About four years ago my mother and I applied to Ontario Housing for an apartment but at each interview we were told, "No vacancies," but we would be kept on the waiting list. A few weeks ago my mother passed away and, faced with a high rent, I contacted Ontario Housing again and was told that I would have to wait another three months for another interview and then placed on a waiting list.
>
> I know that I am being given the runaround. I am paying $186 plus cable and phone and my take-home pay for two weeks is $168, as my slip enclosed will show.

I have here the employee's statement of earnings and deductions.

> I am a widow and I am 62 years of age.

I think, as has been said over and over again this evening, that the rent control legislation is only part of the comprehensive housing policy that this government

should be talking about. With that, I conclude my remarks.

Mr. Godfrey: I rise to add my congratulations that the Minister of Housing has seen fit to make this small step forward for himself and truly a giant step forward for the renters of Ontario.

I congratulate him on accepting this plank from the social platform which our party has espoused for many years. It almost ranks with the acceptance of a rock-ribbed basis of socialism, namely medicare, which was accepted by his party with as much reluctance but eventually came to be—and will be surpassed in the near future, I am sure, by the acceptance of denticare, to be followed by insuricare, I am also sure.

I will not replicate the arguments which my colleagues have put forward with regard to the percentage or the timing, because I am very much aware of these and of their inadequacies and the fact that in Durham West we have more than our share of people who are suffering under exorbitant rents, but I do rise to a specific question.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: What about exorbitant doctors' fees?

Mr. Godfrey: The concern I have is with regard to the exemptions. I can understand the exemptions which go forward under the public housing that is performed by the Ontario government, but there are other government agencies which are being exempted by this same programme, namely the government agencies that have acquired, through expropriation or other socialistic means, a large number of houses throughout the province.

I can give you examples of houses that have been expropriated and acquired by the federal government in the defunct airport area of Pickering. I can give you examples of housing that has been acquired by the Metro Toronto and Region Conservation Authority and remains under their care. I can give you examples from provincial expropriation themselves, such as Squires Beach, in my riding, or the North Pickering development. In many of these areas, housing is being put on the market.

This housing previously was occupied by owners whose properties had been acquired. This is bringing new rental housing onto the market. But the problem is that the government is itself being a gouging landlord in many instances inasmuch as the rentals it is charging for these properties is far in excess of what was the accepted rental, if we worked it out a pro rata basis, from the previous occupants.

Therefore, my specific question and plea is that the minister will include in his bill a sufficient facility that government houses, aside from public housing as I mentioned before, will be subject to the same strictures as other types of landlords.

Mr. Makarchuk: I'd like to make my little contribution to this debate but I think it is unfortunate that the member for Mississauga East (Mr. Gregory) isn't here. A little earlier this evening he defended the small businessman. He said because our party is trying to get the smaller units to come under the rent control that we are in a way harming or damaging the small businessman.

I'd like to point out to him, no matter whether they are large businessmen or they are small businessmen, there should be a certain fairness in their operation. Just because a man is a small businessman, there is no reason to feel that he has the right to gouge or take advantage of his tenants. I think he should be treated the same as anybody else.

It's not a case of being against private enterprise or anything of that nature. I'd like to point to the member that during the election campaign one of the strongest defences of private enterprise I heard was made by the Premier to, I think, a Ukrainian group in Oshawa. If you look at the results of the election in Oshawa, you will see that it really doesn't pay off. Perhaps the Conservative Party would get away from that and speak to the substance or the concerns that bother the people of Ontario.

There was a remark also by the same member to the effect that the municipal authorities in some instances do not help or try to hold back development. I admit there may be certain cases. But I think we have to take into account that one of the reasons for the feeling of the citizens is the fact that due to the failure of the government in terms of providing housing, people have so much of their time and their money invested in housing, so much of their total income has gone into this housing, that any form of development threatens them. Whether the threat is real or imaginary, they have this concern about it. That is one of the reasons that people get excited about these things.

I should also point out to the minister, in Brantford as an example, we tried to prevail on Ontario Housing and we brought it to their attention that they owned a few parcels of land in the city that they finally

admitted that they do own a few parcels of land. We asked them to submit a plan of subdivision for the area. After waiting for two months, they finally submitted a plan of subdivision. We looked at that plan of subdivision in the technical advisory committee, and it was something that a planning school trainee would put out. We don't know who were the people doing the planning. We found out that the densities were wrong, the roads did not connect and everything else.

The municipal officials of the city directed their own planning staff to come up with a plan of subdivision for Ontario Housing, which was sent back to them. This was developed, accepted and eventually the project went on stream. I might add that in this particular case where there was some objections from local residents, we asked OHC to appear at a meeting. We had local officials appear at the meeting and with the three groups present we managed to allay some of the fears and overcome some of the objections of the people in the area. I think options and avenues are open for OHC and for the Ontario government to co-operate in this way to try to resolve the problems.

[9:30]

As to the problems that you are having right now, the reason, of course, why you have had to go through all those rather mental convolutions on rent control is because you have failed to provide housing for the people of the Province of Ontario. In one particular instance, again in the city of Brantford, the city offered to Ontario Housing something like 125 to 130 acres for rental housing, as well as single-family accommodation. And we said to OHC: "Look, we will give you the land, providing you put the land on the market at cost price." But the officials from Ontario Housing said: "Oh, no, we can't do that. That is going to affect the market."

Hon. Mr. Irvine: That's nonsense and you know it.

Mr. Makarchuk: That is not nonsense. That's the absolute truth. The ex-minister says that's nonsense.

Hon. Mr. Irvine: That's nonsense and you know it.

Mr. Martel: He wouldn't understand.

Mr. Deans: You used to say that when you sat over there and you were wrong then.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The hon. member for Brantford has the floor.

Mr. Makarchuk: At that particular time in the city of Brantford, we had a case where we had two developers who had a monopoly control on all the developable land. Between them they controlled something close to 70 per cent of the developable land in the area. By trying to put some land on the market at cost, we had hopes that the city would be able to shake the land out of these developers.

It is not the case where the developers now come crying—in some cases legitimately but in many cases not legitimately—saying, "The reason we can't get land on the market is the municipality does not want to allow us the subdivisions; the province has up tied up on subdivisions." I would suggest to the minister, that this is not the case in many small communities in the province. What is the case—and it's the case in Brantford and I am sure it's the case in London and Cambridge and a few other communities in Ontario—is that you have two or three or four developers who own the majority of the land in the area. They are putting only so many lots on the market in order to keep the prices up.

In Brantford at this time the local developers can go down to city hall tomorrow and take out a building permit for something like 2,000 units. There is absolutely no shortage of land there, There is no shortage of land that has been approved for subdividing for residential construction. But what is keeping those people from putting the land on the market is simply the fact that there is really no rush to put it on the market. They will sell so many units. They will make about $25,000 to $30,000 per unit. They have a nice cash flow, so why rock the boat? When we requested Ontario Housing to get involved and start putting the land on the market and try to put a competitive edge into the market, they refused and, as I said earlier, they replied: "It may affect the market and we don't want to do that."

There is a development on stream in Brantford at this time which will help the rental accommodation. It will certainly help the housing accommodation and we are looking forward to see the price that Ontario Housing is going to be charging for those units. I am sure that will be one of the things that we will be discussing further in the Housing estimates.

If the Tory party did not have that great obligation to the developers and had a commitment to build housing in Ontario, you

wouldn't have to be dealing with this bill right now.

Hon. Mr. Irvine: You should sit down.

Mr. Martel: I am sure you wouldn't understand.

Mr. Lewis: I rise to speak to the principle of the bill, saying quietly to the former incumbent in the Ministry of Housing that he is perhaps the last to intervene, injudiciously, yet again. This bill is almost a political epitaph for some Tories and I would—

Mr. Deans: Was it the ex-minister who said over his dead body?

Mr. Lewis: —have thought those who experienced the burial would be good enough to understand the quotation. On the other hand, referring, alas, to my colleague from Stormont—who is not here—and his references to the current Minister of Housing, I can't remember whether it was the day the minister was appointed or the day after when I was allowed in once again to the Premier's office, ushered in quietly. Before there were alarm bells ringing when we came near the door. Now the treatment is positively ceremonial. And the Premier said to me at the time—I can't recall the exact words—but with a kind of twinkle in his eye he said, "Oh, you are not going to find it easy with the new Minister of Housing." He was very proud of his appointment.

Hon. Mr. Irvine: He should be.

Mr. Lewis: If he doesn't think that we are finding it easy with the new Minister of Housing, think how he felt after the minister came out of his first cabinet meeting and began to talk about rent review and rent control. I think back on that occasion.

But the Premier was justifiably proud of the new incumbent. They didn't applaud for the old incumbent, but they are entitled to do it for the new one.

Hon. Mr. Meen: Oh yes we did.

Mr. Cassidy: That's the minister's epitaph.

Mr. Speaker: Perhaps the hon. member might get to the principle of the bill.

Mr. Lewis: I do not want to speak at length, and I suspect the minister may want to speak a little longer than the norm to cover the subject matter. I and others don't want to press him into conclusion tonight; I'm sure that won't be necessary, if he doesn't feel it.

I am fascinated by the genesis of this bill, forgive a moment's historical rambling. All of us in this party believe in the principle of rent control and rent review and have for a good many years. Our colleague, the member for Ottawa Centre (Mr. Cassidy) put the proposition eloquently in his own bill; and my colleague, the member for Wentworth (Mr. Deans) spoke of it many years ago—but I was always sceptical about whether or not it could ever be embraced by a Tory government. I must admit I am even somewhat surprised today as we actually debate the principle of this bill, that somehow it is the government over there which has disgorged it. I wouldn't have believed that that might happen.

I was utterly amazed at the way in which the question of rents took hold during the campaign. Let me admit that to the House. It was not by some kind of predetermined design and careful calculation that the rent issue blossomed into such a major political furore. I was as surprised about it, as many Tories were, when it occurred. I think that even I—and I must admit this to the House—having espoused it and believed in it for many years, underestimated the degree of public passion about the unreasonable rental increases and the degree of public feeling that something had to be done about it.

It was obvious that a chord was struck during the campaign that reverberated, not only through Metropolitan Toronto, but through most of the urban communities of Ontario. Again, I must admit a certain surprise at the time.

I have to concede an indebtedness to Beland Honderich and the Toronto Daily Star. I think it is fair that it be done publicly. Beland Honderich obviously decided at some point along the way that circulation could be vastly improved in the apartment buildings of Metropolitan Toronto if he ran with rents. So he ran with rents. We ran with rents—and the Liberal Party didn't run.

Although it is the last thing in the world I would expect to do, to pay tribute to Beland Honderich, I have to express a modest vote of thanks—not to mention John Bassett for keeping us out at CFTO; and not to mention Gordon Sinclair. Sinclair, Honderich, Bassett—it's a wonderful array, isn't it—the way the forces of enlightenment are rallying to the call. However, Mr. Speaker—

Mr. Grossman: Now the member knows how we feel.

Mr. Lewis: Yes, it really does grate, doesn't it? But it has its delicious moments as well.

I must really discipline myself, Mr. Speaker, and come back as you would wish me, sir, to the question of this bill and the way in which the minority government has responded to the reality which we all felt. The principle of rent control and rent review kind of grows on one, Mr. Speaker. You analyse it. You learn more about it. You think it through. It's a highly persuasive proposition which the more thought one gives to it the more it takes hold, and I think everyone in the legislative group, at least certainly among New Democrats and Tories, has moved with the recognition of what rent control is all about and what rent review portended.

We always accepted the principle. We've moved to a definition of the particulars. The government repudiated the principle and now it has embraced it. Now it's a question of their looking at the particulars. It's an interesting and important transition which has occurred for all of us. Some are uncomfortable with the bill. I think the minister is uncomfortable with the bill. Sotto voce, he says, "Me," and points to himself as an unrepentant Tory who feels that this kind of intervention in the marketplace is some kind of sacrilege. He is uncomfortable with it, but he brought it in. Think of those to my left who can't even tolerate its presence.

Mr. Cunningham: Nobody is to your left. Nobody could be further left than you.

Mr. Lewis: Nobody is to my left, if you speak of some. But I must say that there are some in the House—clearly, I think, in the Liberal Party—who don't want the bill at all. That emerged. I've never heard such truculent free-enterprise sentiments as I heard this afternoon, as some members of the Liberal group even talked of rent review as sacrosanct in comparison with rent control, trying desperately to draw a distinction which would somehow salvage their political position.

The Tories, uncomfortable or otherwise, have embraced the bill, and it's worth looking at the logic of a shifting position—the way they have shifted, and, frankly, because it's important for me to say it, the way we have shifted. It's a matter of assumption that as social democrats come closer to the trappings of power they moderate their positions, or they might water down some of their approaches. The reality is, in this bill as in other areas of legislation, we have felt tougher and tougher about the particulars, and the positions which I took in the campaign, setting out the particulars, have become tougher and tougher as our caucus looked at them time and time again over the last two or three months.

The position which we have arrived at today, and which my colleagues have put most effectively—in fact I guess almost all my colleagues have spoken in this debate and put most effectively those particulars—demonstrate that we are not prepared to trifle with the principle of rent control and rent review one jot, and that the more we read, the more we understand, and the more we absorb, the more we are as a caucus persuaded that this intervention in the marketplace is absolutely indispensable, that it must persist for a very long period of time, that it must be uncompromising though fair, and that it is one of the best pieces of social intervention that this Legislature has brought itself to in many years. And we're proud of it; we're very proud of it.

As a government, I am prepared to concede, the Tories too have apparently looked at some of the particulars and understood the logic of a shifting position. I don't begrudge that, and I don't pretend that it's all politically inspired, because there are Tories—I daren't name them—who talked to me privately after the bill was introduced and explained some of the feelings they had and some of the perceptions they had about the inadequacies of the bill. Apparently, in the process of discussion there are to be amendments, and I'm glad of that. I guess I'm asking the minister—I hope in a spirit of useful argument rather than rhetorical device—to consider a number of particulars, and before the bill comes to committee of the whole, to look carefully at the amendments which should be introduced, because logic makes a bill fair.

[9:45]

If the minister brings in a bill which in principle is sound, but in a number of particulars represents the last vestige of irrationality, he knows what it is like. He is not happy with the bill, he concedes on a number of points, but he can't give on the final logical consequences of his act. Therefore the bill becomes irrational and a little unfair.

There are a number of particulars which are worthy of evaluation. I read back in Hansard—I wasn't here, I was out of town—when my colleague from Ottawa Centre (Mr. Cassidy) put to the minister the proposition of the fourplex, triplex, duplex, roomers, etc. I read the intervention from the member for St. Andrew-St. Patrick (Mr. Grossman). I read the intervention from the

minister that there would be an amendment. I hope that whatever else is achieved before 10:30 p.m. tonight, that the minister will announce very specifically that the exemption will be lifted, and that we will cover all rental accommodation. I hope the essential fairness and logic of that has impressed itself on the government mind. That's not a political capitulation, that's just something which is eminently equitable. And that's what legislation should be. Therefore I assume the minister will embrace it.

One of the most vivid phone calls I had was from a fellow named David Rabinovitch. He is a CBC producer on the programme "Take Thirty," whom I bumped into while doing a programme on rents with the BC Attorney General, and he called me a day or two later. He was living in a fourplex and described quite movingly the increase in rent which he and his family were subject to and how he couldn't believe that the legislation had managed to exclude him from tenants' rights—from some kind of justice. I felt when I heard it—and we in this caucus have had many of a similar kind—that somehow collectively the Legislature would amend that clause. I see that it will be done, or I gather that it will be done, spontaneously by government. First-rate.

The second point: there is a compelling logic to the incorporation of government housing as well as the private sector. It isn't simply a matter of class, although that is central, it is also a matter of equity. You don't apply laws of this kind in an invidious fashion, in private and public sector components. If the principle is correct that rent control and rent review should apply to protect tenants who are vulnerable from landlords who are rapacious, then it applies equally to all. I hope the logic of that proposition will commend itself to government, rather than the opposition having to combine to force the change. However I sense that we will, if the amendment doesn't come spontaneously from the government.

I want you to look at the arguments that have been made by my caucus mates on the whole question of retroactivity. The member for Oshawa (Mr. Breaugh) put it extremely well. What kind of sacred spirit is there about July 29, 1975? What makes that such a sacrosanct date? Why pay homage to it? If there is cumulative evidence of rent gouging throughout 1975—and you will remember that when the city of Toronto came before the committee of the legislature and made the arguments to move the retroactivity back into 1974, they gave chapter and verse of illegitimate rent increases.

If all of that evidence is before the minister, why then does he not rescue the tenant for the whole year 1975 rather than the arbitrary fixation of the middle of 1975? Since he has eliminated the right of appeal for this six-month period—a decision with which we agree—then why not extend it back to Jan. 1, 1975, minimum?

We would rather go further back. We would go right back to the beginning of 1974 and would so move, based on the experiences of what we know of rent gouging. But leave that aside for the moment. In conservative terms, in terms of the basic view the minister has of how the legislation should work, make it fair. And to be fair to the tenants, those who suffered the gouging in the first part of 1975 should have the same recourse that the government provided in the last five or six months under this bill. That's a matter of simple equity.

Then there's the question of the percentage. It's easy to take the eight per cent because it coincides with BC. It's easy to take the eight per cent, because it was rumoured by Ottawa, but there is much greater logic on our side for six per cent than there is on yours for eight. The Province of British Columbia, in fact, had rent control for more than a year before they decided the fixed percentage. They had already fixed rents. They'd already brought them down and they were able to make an analysis which occupied different components than need be occupied in the Province of Ontario.

Let me remind the hon. minister about British Columbia. Let me remind the hon. minister that the operating costs for the landlords of BC, based on an analysis of the four six-month periods from the middle of 1973 to the middle of 1975, worked out to 3.5 per cent. I read the first 70 pages of that report very carefully. Right, I didn't get a chance to look at all the tables but I was impressed with the lucidity and the weight of the document.

As a matter of fact, it's actually readable which is unusual in government reports. It speaks well for Karl Jaffary, John Brewin and other treasured members of the left. I want to tell the hon. minister, that if the actual operating costs, incorporating all of the landlord's expenses carefully looked at through those four six-month based periods, were only 3.5 per cent, then a six per cent level in the Province of Ontario could compensate for taxes and not only for taxes, but probably for

an additional component of return on investment.

I suspect that if we went before a rent review tribunal, that, in fact, would be documented. I see no particular reason for the grabbing of the eight per cent except that, again, for the Tories it was some kind of figure clutched from above.

I want to mention and re-affirm what my colleagues have spoken of in terms of the exemption for new buildings. I want to put a conviction which is very strong in this caucus. We don't believe for a moment that rent control actual, intended, or otherwise necessarily reduces the building of new rental accommodation. That is a hoary mythology which Tories perpetrate but doesn't commend itself to us.

One of the powerful parts of the BC document, which I gather the minister has in front of him, is the argument—demonstrable, documented—that the decline in rental accommodation began in the year 1970. It had absolutely nothing to do with intimations of rent control. It had everything to do with the market. It had everything to do with interest rates. It had everything to do with the private construction industry. It had everything to do with the way in which developers were deciding to invest their money. It had nothing to do with the threat, looming on the horizon, of so-called rent control.

It wasn't even mooted in the dark days of 1970 in the old Socred regime in British Columbia and it had nothing to do with the decline of rental accommodation which began here in Ontario at the same time. Rent control and rent review, embodied in this bill, if applied fairly, giving the landlord the right to appeal, as it does and therefore giving a return on investment in the process, need not, under any circumstances, deter the building of rental accommodation.

I know that the minister grabs at that. He holds it to him. It's kind of an adrenalin, kind of an ideological adrenalin, that if you bring in rent control, you reduce rental accomomdation. Nuts; that isn't the case. It doesn't have to be the case unless the government's rent control legislation is inconsistent and unfair. And we'll try to make it as fair as possible. I want the minister to know that for the New Democratic caucus equity extends to landlords as it extends to tenants and I assume that their right of appeal will give them the protection that they need.

We also don't accept, and ask the minister to think through, the whole proposition of ending it in the middle of 1977. I don't know whether it has to do with his electoral strategy. I don't know whether it has to do with his desperate hope that this need only be a temporary measure. It can't only be a temporary measure. There will be no adequate vacancy rate in the metropolitan centres of Ontario for the foreseeable future. For the next few years there will be no adequate vacancy rate for rental accommodations. So for heaven's sake don't put a termination point on this legislation.

Or maybe he feels that he can extend it. As I understand it from the provincial Treasurer (Mr. McKeough), these two years don't even extend as long as the government's commitment to the federal wage price guidelines extends. And that's an inconsistency—which is illogical and unfair, and should be altered in an amendment to the legislation.

Those are the kinds of things which should be changed in committee, and we commend them to the Legislature and to the minister. I know that the bill runs counter to many philosophic convictions the government has, but it is just one of those desperate compelling realities that this intervention in the marketplace has to occur. Call it creeping socialism, if you will. Call it in the rhetorical flourishes of my friendly companion from Bellwoods (Mr. McClellan)—oh, do I love his presence in this caucus—call it full-blown socialism, if you want to. But that's what it is—

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: You had to keep some socialism there.

Mr. Lewis: —it's the recognition that the government intervenes in the life of the private sector to protect the citizenry of a province. It caused the government apoplexy when it froze oil prices. It is causing it as much apoplexy in rental accommodation, but it is an absolutely truth—there is no way around it. It is irresistible. It happens. Now, cope with it and make it fair. Amend the legislation so that it works. That's what we are simply putting to the minister.

We put it to him on the question of numbers of units; on the government housing; on the increased retroactivity and the percentage he is allowing; on the exemption for new buildings; on the duration of time that the bill lasts, and on all the multitude of particular points which we in this caucus will struggle to introduce and to amend because we are pleased that this legislation has come. That it is an extension of a social

philosophy to which we subscribe and which we think one day Ontario will also subscribe to with equal feeling.

But, I want to make a final point and it is a point which I know the minister shares at least in theory, if not in practice. There is no member of the New Democratic team in this Legislature who believes that rent control and rent review in any sense is an answer to the housing crisis. No one of us believes that. No one of us is deluded enough, or filled with illusion enough to believe it. We know that it is an absolute necessity to correct the vagaries, injustices—and often outrages—of the way in which the marketplace has worked to the disadvantage of tenants everywhere in Ontario. But, we also know that until the people over there, in whatever period of time they continue to be a government, begin a housing programme in Ontario in excess of 100,000 units a year, then no legislation will be adequate to the task.

If I may say, Mr. Speaker, through you to the minister—and this Speaker (Mr. Stokes) has thought-waves, has cerebral perceptions given to no other Speaker—and when I speak to the minister through him, he is getting my message because it ain't distorted en route —I want to say—

Mr. Deans: It is supposed to be distorted.

[Mr. Speaker Rowe returns.]

Mr. Lewis: This is treason; this is heresy.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: It will be properly filtered now, I'll tell you.

Mr. Speaker: I think I stayed away long enough.

Mr. Lewis: Now I shall have to acknowledge the Speaker and speak to the minister. You know what it will take to build housing in Ontario?

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: Money.

Mr. Lewis: No, it is not money. It is intervention in the private sector. It is called public ownership of urban land. That's what it is going to take to build housing in Ontario, and that too will one day commend itself.

[10:00]

How I remember the Tories impugn the integrity of rent control and rent review. They laughed us out of court for putting the proposition that this was the answer to rental accommodation. Now they come in here and introduce it.

Let us say to them as a political party that some day they're going to have to descend on those municipalities which raise their red tape at every turn in order to prevent the introduction of adequate housing. Some day they're going to have to descend on these developers who sit on land speculatively, acquisitively, adding their profits. Some day they're going to have to come to grips with the fact that if the private sector won't do it the public sector had better do it.

The government can still do it in conjunction with private house builders. The Tories don't have to build it themselves. But at some point the government will have to intervene to rescue the housing accommodation market just as we are presently intervening to rescue the rental accommodation market.

With a little bit of bemusement and not a touch of surprise I rise, in conjunction with all my colleagues, to support the principle of this bill; to say to the minister that we will amend it as thoughtfully and resourcefully as we can in committee; to hope he will embrace some of these amendments when they're put or, indeed, pre-empt us by putting them himself—we don't begrudge it. If anything at all justified that whole election campaign and its outcome, it's this bill and the companion piece of legislation which the Attorney General will bring forward. We are jolly well proud of it.

Mr. Speaker: Are there any other hon. members to speak before the minister replies? The member for Wentworth.

Mr. Deans: Mr. Speaker—

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: Mr. Speaker—

Mr. Deans: I'm sorry; did the minister want to say something?

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: No, it's all right.

Mr. Deans: I'm prepared to let you say it if you want to.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: Are you going to drag it on?

Mr. Deans: Pardon? I can't hear you.

Mr. Cunningham: He's saying you're an anti-climax.

An hon. member: He says the member for Ottawa West (Mr. Morrow) wants to speak.

Mr. Deans: He wants to speak?

An hon. member: It's hard to believe.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Ottawa West.

Mr. Morrow: Mr. Speaker, I don't want to be presumptuous in rising at this time—

Mr. Lewis: There is another election coming.

Mr. Morrow: —but I thought, although the minister was urging me to say something some 15 minutes ago on this subject, that after the Leader of the Opposition spoke it would be proper for the minister to close the debate. I see other members on the other side of the House wanting to speak to the bill so I'll take this opportunity of saying how pleased I am, as an urban member of the Legislature, to see this bill come before the House.

Mr. Lewis: Why is your adam's apple bobbing?

Mr. Morrow: I want to make it abundantly clear to all the members on the other side of the House, particularly the new members, that the matter of rent control and rent review was a very strong topic in the Progressive Conservative caucus of the former Parliament.

Mr. Cassidy: That's right, you fought it bitterly.

Mr. Morrow: Several members of our caucus argued loud and long for some form of rent control.

Interjections.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Mr. Morrow: I might say that I live in a highrise apartment with some 300 units and I have a pecuniary interest that perhaps I should declare because I am a renter now. I did feel, particularly after the Toronto bill came before the standing committee of the House last May, that there was a good deal of justification at this time for looking into the matter of some form of rent control to be brought forward in this province.

Many members in our caucus took up the challenge and we spoke at length many times throughout the months of April, May and June. It was decided, I might say, by a strong consensus in our caucus that rent control and even the cornerstone of this bill, rent review, would be a plank in our platform in the upcoming election.

Mr. MacDonald: But "King Canute" Irvine tried to sweep the sea with his broom.

Mr. Lewis: You name it!

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Mr. Morrow: The only thing I'll agree with the hon. member opposite on is—

Mr. Lewis: Just a second; someone has fainted in front of you.

Mr. Morrow: —perhaps we didn't have all the pegs in place at that time and there has been some evolution in our thinking before this bill came into being. As the Leader of the Opposition has said, that's all to the good. The more thought that has been put into the bill and the more input, the better the bill; and there's input in this bill, I will say, by members of all three parties in this House. I don't even take the position of the Leader of the Opposition or other members of his party who begrudge the contribution from the third party of the House. There are many in that caucus who are favourable to some form of rent review.

I only want to emphasize that if the minister has acted expeditiously on this matter, it is not only because of the urgings of the parties opposite, but because of the urging of many members in his own caucus. Being a very flexible man and a great humanitarian he is not only looking after the interests of the people who rent in the city of Ottawa and the great city of Sault Ste. Marie but for all renters across this province. I do want to congratulate him. I would like to say that I commend the hon. minister for bringing in this bill so soon after assuming office.

I know that there are many of us who have grave reservations, as the Leader of the Opposition has said, about some of the exemptions in the bill. I am one who has grave reservations about certain exemptions, particularly the one to do with four units or less. There are 300 units in my apartment. I don't want the privilege of having my rent frozen at eight per cent for the balance of this year and then have to pay eight per cent next year unless the landlord, who is Sun Life — and I couldn't care less about Sun Life—

Mr. Lewis: You are losing your grip, you know.

Mr. Morrow: —proves that I should pay more. They are going to have to justify to me why I should pay more.

Mr. MacDonald: You are on the road to Damascus.

Mr. Foulds: I'll bet you are taking emergency courses in French.

Mr. Morrow: So I want my fellow man who rents in the four-unit apartment, in the triplex, in the double or the duplex or even the single dwelling unit, to have the privilege to appeal his rent.

Mr. Lewis: What about these government buildings? What about them?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. One person speaking at a time I think is enough.

Mr. Morrow: I have a great number of government buildings in my riding.

Mr. Lewis: Like the federal Parliament.

Mr. Morrow: I will agree with you. There are many problems there.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The hon. member has the floor.

Mr. Lewis: On a point of order—

Mr. Morrow: I am not yielding the floor. I got your point.

Mr. Lewis: I don't want you to yield the floor. God forbid. Did I hear—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. Order.

Mr. Morrow: I am speaking personally—now, just a minute until I qualify myself.

Hon. Mr. Welch: He wants to qualify it.

Mr. Lewis: What about retroactivity? You will have to admit—

Hon. Mr. Welch: Sit him down.

Mr. Morrow: The hon. Leader of the Opposition doesn't want me to finish. I said that I would like to qualify myself. I know that there are problems with a great many of the people in our government-rented buildings, but I also know that if you give everyone the opportunity to appeal their rents and so on, no matter who they may be throughout the province, we will get into legislation that will bog us down. We will not be able to get anywhere with it and you will not be able to solve the many injustices there are.

Mr. Wildman: Rough justice.

Mr. Morrow: Now, we don't have to do this all at once. Let's bite off so much at one time.

Mr. Lewis: Sure.

Mr. Morrow: I am in favour of the retroactivity measure. I won't go so far as the Leader of the Opposition went. I am in favour of the way it is written. I couldn't care less if it was for another six months.

Mr. Lewis: Oh, you couldn't?

Mr. Morrow: That's right. I wouldn't mind.

Mr. Cassidy: Does the minister hear that?

Mr. Morrow: I am in favour of the eight per cent. I think it is fair where it is.

Mr. MacDonald: We may have to change the minister again.

Mr. Lewis: Who are you speaking for?

Mr. Morrow: I am speaking for myself. When I speak, I always speak for myself.

Mr. Lewis: I understand you lead a backbench group.

Mr. Morrow: If the hon. member would just listen—

Mr. Lewis: I am listening.

Mr. Morrow: I am in favour of those two features; I am in favour of the rollback provision and even the roll-forward, if it can be justified by the landlords. We have got to look after both these people, as the hon. member says. I am in favour of the minister bringing in any new provisions in this legislation that will help solve our problems.

Interjections.

Mr. Morrow: There is one other thing. I am of the opinion that there should be some companion effort to this bill in the near future. I think the minister is justified in his concern about not enough units being built. That's a justifiable concern, and I think some sort of package should come in later to promote more units being built. We should be looking into mortgage interest rates and so on to help the builders, because there's nothing like having lots of units in order to eliminate the scarcity of rental apartments.

I'm going to close on the note that I'm prepared to support the legislation. I am happy that it has been brought in. I am in favour of certain exemptions being removed, and perhaps I'll so voice myself at that time.

Interjections.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Mr. Deans: Mr. Speaker, perhaps you would like to check and see if any other

back-benchers of the government would like to add to the comments of the member for Ottawa West—

Mr. Lewis: Now, now. Mr. Speaker, there is one here.

Mr. Ferrier: Don't let the cabinet intimidate you.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Wentworth has the floor anyway.

Mr. Cassidy: The member for Carleton-Grenville (Mr. Irvine) may have a contribution.

Mr. Martel: He doesn't understand.

Mr. Deans: Mr. Speaker, it's always very difficult when you come to a point like this. After eight years of talking and attempting to persuade the government that there was a need for rent control in the Province of Ontario, to finally see the bill before you and to recognize that some of what you've been trying to accomplish has been seen at last. I've got to tell you, though, that for a great many people the bill is too little, too late.

When we first started talking about the need for rent review and rent control and amendments to the Landlord and Tenant Act back in 1966 and 1967, the need was evident at that point; and if the need was evident at that point, you can imagine just how great the need has become over the last eight years.

Mr. MacDonald: The Tories are slow learners.

Mr. Deans: It bothers me when I think back to 1968, I think—it might have been 1969—when the city of Ottawa came before the private bills committee and asked for private legislation to allow that city to implement a form of rent review with controls that would have enabled them to take grip on what was then going on. The government members came together as one group to block that and had that section of the bill withdrawn and the remainder of that private bill was allowed to pass.

At that point, many of us in this House. recognized that there was a need. Many of us argued in the committee and in the Legislature that that section of that bill ought to have been allowed to stand and that Ottawa should have been given the opportunity to act as a guinea pig or as a test area for rental legislation of this type. But the government chose not to do that. In fact, the situation that has occurred since 1967 through 1975 has been so bad for so many people that this bill isn't going to help them very much.

I still happen to think that one of the objectives of the Legislature of Ontario ought to be that we try to ensure those who wish to do so should have an opportunity to own a home of their own, that there's a chance for people to purchase and to own housing or accommodation. It grieves me to think that we have reached the point where things are so bad that so many people are forced to live in rental accommodation that they have become at the mercy of so many gouging landlords.

[10:15]

Like most people, I could stand in the House and speak for some considerable period of time about the numbers of people that I have spoken to or sat in their living rooms or they have sat in my living room and in my office, telling me about the problems that they faced in trying to meet the rental increases that were being imposed upon them. I raised this matter with the previous minister, the member for Carleton-Grenville, on a number of occasions. He stood in his place and told me I was nuts, maybe not in as many words, but that was the intent. I can remember the minister standing up telling me, as he did on every single occasion every time I raised the matter, that I didn't know what I was talking about.

Mr. Samis: He said you don't understand.

Mr. Deans: I can remember it.

Hon. Mr. Irvine: Like you, I can check Hansard.

Mr. Germa: The hon. member for Carleton-Grenville should resign from the cabinet.

Mr. Deans: I can remember because it wasn't so long ago. I am going to tell him something. It is because of the folly, the inaction and the actions of this government that we are dealing with rent legislation here. It is because this government has failed so miserably in providing accommodation for people at a price that they can afford that we are here at 10:16 on this date and this year, dealing with rental legislation. It is because of Stanley Randall and his policies on land in 1967 and 1968 and 1969 that we are forced to the position of having to regulate rents in the Province of Ontario. It is because of the policies of Ministers of Housing who preceded the member for Carleton-Grenville and of the current Minister of Housing—

Mr. Martel: Their lack of policies.

Mr. Deans: —that we have been faced with the skyrocketing cost of land in the Province of Ontario which has been the major contributing factor to the rising cost of accommodation which has caused most people not to be able to purchase accommodation of their own.

When we deal with this legislation, we are dealing with it today, at least eight years after it was necessary. If the government had moved when the need was evident to most thinking people and if it had moved on two fronts—if it had moved to control the rents in 1967 and 1968 and if it had also moved concurrently to build houses in 1967 and 1968, then we wouldn't be here tonight doing these things. We wouldn't have to be. We wouldn't have needed rent controls at this point in the province.

This government has never understood that the major problem rests in the provision of an adequate supply of accommodation. That is where the government has failed. When it was asked in 1968 and 1969 why it was that it didn't go in competition with the land speculator, why it didn't drive the prices down using the land it had, I was told by the then minister responsible for housing, Stanley Randall, whom I mentioned before, that the government of Ontario wasn't going into competition with private speculators. The government of Ontario was looking at the speculators' prices and setting its prices accordingly and it helped to drive up the price of housing.

The minister of this day is doing exactly the same thing in the Home Ownership Made Easy programme. The government has taken a very good worthwhile programme and destroyed it. It was a programme that in its inception could have been used to provide decent accommodation for people at a price that they could afford. By its manipulative ways, by kow-towing to private enterprise, the government has turned around and destroyed that programme and made it into a programme for people to gain out of the government's activities.

Hon. Mr. Irvine: You know that's wrong.

Mr. Deans: I don't know it's wrong. I know it is right. I know, for example, that you have allowed the prices in that sector to go to exactly the same prices as they are in the private sector.

Mr. Martel: Tell him he doesn't understand.

Hon. Mr. Irvine: Don't blame the present minister.

Mr. Deans: I don't blame the present minister. I am saying that he is an extension of you who are an extension of the one before who goes all the way back to Stanley Randall. You have all got the Stanley Randall complex.

Mr. Lewis: Oh, God forbid!

Mr. Deans: And that is the difficulty.

Mr. Lewis: That is practically fatal. It's a contagion.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I wonder in the few moments that are left whether we could get to the principle of this bill.

Mr. Deans: I am speaking about the principle of the bill.

Mr. Speaker: You're speaking about the ministers or former ministers. Let's get to the principle of the bill, please.

Mr. Hodgson: Go back where you came from.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The hon. member for Wentworth has the floor.

Mr. Germa: The ghost of the Minister of Culture and Recreation (Mr. Welch) is in this bill.

Mr. Deans: Anyhow—

Mr. Hodgson: Why did you come here?

Mr. Lewis: What do you mean, why did he come here? He's here. He was born here. Leave him alone.

Mr. Hodgson: No way.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. Would the hon. member for Wentworth continue, please?

Mr. Deans: I am going to continue in a minute. I doubt if there is any single area of government that aggravates me more than the area of housing as far as it applies to this government. In looking at what they've done in trying to ensure that there was an adequate supply, and what they've done in trying to make sure that there was rental accommodation, and what they have done in trying to keep prices down, I can only come to the conclusion that they work hand in hand with the developers; that they have a vested interest in making sure that the developers of the Province of Ontario are maintained. I came to that conclusion some years ago, and said that once before in the Legislature.

Let me say this legislation will be in place forever. It will be in place forever because this government will never ever address itself to the problem of developing a sufficient number of housing units. This government will never be able to appreciate the difficulties that are being faced by the people who work in the average jobs in the Province of Ontario and earn average wages. This government will never be able to understand the frustrations that are being felt by the young people of the day, who are growing up and getting married and looking at where they might go to find accommodation, only to find that there is no likelihood in their lifetime of their ever being able to afford to pay for it.

Mr. Martel: It will never take on the land speculator either, and that is the real problem.

Mr. Deans: I think that is where the government has failed. When I watch what has happened in the 11 years—that's the eight years that I have been here and the three years that I had an interest in this matter prior to getting elected—I have seen the housing situation in the Province of Ontario deteriorate from the point where the average individual, in the average job, could pay out 25 to 30 per cent of his income and purchase an accommodation and pay it off in 25 years, to a point where it would take 60 to 70 per cent of his income, even if he could qualify for the mortgage in the first place, which most people can't.

They are never going to solve the problem. They are never going to solve it because they don't know how. They don't know how. When I hear the minister telling me about how it is to benefit the first purchaser that the Home Ownership Made Easy programme was brought in, and when I hear the minister telling me that it is right in the province to allow speculation to take place at the public expense in the HOME programme, then I can only assume that they really don't intend to try to provide a supply of housing for those income groups that can't get into the private sector. They can't build a sufficient number of houses in any given year under the HOME programme to meet the need, and they allow those that should have been the stock of the HOME programme to be sold for private speculative gain. That's where they have failed.

I happen to think this particular legislation will likely be in place for as long as I live. It will be in place for that long simply because this government will never ever take the necessary steps to try to alleviate the housing shortage. There is one problem with the whole thing. Even this government must recognize that the rise in rental rates over the last three to four years is far in excess of the actual increased costs of maintaining and paying for the buildings that are currently available for apartment rentals. They must recognize that in almost every case the owners have raised rents far in excess of what could be generally considered as attributable to rising costs in their particular areas.

As a result of that, there are a great number of people who are simply locked in to rental accommodation that they cannot afford on the incomes that they have. There are many senior citizens who are in that category. There are many people on fixed incomes in that category. There are many of the working poor who are in that category, and frankly this legislation isn't going to help them one single bit. At least, it isn't going to help them as long as it is left in the hands of this government.

I think that after all these years of fighting, perhaps we have come to the point where we have the legislation. And it may be too late for it to be of any good to a lot of people.

Mr. Speaker: Do any other hon. members wish to speak to this before the hon. minister replies? Can the hon. minister summarize in three minutes or does he wish to leave it for another day?

Mr. Nixon: You've got three minutes.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: Mr. Speaker, I am just overwhelmed.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes moved the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to.

Hon. Mr. Welch: Mr. Speaker, before moving the adjournment of the House, it would perhaps be appropriate if I made one or two observations about our programme on Thursday. It had been our intention to have the House in committee of supply on Thursday. But I think it would be important to finish this debate. So on Thursday, if I might be allowed to make this one change, we will have the hon. minister's summary with respect to Bill 20. The Minister of Revenue (Mr. Meen) is anxious to proceed with Bill 8, and so our programme would be this: We will finish up Bill 20, second reading, and then appoint the committee so that we can refer Bill 20 to the select committee. We will

go briefly into committee of the whole House to finish up Bill 8, and then we will go into committee of supply to carry on for the rest of the afternoon and that evening with estimates. On Friday, of course, we will have Throne Speech debate.

In view of the fact that tomorrow is committee day, and by virtue of some understanding, we will not count tomorrow as a day as far as the standing committee on estimates is concerned, so that, in fact, the standing committee on estimates will have four days starting on Thursday. It was my understanding that they were to start the estimates of the Ministry of Housing on Thursday. With some allowance, we were hoping to finish with the Minister of Housing tonight so that he could go to his committee. We may have to allow for some time on Thursday for the hon. minister to wind up the debate on this second reading, and then go down to the standing committee on estimates. So that would be understood.

Hon. Mr. Welch moved the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to.

The House adjourned at 10:30 p.m.

CONTENTS

Tuesday, November 18, 1975

Residential Premises Rent Review Act, Mr. Rhodes, on second reading 713

Motion to adjourn, Mr. Welch, agreed to 741

SPEAKERS IN THIS ISSUE

Bennett, Hon. C. Industry and Tourism (Ottawa South PC)
Breaugh, M. (Oshawa NDP)
Burr, F. A. (Windsor-Riverside NDP)
Bryden, M. (Beaches-Woodbine NDP)
Cassidy, M. (Ottawa Centre NDP)
Cunningham, E. (Wentworth North L)
Deans, I. (Wentworth NDP)
Eakins, J. (Victoria-Haliburton L)
Ferrier, W. (Cochrane South NDP)
Foulds, J. F. (Port Arthur NDP)
Germa, M. C. (Sudbury NDP)
Godfrey, C. (Durham West NDP)
Good, E. R. (Waterloo North L)
Grande, A. (Oakwood NDP)
Gregory, M. E. C. (Mississauga East PC)
Grossman, L. (St. Andrew-St. Patrick PC)
Henderson, Hon. L. C., Minister without Portfolio (Lambton PC)
Hodgson, W. (York North PC)
Irvine, Hon. D. R., Provincial Secretary for Resources Development (Carleton-Grenville PC)
Laughren, F. (Nickel Belt NDP)
Lewis, S. Leader of the Opposition (Scarborough West NDP)
MacDonald, D. C. (York South NDP)
Makarchuk, M. (Brantford NDP)
Mancini, R. (Essex South L)
Martel, E. W. (Sudbury East NDP)
Meen, Hon. A. K. Revenue (York East PC)
Morrow, D. H. (Ottawa West PC)
Nixon, R. F. (Brant-Oxford-Norfolk L)
Reid, T. P. (Rainy River L)
Rhodes, Hon. J. R., Housing (Sault Ste. Marie PC)
Riddell, J. (Huron-Middlesex L)
Samis, G. (Cornwall NDP)
Sargent, E. (Grey-Bruce L)
Shore, M. (London North L)
Smith, Hon. J. R., Correctional Services (Hamilton Mountain PC)
Stephenson, Hon. B., Labour (York Mills PC)
Warner, D. (Scarborough-Ellesmere NDP)
Welch, Hon. R., Culture and Recreation (Brock PC)
Wildman, B. (Algoma NDP)
Williams, J. (Oriole PC)

No. 19

Ontario

Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT — DAILY EDITION

First Session of the Thirtieth Legislature

Thursday, November 20, 1975

Afternoon Session

Speaker: Honourable Russell Daniel Rowe
Clerk: Roderick Lewis, QC

THE QUEEN'S PRINTER
PARLIAMENT BUILDINGS, TORONTO
1975

10

CONTENTS

A list of the speakers taking part in the debates in this issue of Hansard appears, in alphabetical order, at the back of this issue.

Daily contents of proceedings also appears at the back of this issue. Reference to a cumulative index of previous issues can be obtained by calling the Hansard Reporting Service indexing staff. Phone 965-2159.

Hansard subscription price is $15.00 per session, from: Sessional Subscription Service, MGS, 9th Floor, Ferguson Block, Parliament Bldgs., Toronto, M7A 1N3. Phone 965-2238.

LEGISLATURE OF ONTARIO

The House met at 2:04 p.m.

Prayers.

Mr. McEwen: Mr. Speaker, we have with us, seated in the east gallery—from the township of Pittsburgh, in the great riding of Frontenac-Addington, the heart of tourism, represented by the Land of Lakes Tourist Association—40 grade 10 students of LaSalle Secondary School, along with their teachers, Mr. W. Lofgren and Mr. Allen. Will the members join with me in welcoming this group to this House?

Mr. Godfrey: Mr. Speaker, I would like to present to you, and through you to the House, 64 students from the school of St. Bernadette in Ajax, where the air is much cleaner than it is in Toronto. They are in the west gallery.

Mr. Roy: Mr. Speaker, before you call for ministerial statements, I would like to raise a question of privilege affecting all members of the House. Mr. Speaker, it deals with the precedent that has been set most recently, especially since Sept. 18, 1975, wherein you allow parliamentary assistants to ask questions of ministers in the House.

I point out that parliamentary assistants take an oath of secrecy when they are sworn, that they participate in policy, that they answer for the government and very often in this House participate in the discussion of bills and in the estimates. In fact, they are part of government.

The purpose of the question period is for private members to ask questions of the government. By allowing parliamentary assistants to ask questions, in fact you are allowing a situation where the government is asking questions of the government.

Mr. Yakabuski: That's right.

Mr. Roy: Mr. Speaker, I am asking you to make a ruling on this; and for your assistance, I would point out that on Nov. 5, 1974, in the federal House, Mr. Speaker Jerome made a ruling, against strong opposition from the government, that parliamentary secretaries could not ask questions of the government because in fact they were government. I ask for this ruling, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: My first reaction is that I disagree with the hon. member because a parliamentary assistant is an ordinary member of the Legislature like everyone else. He is not a member of cabinet, and I think you referred to the oath of secrecy. There may be something I am not aware of; so, after I consider this further, if I have a different opinion I shall report back to the House. But that is my initial, off-the-cuff opinion.

Mr. Roy: Mr. Speaker, would you report back to the House on your research of this?

Mr. Speaker: One way or the other, yes.

Mr. Roy: And would you direct yourself to the ruling of Nov. 5, 1974, in the federal House?

Mr. Speaker: Well, we are not concerned with the ruling in the federal House here at the moment, but I shall undertake to report back to the House one way or the other.

Mrs. Campbell: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, I would like clarification on the operation of what are now being called select committees. My understanding is that a select committee, although it does in fact order its own business, must have authorization from this House before it makes an expenditure of money.

We had a problem this morning in the bills committee dealing with Bill 5. My understanding was that that bill was sent to committee so there could be input from the public. When the select committee was set up there was no authorization for the expenditure of funds. Apparently there came to be a confusion because the minister didn't have funds and the advertising was held up.

Could I understand whether it is right that a select committee being set up is then authorized to expend any funds it wishes without the authorization of this House.

Mr. Speaker: I shall take that as notice, because there are implications going through my mind. Is this a select committee? I thought it was a standing committee considering Bills 4 and 5. It was a select committee; I am corrected.

Mrs. Campbell: There are no standing committees, Mr. Speaker, but I think in effect

what we have is a misnomer with this committee and I would like it clarified.

Mr. Speaker: Perhaps the hon. member will permit me to report back.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Before rising on a point of privilege, I would like to welcome to the Legislature Mr. Maxwell Henderson, who was chairman of the Special Programme Preview Committee and who is in your gallery, sir. The Treasurer (Mr. McKeough) will be making reference to his report in a moment or so.

Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of privilege resulting from the allegations made yesterday by the member for High Park-Swansea (Mr. Ziemba). These allegations suggest in direct terms that the decision of the government of Ontario in 1971 to reduce the drinking age and the age of majority in this province was in direct repayment for campaign contributions made to the 1971 campaign—

An hon. member: How much were they?

Hon. Mr. Davis: —by the brewers and distillers of Ontario.

Mr. Speaker, in my years in this Legislature I have heard many baseless charges, uttered often in haste and often in passion. I have even heard some ridiculous suggestions and allegations, but I have never heard an allegation as vicious and demeaning as the one uttered by the member for High Park-Swansea. Indeed, even the member's predecessor in that seat, took more care, by and large, in the charges he raised from time to time in this House.

Mr. Lewis: On a point of privilege, the Premier never said it at the time.

Mr. Martel: Oh, come on!

Interjections.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Interjections.

Hon. Mr. Davis: I know members opposite are embarrassed and so they should be.

The suggestion that this government lowered both the age of drinking in this province and the age of voting and majority in repayment for some political donation by a company or group of companies is cruel and grossly defamatory. I will use the Churchillian parliamentary form, if I may, and refer to it as a terminal untruth of the worst order. If I may quote from the member's exchange on Global news last evening:

Mr. Ziemba: No one ever asked for this legislation. It came down in July of 1971 just prior to the last election, last big election of Davis' big win. He ran an election in which he spent $5 million. I think that he brought in this legislation as—in payment for contributions to his party.

Mr. Cameron: Contributions from whom?

Mr. Ziemba: From the brewers and distillers of this province. He was responding to them, to their demands for increased profits by way of introducing alcohol to a whole new group of drinkers.

Mr. Cameron: Are you saying that William Davis bought a part of the 1971 election in return for the lives of a number of the province's young people?

Mr. Ziemba: Exactly, that's exactly what I'm saying. That's exactly why I feel so strongly about this.

A careful examination of the facts surrounding this evolution in public policy in Ontario will indicate that other governments of other political affiliations had lowered the drinking age previous to the decision by the government of this province. Moreover, a clear examination of the record will indicate that the New Democratic Party in Ontario had taken this position in October of 1970 some time—

An hon. member: They supported it.

Hon. Mr. Davis: —before the party which it is my privilege to lead felt it appropriate to concur.

Hon. Mr. Welch: Members of the opposition better read their own stuff.

Hon. Mr. Davis: One could ask, based on the cheap ramblings of the member's allegations, whether the NDP in Ontario came to similar agreements with those who sell spirits in Ontario.

An hon. member: We would have rejected it.

Hon. Mr. Davis: It would be a sick question—

Mr. Lewis: Then why does the Premier raise it?

Hon. Mr. Davis: —unworthy of any member of the Legislature, except perhaps the member for High Park-Swansea. Thoughtful members would not ask these questions of the other political parties because to do so would be to betray a lack of respect for their leadership that I could not, in good conscience, be associated with at any time.

The decision of my government to lower the age of majority was based upon a developing view and belief in the increased capacity of young people to exercise responsibility as citizens, voters and consumers. If there are those who wish to question that responsibility today, that is their right. I say to the member from High-Park-Swansea that to do so in the fashion he has chosen is to betray a personal irresponsibility and lack of judgement that is shocking and disgraceful.

I might also refer the member to a publication put out in October, 1970, and I have a copy for him here if he has not read it, entitled "A New Democrat Ontario," which I hold here in my hand, and which states, on Page 60—to be helpful to him so he may look at it:

> The state has very little business interfering, and then only on the most highly qualified definition of what constitutes the public good, in the decisions affecting the individual's personal life.
>
> The age of majority would be reduced from 21 years to 18 . . . This would include voting, running for public office, entering into contracts and drinking.

The decision made by my government in 1971 was a decision made in good faith, relative to the interests of the young people of Ontario. The suggestion that it was prompted by a motive of partisan financial support surely demands not only a personal and public apology to this government and myself, but also an apology to the people of Ontario, and especially to the young people of this province?

[2:15]

Mr. Ziemba: Mr. Speaker, first of all, I am surprised and amazed that the Premier, over across the floor with all the awesome power and glory at his command, would choose to descend on me for the statements that I have been making for the past four years. He has ignored—

Hon. W. Newman: Why doesn't the member stand up and apologize like a man?

An hon. member: Be a man.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. Does the hon. member wish to respond to the statement of the Premier directly?

Mr. Bullbrook: Why don't you make sure he gets the chance, Mr. Speaker? Nobody interrupted the Premier.

Mr. Speaker: I agree.

Interjections.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. We will hear the member for High Park-Swansea. Order, please.

Mr. Ziemba: The Premier is entitled to his beliefs, and I grant him the right to his opinions in the same way that I am entitled to mine. I am going to read into the parliamentary record statistics on motor vehicle collisions, facts from his ministry of—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Mr. Ziemba: These are the facts and I am going to give them to you; the hard facts.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The debate here, as I see it—order, please; will the member take his seat when the Speaker is standing?—concerns the allegations that were made on the air last night. We are not debating the whole issue of the age of majority or what have you. This is not the purpose of this. The Premier rose to point out certain remarks to which he strongly objected. The hon. member may reply to those, but may not debate the whole issue of drinking and age of drinking, please.

Mr. Ziemba: Mr. Speaker, I would like to read into this record the number of accidents that 19-year-olds—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. That's debating the issue and that is not really the point of—

Mr. Ziemba: That's why I keep telling you—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The hon. member will take his seat. I think I made it quite clear that we are discussing the allegations that were made, not the whole issue of the age of drinking.

Mr. Ziemba: If the Premier of this province is prepared to open his books regarding the 1971 election and prove to us that he didn't get contributions from the brewers and distillers of this province, I will apologize then.

Hon. Mr. McMurtry: That's cheap. The member is a disgrace to his party. It's a party that I happen to respect, but he is a disgrace to it.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I think we will close the matter. It is a matter of personal privilege. It is something that happened outside the House, over which the Speaker has no control, of course.

Statements by the ministry.

SPECIAL PROGRAMME REVIEW

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Mr. Speaker, in June of this year the Premier announced the appointment of a Special Programme Review Committee to examine the government's expenditures and to make recommendations for improvements in productivity so as to reduce government spending growth in the years ahead. The government promised at that time that the committee would complete its work by mid-November. It is my pleasure to announce that the committee has met its target date and I am, therefore, tabling today its report, which contains some 180 recommendations.

The committee, as members will be aware, consisted of three representatives from the private sector, three senior civil servants, the Chairman of Management Board and myself as chairman. In tabling this report, I would like to give particular recognition to the services of the three private sector representatives; Mrs. Betty Kennedy, who could not be here today; and Mr. Hurlbut, who is out of the city; and Mr. Maxwell Henderson who has been recognized in your gallery already. These three people have given very generously of their time and talents in the last six months and we owe them a debt of gratitude for their dedication and industry.

In the course of its work, the committee interviewed civil servants from every ministry and organized a broad and comprehensive review of public expenditures by the Ontario government, local governments, school boards, universities and colleges, the health field, and many other bodies which depend on taxpayer dollars for their support.

The committee also received over 100 representations from the public. The general message of these letters and submissions reflected the anxieties of ordinary taxpayers that government spending at all levels be efficient, restrained and subject to continuous and stringent scrutiny. The taxpayers of Ontario are right.

At all levels of government, and among the army of agencies and institutions which feed off the taxpayer, there is a continuous risk of bureaucratic complacency and smugness in determining how money should be spent for the public good. My view is that elected representatives at all levels of government have to take a more active and critical participation in the process of controlling the public sector. It is, in these times, as irresponsible to demand more spending as it is to allow programmes to expand and proliferate. Both styles of public office lead to more debt or more taxes, or even to more of both of these unpleasant burdens.

In its initial stages, the committee drew from me, as chairman, an outline of the province's fiscal and expenditure structure, plus some broad guidance on target spending reductions. The September election, as members can well appreciate, took most of my time in the summer period and I was not able to give the committee much of my attention. After re-election, I decided it was essential that committee members work in an atmosphere of independent inquiry. I therefore adopted a hands-off policy and allowed them complete freedom of action. For this reason, members will find a refreshing stamp of independence in the final report.

I am glad to see that the final report reflects a genuine concern for the interests of the ordinary taxpayer and for more effective and efficient programme delivery. The broad approach corresponds to my own view that outlays from the public purse are seen too often, by too many, as a costless remedy to every conceivable economic and social problem of the day.

Incomes, jobs and wealth are generated in a modern economy by a balanced blend of public and private activities. There is considerable evidence that the balance has been undermined in recent times. I draw the attention of members to the opening sentence of the report. "The size of contemporary government spending has become a matter of grave concern, not only to those responsible for it but to all Canadians in every walk of life."

I do not think we can over-emphasize the importance of economic growth to the welfare of ordinary citizens. Whatever sleight-of-hand economics may be conjured up to justify public sector extravagance and heavy taxes, the plain fact of the matter is that the citizens of Ontario want more and better jobs, more private consumption and higher personal incomes. This can only be achieved through private sector economic expansion; it does not come about by expanding the size of the civil service nor by multiplying social services faster than we are willing to be taxed in order to pay for them. There is no way out of this dilemma. With an expanding population, growth is essential if we are to avoid a steady deterioration in the welfare of the general public.

The committee, in examining the range of public spending, compiled 12 principles for

the guidance of government. The first of these says: "Government policy should continue to be directed towards the goal of economic growth." I would go further and say that I see no viable alternative for Ontario, either now or in the future. Economic growth is what the public wants and expects.

There is a general theme throughout the report which emphasizes the need to improve the degree of fiscal responsibility in the public sector. It advocates, in many places that this can be achieved by maintaining a closer proximity between spending decisions and financing decisions. The report sees this as particularly relevant in that large area of spending which is nourished by transfer payments from the provincial government. Also, the report favours a more frequent application of user charges for public services where the benefits are sufficient to warrant it or where services are seriously over-exploited. I find no disagreement with these principles and we shall be overhauling some of the conventional fiscal wisdom of the past to see whether we can accommodate the proposed changes.

Let me dwell for a while on the dimensions of the problem we all face in controlling the growth of public sector spending. As near as we can estimate, at this time in Ontario, there are over 800,000 people whose jobs are paid for, either in whole or in part, out of public funds. I do not include in this figure the many people who derive work as a result of direct provincial purchases of goods and services and government investments in construction activity, but I do include school boards, universities and colleges, doctors, nurses, and federal, provincial and local government civil servants.

The 800,000 is equal to over 20 per cent of the labour force in Ontario, or one job in five. I find this a very sobering statistic because it illustrates most graphically the sheer size and complexity of the public sector. It is also a clear warning that without a periodic and impartial overhaul of spending programmes, costs will creep upwards in an irresistible manner and both programmes and employment will become ossified and wasteful.

The consumption by the public sector of the output and energies of one worker in five also underlines the necessity of monitoring and improving the productivity performance of this enormous industry. A report such as the one released today cannot possibly probe into every nook and cranny of public spending but it has made a very necessary start on the process.

I find it encouraging that a short period of intensive study has been able to produce so many recommendations. I think it only fair to say that the medicine proposed will not appeal to all people; on the other hand, some recommendations, such as those calling for higher tuition fees, are not consistent with announced government policy and may even run counter to the guidelines of the federal anti-inflation programme.

We are in a period where the chronic imbalance between the growth of the private and public sectors has to be put right. The result will be tough decisions, and for many these decisions may be unpleasant. While it is too early for the government to respond in detail to the recommendations of the Special Programme Review Committee, we shall be giving very careful consideration to the report and its findings will be of great assistance in helping to achieve Ontario's 10 per cent expenditure growth target for fiscal 1976-1977.

I should also like to take this opportunity to invite further comments and suggestions on the report from the general public, from local governments and the many public bodies affected by its findings. It is our hope that within the next two to three weeks we can achieve a wide circulation of this important document and that this will provide a unique opportunity for the taxpayers of Ontario to make their views known on the specifics of the programmes for which they are paying.

In the end it is the taxpayer who pays the cost, either through inflation or through higher taxes. Nothing is free. People everywhere are paying now for every service offered by the governments and their agencies whether it is a waterfront park, a book from a public library or a visit to the doctor. There is absolutely no magical fiscal formula for doing it any other way.

The Ontario government has already announced its intention to keep its expenditure growth down to 10 per cent next year. This has, I am sure, given a clear signal of restraint to provincial programme managers and to the many governments, boards and agencies through which 70 per cent of the provincial budget is channelled. The alternative is higher taxes, which in turn would mean a lower rate of growth in personal consumption, less business investment and consequently fewer new jobs.

I think it appropriate at this time to reemphasize the government's intention to adhere to the terms of the Edmonton commitment. This involves a pledge on our part to increase our transfers to local authorities at the rate of growth of our revenues. This year

we have substantially overpaid on that commitment and in fiscal 1976 we intend to take this overpayment into account.

Mr. Lewis: The Treasurer didn't tell them that in advance.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Accordingly, I expect transfers to local governments in 1976 to grow by about 5½ per cent.

Mrs. Bryden: They can't live on 10 per cent.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: This action will require some tough choices at the local level. Wage and salary raises and other cost escalations will have to be found from efficiency improvements or increases in local taxes or from programme revisions and deletions. I am convinced that belts can be tightened at the local level with no loss of essential services. That must be the responsibility of the locally-elected representatives. The buck must stop at every level of government.

At the provincial level, we intend to continue the programme of restraint initiated earlier this year. Some ministries will be subject to a virtual budgetary freeze. The size of the civil service will be further reduced. It is essential that Ontario's borrowing be kept within reasonable limits, and to this end our expenditures next year will be held below the growth of revenues.

[2:30]

Mr. Singer: You're going to lose a lot of those Tory mayors and controllers when they have to raise municipal taxes.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Similarly, I expect Ontario Hydro to actively seek out ways of reducing its intended borrowing load in the next two to three years.

Mrs. Campbell: There won't be any more public housing.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Until we have achieved a restoration of fiscal balance, there can be no large new programme initiatives and I repeat our earlier promise that this government will not be drawn into massive new federal-provincial shared-cost programmes.

For those who have dreams and pretensions toward ambitious new schemes of large-scale income redistribution. I would advise them to consult with Canadian taxpayers first. I see no great thirst on the part of taxpayers to undergo a forcible reduction in their standard of living to finance new income redistribution programmes.

Mr. Renwick: We will watch for that.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: These are tough times and restraint has to be applied in the public sector—

Mr. Roy: You're starting to realize it, are you?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: —both as an example and as a necessity.

I am encouraged by the report tabled today. As I have said, it is too early yet for a considered response by the government, but nonetheless we do not have a great deal of time. I intend to introduce an early budget in support of the new discipline that is sweeping through the public sector. If we delay now, we shall pay the price later, and we intend to keep our economy and our society free of foolish economic fallacies and weaknesses. We intend to keep Ontario strong.

Mr. Reid: Get the NDP out of your bed.

Interjections.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

TORONTO TEACHERS' NEGOTIATIONS

Hon. Mr. Wells: I would like to bring members up to date on several new developments relating to the teachers' strike in Metropolitan Toronto.

As was reported earlier today, representatives of the Metro Toronto school boards met with staff of the Anti-Inflation Board this morning in Ottawa. The school board had requested the meeting in order to seek clarification on the application of the anti-inflation guidelines to the Metro Toronto situation.

The school board had asked representatives of the secondary school teachers to join them at the meeting, and I am very sorry that the teachers declined to take advantage of this opportunity, because it is clear that both parties would have gained from the discussions this morning. I say this because it is obvious that misunderstanding about the anti-inflation guidelines is a major factor in the continuing impasse that we face here in Toronto between the school boards and their teachers.

Just to illustrate this, let me comment on the statements attributed to one of the leaders of the Ontario Secondary School Teachers' Federation this morning. This spokesman was quoted as saying that the Metro secondary school teachers are exempt from the federal wage and price guidelines. Personally, I am surprised that he would say this because I

myself have met with representatives of both the teachers and the school board to explain the provisions of the anti-inflation programme as they relate here in the Province of Ontario to the public sector and as they relate to the negotiation of collective agreements. I believe that this application, and that the application of these guidelines, was clearly understood by both parties here in Metropolitan Toronto.

To clarify once again, let me reaffirm that the guidelines will apply to the negotiations of all collective agreements for those groups covered by the federal anti-inflation legislation where an agreement had not been reached prior to midnight on Oct. 13.

Mr. Lewis: But he meant that they fall under the exemptions.

Hon. Mr. Wells: That isn't what he said, though.

Mr. Bullbrook: That's the whole problem.

Hon. Mr. Wells: Members will recall that on Nov. 7 I clarified, for school boards and teachers, the definition which the Anti-Inflation Board will use in determining whether or not an agreement had existed prior to that time.

It is clear that no agreement existed between the Metro Toronto school board and its secondary teachers as of midnight, Oct. 13, so it is quite obvious that they are subject to all of the provisions of the wage and price guidelines.

The confusion appears to stem from the fact that the guidelines outline a number of circumstances in which the Anti-Inflation Board may give "special consideration" to an agreement to see if an amount higher than the normal maximum increase might be allowed.

One such circumstance is that the previous agreement was signed prior to Jan. 1, 1974. Another involves the existence of historical relationships with other groups in the labour force. Both of these circumstances would seem to have some application in the present Metro situation.

However, in no way does this mean that the guidelines are not applicable. It only suggests that where such circumstances exist the Anti-Inflation Board may decide to permit the employer to pay more money than would normally be allowed.

Within the last few hours, I have spoken at length with Ottawa and obtained further clarification on these matters. I have learned that the Anti-Inflation Board wishes to reaffirm a particular portion of its general statement issued on Nov. 7. In that statement, the board stated it did not intend to replace normal collective bargaining processes; however, the board indicated at that time that in situations where an impasse had been reached it would be prepared to offer clarification of grounds for possible special consideration under the guidelines.

The Anti-Inflation Board is well aware that an impasse does indeed exist here in Metro Toronto between the school board and the secondary teachers. Thus it has this morning issued an invitation to both parties, the school board and the teachers, requesting them to submit information which would enable the Anti-Inflation Board to assist in clarifying the grounds for any special considerations under the guidelines.

The Anti-Inflation Board has stated this morning that any requests for special consideration will be closely scrutinized. It has further stated: "The judgement of the board will be influenced not only by the merits of the particular case but also by the possible impact of the resulting settlement on the successful implementation of the anti-inflation programme as a whole."

It is my hope that both parties, the board and the teachers, will take up the offer of the Anti-Inflation Board and make presentations to Ottawa as quickly as possible. However, in the light of these developments, my concern is that there will be no further bargaining until this clarification has been received from the Anti-Inflation Board.

Mr. Bullbrook: That's the whole problem.

Mr. S. Smith: That's what I said six days ago.

Hon. Mr. Wells: I hope this will not be so and I would strongly urge both parties to get back to the bargaining table, perhaps using the services of the Education Relations Commission if such can be of help. We also know that the Anti-Inflation Board will deal with this matter as quickly as possible but I might say that in the meantime—

Mr. Singer: That's what the minister should have done a month ago.

Hon. Mr. Wells: —it would seem to me that the logical and responsible course of action for both the school boards in Metro and the secondary school teachers would be to get the schools open and operating normally at once—tomorrow—here in Metro Toronto rather than continuing this present

impasse, which by any measure is rather futile at this time in the absence of clarification from the Anti-Inflation Board.

Mr. Bullbrook: If the government here had its own board, it could make its own decision. It could decide on the exemptions itself tomorrow.

Mr. Speaker: Just before I call the next order of business, I'll recognize the member for Windsor-Sandwich.

Mr. Bounsall: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I am sure you and the other members of the House would wish to join me in a warm welcome to the 40 students from Vincent Massey Secondary School in the east gallery. They are under the direction of Mr. Norm Kocot, their teacher.

Mr. McCague: Mr. Speaker, please join me in welcoming 28 grade 9 history students from the Stayner Collegiate Institute under the direction of Mr. Mickericus.

Mr. Speaker: I'd also draw to the attention of the House that, seated in the Speaker's gallery, we have. K. S. Sagoo, OBE, and member of the Parliament of Kenya, who is visiting Ontario, I know the members of the House would like to welcome him.

Oral questions.

TORONTO TEACHERS' NEGOTIATIONS

Mr. Lewis: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to pursue matters with the Minister of Education for a moment, if I may, because I'm a bit perplexed.

Wouldn't it be the better part of logic to invite the Anti-Inflation Board to come to Toronto to meet with officials of the ministry, the Ontario Education Relations Commission and various representatives of the teachers' groups who will be engaged in on-going negotiations—whether Metro, Peel or elsewhere—to attempt to clarify the broad exemptions which will be permitted in order that collective bargaining may proceed on that basis and with that knowledge throughout the province, rather than each individual dispute or confrontation having to go the route which will necessarily prolong bargaining.

Hon. Mr. Wells: Mr. Speaker, I think as my friend knows, first of all, the Anti-Inflation Board up until now had taken the position that it was going to review settlements after they had been agreed to by both parties. This was the general rule. In their statement of Nov. 7 they said, however, that where an impasse had occurred they would, under special consideration, consider defining what special consideration means. They are now applying that particular section of their Nov. 7 statement to this particular situation. They feel that, given the fact that they review both sides' positions and probably make a determination about what special consideration would apply here, this will serve as a benchmark for other groups in this province, both in the public and the private sector. I can't presume to ask them to come to Toronto to do this.

Mr. Lewis: It would sure save a lot of time.

Hon. Mr. Wells: Their place of abode is in Ottawa. That's where they are operating out of and that is where their staff is.

Mr. Lewis: We wouldn't want to discomfort them.

Mr. Singer: And never the twain shall meet.

Mr. Lewis: On $1,034 a week they could certainly afford travel expenses.

Hon. Mr. Wells: I might say that the Ministry of Education, the Education Relations Commission, and indeed the school boards, the school trustees councils and the teachers' federations, are all being asked for information upon which the board can make various decisions that it is going to have to make. They want the salary settlements for the last five years for major boards in this province and they want all kinds of information. They will not be without factual background upon which to make their decisions.

Mr. Lewis: Would the minister agree, however, that even when the exemption considerations are taken into account, there remains the fundamental impasse between the last board offer and the teachers' reliance on the fact-finder's report? Is there, therefore, no way the minister can bring the parties together to proceed with a settlement on those matters, independent of whatever the Anti-Inflation Board may rule?

Hon. Mr. Wells: It is my impression from talking with the parties—and I think the school boards have indicated this, because they decided to go up to Ottawa even before the invitation was issued by the Anti-Inflation Board; they just happened to be there this morning as the board made its decision that it would ask the parties to present their position—

Mr. Lewis: It is a long stall.

Hon. Mr. Wells: —the board wants clarification before it will, as I understand it, make any change in its position, if indeed it was even thinking about any change. So I suggest to my friend that, with that particular position, until the Anti-Inflation Board makes a decision, it is going to be very difficult to bring the parties together.

Mr. Singer: Supplementary, Mr. Speaker: Could the minister explain again—and perhaps in simpler terms so that even I could understand it—the usefulness of the two parties continuing to bargain and perhaps arriving at a figure which they have no way of telling is going to be final? What is the purpose of the exercise? Isn't it an exercise in futility?

Hon. Mr. Wells: Perhaps my friend missed the last part of my statement, where I said that really the better part of wisdom right now would be for the boards to open the schools and the teachers to get back and operate things normally and then let's get the determination from the Anti-Inflation Board.

Mr. Lewis: That is not going to happen.

Hon. Mr. Wells: I suggest that would be the best thing that could happen at this point.

Mr. Lewis: Wonderful!

Mr. Foulds: Would it not be neater and quicker if the board and the teachers submitted their respective final offers for a judgement from the Anti-Inflation Board? Would the minister not suggest that would be a quicker way of settling it?

Hon. Mr. Wells: I'm sorry? What offers?

Mr. Foulds: Would it not be quicker and easier if the teachers and the boards submitted their respective final offers—my colleague has confused me here—submitted their final stances to the Anti-Inflation Board for a judgement? Would that make the Anti-Inflation Board a final offer selector according to the minister's legislation?

[2:45]

Hon. Mr. Wells: I guess if they did what the member suggested it would, but I don't believe that's the role the Anti-Inflation Board wants to be put in. In fact, what is going to happen is that the school board is going to present its position to the Anti-Inflation Board and if the teachers accept the invitation offered to them they are going to put their position to the Anti-Inflation Board—

Mr. Lewis: But that is a matter of exemption, not position.

Hon. Mr. Wells: —which is then going to define their position as to whether they are entitled to special consideration or not.

Mr. Lewis: Right.

Hon. Mr. Wells: The question then remains how far will the Anti-Inflation Board go in stating what they mean by special consideration? Will they do it in general terms or will they do it in very specific dollar and cent percentage terms?

Mr. Lewis: The strike could go on forever at this stage.

Hon. Mr. Wells: That we will have to wait and see—

Mr. Lewis: The minister is insensitive.

Hon. Mr. Wells: —because the board has no bench-marks upon which to go. I might tell my friend that the board is presently considering the Hamilton elementary settlement—

Mr. Lewis: I gathered that.

Hon. Mr. Wells: —which is presently up there; this is a settlement that was signed by both parties. They expect to have some decision on that very shortly which, again, will establish some bench-marks, some guidelines, some precedents.

Mr. Speaker: A supplementary from the member for Hamilton West.

Mr. S. Smith: A supplementary: Does the minister not recall that about a week ago my leader and I both suggested to him that he take the initiative, get a decision from the Anti-Inflation Board first of all, so as to prevent a strike which might be totally academic anyhow? At that time he said this would be interfering with the rights of the teachers. What has happened, that the minister today comes in having changed his mind on that issue?

Mr. Mancini: That's par for the course.

Interjections.

Hon. Mr. Wells: First of all, I haven't changed my mind; the Anti-Inflation Board has changed its mind and decided that in this particular instance it would consider an agreement beforehand.

Interjections.

Mr. S. Smith: The minister should have asked them.

Hon. Mr. Wells: I would like to know where the Liberal Party stands on this matter.

Mr. Shore: We are asking the questions.

Mr. Singer: The minister could have done it himself in the first place.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Hon. Mr. Wells: The member for Ottawa East wanted legislation. Does he want this House to bring in legislation? Does he want legislation?

Mr. Roy: Mr. Speaker, could I answer the question? I have been asked a question.

Mr. Breithaupt: We are supposed to ask them not answer them.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. It's not the minister's right to ask questions.

Mr. Roy: Mr. Speaker, if the government can't do the job we'll move over.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. Does the hon. Leader of the Opposition have further questions? The hon. Leader of the Opposition has the floor.

DRYDEN CHEMICALS LTD.

Mr. Lewis: May I ask the Attorney General, Mr. Speaker, could he clarify what legal proceedings or recourse he is investigating that may be applied to Dryden Chemicals Ltd., or Reed Paper, in northwestern Ontario, involving the pollution which may have caused, or may yet cause, Minimata disease amongst the native community?

Hon. Mr. McMurtry: The matter is being considered by the ministry in its broadest terms, because of course there are very difficult problems in determining just what may or may not have occurred. As a step to a better understanding of the problem and what may arise, I have instructed one of our senior counsel to go to Japan, and to my knowledge he is in Japan now with the group of doctors now visiting Japan at the request of the Minister of Health (Mr. F. S. Miller).

Mr. Lewis: By way of a supplementary, if I may: There was a reference made in the report to the children who might some day be affected. Can I ask the minister, in addition to the health of the children would it be possible to pursue a suit against the company to seek economic compensation for the loss of livelihood experienced on behalf of the native communities?

Hon. Mr. McMurtry: I have not seen the report to which the hon. Leader of the Opposition refers, but all I can say at this time is that it's a very complicated matter. The matter is being reviewed. The legal implications, the difficulties, are certainly well appreciated by some of the member's colleagues, and I hope that in due course I'll be able to make a more comprehensive statement to the House.

Mr. Singer: Supplementary, Mr. Speaker—

Mr. Speaker: Perhaps we should have a supplementary from the member for Ottawa East this time.

Mr. Roy: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would just like to ask the Attorney General—

Mr. Kennedy: Equal time for the leadership candidates.

Mr. Roy: —in view of his comments yesterday about taking this action against Dryden Chemicals—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. It must be a supplementary question dealing with the answer given today.

Mr. Roy: Yes, it's right on, Mr. Speaker. I just want to ask the minister if he is going to show the same enthusiasm for the prosecution of this case as he did in the Dow Chemical case?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. That's not supplementary to this. The member for Wilson Heights wanted to ask a supplementary, I believe.

Mr. Singer: I wanted to ask the Attorney General what kind of instructions he is giving to the official guardian and/or others in relation to a class action, which the newpapers reported today that he thinks it is possible to bring; and how he is going to do that without substantial changes to the existing legislation?

Hon. Mr. McMurtry: Again, I have not seen the report; I assume there is some newspaper report with respect to this matter—

Mr. Singer: Page A-20 of today's Star.

Hon. Mr. McMurtry: I apologize to the House; I have not seen it.

Mr. Singer: I'll send it to the minister.

Hon. Mr. McMurtry: I would be very much obliged if my friend would send it. I can just indicate that it's a matter that is under discussion with the official guardian; I've been discussing it with him for several weeks. I'm not in a position at this point to tell my hon. friend what amendments may be necessary, but it is a matter to which we're giving very serious consideration.

Mr. Roy: Have you heard of the Dow Chemical case?

MENTAL RETARDATION PROGRAMMES

Mr. Lewis: A question of the Minister of Community and Social Services: In a letter the minister was kind enough to send me on Nov. 13 last in response to a question I'd asked in the House, he indicates that by the end of fiscal 1975-1976 some $66 million will have been received under the Canada Assistance Plan for the funding of mental retardation programmes transferred to his ministry. Yet in the period 1975-1976 his ministry is spending $15 million of that money. What is happening to the other $51 million which we were assured, absolutely assured in the Legislature, would apply to a mental retardation programme?

Hon. Mr. Taylor: I'm glad the Leader of the Opposition asked that.

Mr. MacDonald: Why?

Mr. Good: It is only the second time you have had to say anything.

Hon. Mr. Taylor: There is no question that the moneys are committed. As the hon. member knows, I gave him the projections in terms of the spending over a period of years.

Mr. Lewis: That's additional money.

Hon. Mr. Taylor: That's right, the spending is over a period of years. But—

Mr. Lewis: Yes, more money—

Hon. Mr. Taylor: Just remember this, that it's not just a question of spending the money in any old way at all.

Mr. Lewis: I know.

Hon. Mr. Taylor: It is a matter of making a wise use of that money and ensuring we have the programmes and that the facilities and the programmes are developed where they are going to do the most good. So that until we finalize that, we are not going to be spending the money just for the sake of spending it.

Mr. Lewis: I see. By way of supplementary, is the minister then placing the additional $51 million in trust? Or is he disbursing money received under the Canada Assistance Act explicitly for mental retardation through other programmes in his ministry so as to cut down the amounts required from general revenue?

Hon. Mr. Taylor: As far as the—

Mr. Good: I'm glad you asked.

Hon. Mr. Taylor: Yes, I'm glad he asked that as well, because I want to ensure in my ministry that those moneys are available when we are ready to use them.

Mr. Reid: So you are putting them in trust.

Hon. Mr. Taylor: I have been assured on an inquiry that those moneys have been earmarked for these specific programmes in connection with mental retardation and that when there is a call for these moneys, the moneys will be available.

Mr. Lewis: Supplementary: My question is not being answered. The money has been received, and is being received, from the Canada Assistance Plan. Is the minister putting it in trust for the use to which it is to be applied or is he disbursing it into other programmes in his ministry? What has happened or will happen to the additional $51 million?

Mr. Breithaupt: It makes for a lumpy mattress.

Hon. Mr. Taylor: I haven't checked our bank book recently in terms of where the money is—

Mr. Lewis: Could you do so?

Hon. Mr. Taylor: All right, just a minute. Insofar as the moneys from the federal government are concerned, they don't come into the bank account in my ministry. The member will have to check with the Treasurer for that. But as far as the credit goes, when we wish to disburse those funds—

Mrs. Campbell: Where is it?

Hon. Mr. Taylor: I'll reiterate that those funds are available—

Mr. Shore: Correctional Services.

Hon. Mr. Taylor: —for dispersal through properly worked out programmes and facilities.

Mr. Lewis: You are reneging on the commitment.

Interjection.

Mr. Lewis: I had a very embarrassing question for the Minister of Government Services, (Mrs. Scrivener), who intuitively sensed it and fled the House. I therefore have no further questions.

ANTI-INFLATION PROGRAMME

Mr. Breithaupt: A question of the Treasurer following his statement with respect to the Special Programme Review and his apparent knowledge now as to how Paul felt on the road to Damascus. Can he tell us, now that the buck has stopped passing, and because of the question that arose from the statement of the Minister of Education (Mr. Wells), whether he is reconsidering having his own approach to dealing with the various matters that the Anti-Inflation Board would deal with federally so that matters such as those affecting the teachers and other groups could be dealt with, perhaps more expeditiously, if we had a group operating here under the federal guidelines, rather than dealing with the group that the Minister of Education says perhaps won't come from Ottawa all the way to Toronto?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: I can't imagine anything more irresponsible than a provincially-appointed board in this province or, for that matter, in some other province—and let's for a moment assume that they were in all provinces—and I assume that in nearly—

Mr. Bullbrook: They eventually will be.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: —every province there are problems in terms of—

Mr. Bullbrook: They will be; oh yes. They will be within six months—the Treasurer will have one.

Mr. Shore: Supplementary.

Mr. Speaker: The member for London North.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: I haven't finished, Mr. Speaker. I thought the member for Sarnia had a question.

Mr. Bullbrook: I have a statement: You will have one within six months—make no mistake about it.

Mr. Speaker: The minister will continue with his answer, please.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Let's assume for a moment that there were 10 boards and that the first questions referred to all of them happened to be teacher and board of education disputes. It would be highly irresponsible if any one of those boards settled until they had checked with the other nine and with the federal board—

Mr. R. S. Smith: Not boards of settlement.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: —and compared the action which one board was prepared to take with that of another. If we had a board here today in operation, it would be completely wrong for that board to take action until they find out what the federal board was proposing to do in other provinces.

Mr. Bullbrook: You don't have the most fundamental grasp of it—not even fundamental—you don't understand it at all.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: The irresponsibility of the member for Sarnia shines through beautifully in all of this.

Mr. Bullbrook: You don't understand the question.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Just beautifully. The irresponsible member from Sarnia.

Mr. Bullbrook: The Premier (Mr. Davis) doesn't understand it and you don't understand it.

Hon. Mr. Davis: I do.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The member for Kitchener.

Mr. Breithaupt: If it is the intention of the Treasurer to keep Ontario strong, as he says, what is possibly wrong with having our own board dealing with the same kinds of exemptions—

Mr. Bullbrook: Right.

Mr. Breithaupt: —referred to by the Minister of Education, for historic or traditional purposes—

Mr. Bullbrook: That is sloughing off responsibility.

Mr. Breithaupt: —in the same way that the board in Ottawa will eventually have to do, and therefore doing it earlier and within a proper Ontario balanced framework?

Mr. Roy: Yes, give us the responsibility.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: It could not be done earlier unless we were irresponsible. If the member wants to sell out to everybody who comes along and wants an exemption or a loophole, he can do it. We are not going to—

Mr. Bullbrook: You don't understand it.

Mr. Singer: Is there no Ontario integrity? Does there always have to be a sellout?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: —do that on this side of the House. We are going to be responsible in this fight and we are not going to curry special favour for political reasons—for crass political reasons.

Interjections.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The member for London North with a supplementary to this question?

Mr. Shore: Mr. Speaker, before we lock into this plan, would it not be responsible to make sure we understand it and put our thrust to the federal government so that we know what we are opting into? Is that responsible?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: That is exactly what we are doing. We had officials in Ottawa yesterday and the day before.

Mr. Singer: It is a sellout.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Ministers will be going to Ottawa next week.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The question has been asked.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: I think the members opposite might have some—

Mr. Reid: Has the agreement been signed?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The question was asked and is being answered.

Mr. Roy: You signed a blank cheque.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The hon. minister.

[3:00]

Hon. Mr. McKeough: I think the members opposite might have some respect, let alone sympathy, for a federally appointed board that can't answer all the questions overnight.

Mr. Bullbrook: And that's apparent. Overnight? Six months it will take. You watch it.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Their decisions are coming forward, they are making their minds up and they are doing it on a consistent national basis. We are making our point of view known.

Mr. Bullbrook: It won't work.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Those decisions are coming forth from Ottawa.

Mr. Bullbrook: The Treasurer knows it won't work.

Mr. Breithaupt: A further question of the Treasurer following that additional information that he has given us: Since there apparently is apprehension among his own officials as to what these guidelines will be and the details of them, does the minister intend to advise the House as to what the terms of reference will be before in fact they are signed, I believe it is next week?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: There is no apprehension in the minds of our officials; I don't think it is correct to say that. Certainly, the officials have not received all the answers which they would like to have—none of us has—in a programme of this magnitude. I think in fairness to the government of Canada it can be said that they are consulting—not making all the decisions unilaterally.

Finally, in response to the member's question, the agreement will not be signed next week. I don't know how that appeared in the paper. The agreement really hasn't been presented to us yet and there is just no possibility that an agreement will be signed next week.

Mr. Lewis: A supplementary, if I may: I take it then that we won't in fact have an opportunity to debate the memorandum of agreement, or indeed the implications of the Treasurer's statement to the House, during the course of this session at all, and that we will have been committed to the procedure without a full debate over a day or two engaging the attention of all members of the Legislature?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Mr. Speaker, I don't know—(a) I don't know when the House is going to rise, and (b) I don't know when that agreement might be signed, but it is not going to be signed next week.

Mr. Bullbrook: A supplementary, if I may: Current with my question of two days ago, is there a possibility that we can have some undertaking, either from the Treasurer or the Premier, that we can fully debate that memorandum of agreement before the House rises?

Mr. Lewis: That's the same question.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: I can't give that undertaking; perhaps the House leader can. I think we are several weeks away from an agreement being signed, either by the government of Canada or by this province.

Mr. Lewis: But you've already reported what the government is going to do.

OFFSHORE OIL SUPPLIES

Mr. Breithaupt: A question of the Minister of Energy, Mr. Speaker, following the report that it is expected that within six years there may be some requirement for Ontario to use offshore oil to resolve some of our energy problems: Has the minister a statement to make with respect to the accuracy or otherwise of that report?

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: Mr. Speaker, I think the member is referring to a report that was in the Globe and Mail about a week ago, which his research staff has dug out for him.

Mr. Breithaupt: No, I save these things myself.

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: The report, in large measure, results from the report of the National Energy Board of October, 1974, wherein they look at the prognosis for oil supply and demand in the country. In fact, they have recently held additional hearings and will be reporting—we hope within another week or two, and hopefully before the Ministers of Energy meet on Dec. 12—on the supply/demand situation. It does appear—they indicated a year ago—that by the end of this decade or the early part of the next decade, Ontario will have to rely for some of its supplies west of the Ottawa Valley on imported crude, not on domestic crude.

Mr. Breithaupt: I thank the minister for the answer which his research staff no doubt dug out for him.

INTEREST PAYMENTS ON ONTARIO SECURITIES

Mr. Breithaupt: A further question of the Treasurer: Have any arrangements been made with respect to the persons who hold Province of Ontario securities or Hydro securities, so that they may have the opportunity to receive the interest payments that would otherwise be coming due and which might obviously be held up because of the postal difficulties?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: As has been done in the case of Canada Savings Bonds—I asked that question myself this morning and I will get a reply for the member.

KREVER REPORT

Mr. Leluk: Mr. Speaker, a question for the Minister of Health.

Mr. Roy: Order. Is he not a parliamentary assistant?

Mr. Leluk: Can the minister tell the members of this House what the present status is of the Krever report, which deals with the organization and operation of the Addiction Research Foundation of this province, and whether any of the recommendations contained in that report have been implemented at this point in time?

Hon. F. S. Miller: The Krever report was asked for, I guess, by the Addiction Research Foundation itself and was received by it. There was a period of time after its receipt when there was no apparent action being taken. I was concerned and so I saw the chairman of the board and he assured me he would step up the review of it, even though a review had been going on in camera.

I feel that in the intervening months, across the summer, a great deal has been done. For example, we now have a committee, representing our ministry staff and ARF, which is looking at the goals, objectives and role of the Addiction Research Foundation.

A consultant was hired by the ARF and that was one of the recommendations. That consultant has made a report on the restructuring of the management and organizational structure. I am told that almost therapy sessions have been held lately with staff and that they are changing their roles. My opinion is that a good deal of progress is being made as a result of the Krever report.

AIR POLLUTION STUDY

Mr. Martel: A question of the Minister of the Environment: Is the minister aware that in Dr. Neri's report, which came to light about a week ago, the following statements were made—during the two years of the survey the shutdown of the smelter operation was necessitated on 22 occasions; shutdowns occur when the index, which is scaled 1 to 100, reaches 50. Is the minister aware that statistics presented last week by his own min-

istry for the same period of time, 1972 to 1973, say the pollution index was exceeded on only seven occasions? How does one account for the difference between 22 and seven?

Hon. Mr. Kerr: Mr. Speaker, that's my information as well. In 1972 there were seven occasions over 32 and once over 50; and in 1973 there was one occasion when the API exceeded 32. That's the information I have. If there is other information, I would be happy to have it.

Mr. Martel: A supplementary question: In the Neri report it says there were 22 occasions when there were plant shutdowns and that only occurs when the limit reaches 50. How do we get the difference in material presented by the ministry and that used by Dr. Neri? Can the minister find out for this House where the difference lies?

Hon. Mr. Kerr: Plant shutdowns occur when the emission level reaches 100. They are cut back until 100. That's for outside readings.

LINDSAY APARTMENT BUILDING PERMIT

Mr. Eakins: Mr. Speaker, to the Minister of the Environment: What is the minister's response to a motion passed by the council of the town of Lindsay this past Monday evening that the request to grant a building permit to the ANED Construction Ltd. to construct a 103-unit apartment building on Westwood Ct. in Lindsay be approved, knowing that it is going to cause overflow to the Lindsay St. N. pumping station on occasion, knowing that this will cause pollution until the pumping station has been upgraded; and also knowing that a request was made to the Ministry of the Environment in early April, 1975, and the town still does not have a decision from the ministry; housing is more critical at this time than the pumping station and as a result this seemingly arbitrary action is recommended due to the procrastination of the Ministry of the Environment?

Hon. Mr. Kerr: I will take notice of that question and get the hon. member the answer.

Mr. Speaker: I will agree to one supplementary.

Mr. Eakins: Will the minister assure me that he will take this personally and look after it on behalf of the council of the town of Lindsay?

Hon. Mr. Handleman: He just said so.

OIL AND GAS PRICES

Mr. Philip: Mr. Speaker, a question to the Attorney General: During the last two days, stories have been carried in the daily newspapers suggesting that one or more oil companies may be intimidating or in some ways inhibiting the freedom of speech of certain gasoline retailers. Is the ministry or any of the ministries planning on investigating this serious matter?

Hon. Mr. McMurtry: I am sorry, I know of no investigation by my ministry at the present time. That does not mean there is not one. I thank the hon. member for bringing the matter to my attention. I will make inquiries and ask that the matter be looked into if it is not being investigated at the present time.

STUDENT HOUSING PROGRAMME

Mrs. Campbell: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Attorney General. Is he aware of any investigation by the RCMP into possible illegal actions in the development of the Ontario student co-operative housing projects? Is he aware that that investigation is allegedly completed, and has he taken any steps to investigate it to indicate what his role may be as a result of that investigation?

Hon. Mr. McMurtry: Mr. Speaker, as I know my hon. friend, the member for St. George, well understands, the RCMP does not come under my jurisdiction.

Mr. Roy: There is something missing in your outfit.

Hon. Mr. McMurtry: I am not aware of any report that has been completed. I've just heard for some time that this matter was being investigated. I will again make inquiries and report back to the Legislature, if there is something to report back, in relation to this investigation.

LEAD LEVELS AT GM PLANT

Mr. Breaugh: Mr. Speaker, a question for the Minister of Health. Will the minister conduct an investigation into the dangerous lead oxide levels reported by General Motors of Canada at their south Oshawa battery plant, and will that investigation cover the workers inside the plant, their families and the residential areas adjacent to the plant, and can we have that report tabled in the House?

Hon. F. S. Miller: Mr. Speaker, I believe it's already done. I believe General Motors opened a new battery plant recently—two or three months ago. According to the Ministry of the Environment, the levels outside the plant have been acceptable. However, levels inside the plant were found to be unacceptable, even though it has supposedly the most modern equipment around. This is why the notice was given. I believe high lead levels were found in the urine of the workers, and that's checked on a regular routine basis. As a result of the high lead levels there, blood samples were taken. I am pleased to say that by noon today, 21 of them were back and all were normal. Therefore, the plant is remaining closed while the ventilation is improved. Once it's improved, they will be back. There appears to be no hazard to the workers in the short exposure.

Mr. Breaugh: Would the minister please explain to us what the monitoring system is that his ministry does? Also, could he identify those 29 workers? There seems to be great disparity as to what General Motors says and what the ministry says. We don't know who they are.

Hon. F. S. Miller: Mr. Speaker, my ministry doesn't do in-plant monitoring on a normal basis. The Ministry of Labour is responsible for that, but our ministry supervises and sets standards. The information came to me.

VIOLENCE IN HOCKEY

Mr. Roy: Mr. Speaker, a question to the Attorney General: Agreed that his enthusiasm for cutting out hockey violence is sincere, doesn't he think that he is reacting just a bit much in sort of benching one of his Crown attorneys, Doug Walker in St. Thomas, who's coached the local midget team for 10 years—

Mr. Shore: He wasn't a good coach.

Mr. Roy: —and apparently Mr. Greenwood from the ministry telling him that there is a conflict of interest?

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: This is of urgent public importance?

Mr. Roy: Isn't the Attorney General overreacting a bit much? Doesn't the Minister of Housing consider that urgent?

Mr. Speaker: Order.

Hon. Mr. McMurtry: Mr. Speaker, the matter that my friend refers to was drawn to my attention yesterday in Welland. I can assure him that such instructions did not come from me. I am concerned that such instructions would be given—if such instructions were, indeed, given—and I'm certainly looking into the matter, because I share my friends' view; I simply do not agree that there is any conflict of interest.

Mr. Roy: Could I ask one quick supplementary? I gather from his answer today, the Attorney General is prepared to contravene these instructions to his colleague.

Hon. Mr. McMurtry: Contravene?

Mr. Singer: Reverse them.

Mr. Roy: Reverse them.

Hon. Mr. McMurtry: Yes, if there were instructions given to any coach, as stated by my friend, that he could not participate as a coach simply by reason that he was a Crown attorney or an assistant Crown attorney, I will in fact reverse those instructions.

[3:15]

HIGHWAY 400 EXTENSION

Mr. Dukszta: I have a three-part question for the Premier. 1. Is he going ahead with extending Highway 400? 2. What is the proposed alignment? Needless to say, the extension of 400, as much as paving Spadina, would be of tragic consequence to Metro Toronto. 3. What is the schedule of construction?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I think that question should be properly directed to the Minister of Transportation and Communications.

Mr. Dukszta: May I redirect the question?

Mr. Speaker: Yes, you may.

Mr. Dukszta: Mr. Speaker, do you want me to repeat it again? With all the traffic consequences, is the government going ahead with the extension of Highway 400; what is the proposed alignment; and what is the schedule of construction?

Mr. Evans: Why not?

Hon. Mr. Snow: To the first question, the answer is yes. To the second question, the alignment as far as Eglinton Ave. is established because we own the right of way. The alignment from Eglinton Ave. to St. Clair is yet to be established in consultation

with Metro. As to the third question, the schedule is not established yet.

Mr. McClellan: Supplementary: Could the minister advise the House of the cost to the province of the Highway 400 extension?

Hon. Mr. Snow: No, I can't at this time.

BOOK PUBLISHING BY CENTENNIAL COLLEGE

Mr. Reid: A question to the Minister of Colleges and Universities: Does the minister think it appropriate that a community college, in this case, Centennial, should be competing with the private book publishing companies in Ontario, which we are trying to support, by publishing textbooks and other books in direct competition with those firms?

Hon. Mr. Parrott: I would ask the member to supply that specific information to me. I am not at this time aware of the competition whereof he speaks.

Mr. Reid: I will provide the information, but by way of supplementary, as a general policy does he think it appropriate that community colleges generally should be in competition with the private sector?

Hon. Mr. Parrott: I think that it is very necessary for the practical experience of a community college to come to grips with the marketplace. That's primarily their design and I think there is a value in that approach to that problem.

ANTI-INFLATION PROGRAMME

Mr. Mackenzie: To the Treasurer: Does the minister consider that the price guidelines apply to the purchase price of buses for public transit systems?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: They don't apply to us. Whoever is selling these buses, presumably depending on whether they are one of the 1,500 firms, may be within the formal guidelines of the government of Canada in terms of the price to be charged. If they are not that large—and I would be surprised if they weren't—then I think they are under the same moral guidelines which all firms or sellers are in the province.

As far as the purchaser is concerned, he has the option of paying the price or not paying the price. He also has the option, if he thinks the price is excessive or has risen excessively, of probably asking—once it's rolling—the opinion of the Anti-Inflation Board, of complaining to the Anti-Inflation Board.

I may say that—and this will be going out to the municipalities, I hope, tomorrow or Monday—we are in the process of establishing a committee within the government under the Management Board secretariat, but probably including representatives from the Ministry of Transportation and Communications, the Ministry of Government Services and the Ministry of Health, several of the large purchasers in government, to which government purchasing agents can refer any of their views as to excessive or very rapid price increases. That committee will be monitoring the price of goods which the government, which is a large purchaser of goods, will be purchasing during the life of the programme. If they find a price increase to be excessive or not justifiable in their view, then they will be passing that information along to the Anti-Inflation Board.

Mr. Mackenzie: Supplementary: In view of the minister's programme of budget austerity, will he make exceptions for exceptional increases that are being quoted to municipal transit commissions and continue the subsidy of 75 per cent so that public transit systems are encouraged and not decreased in the interest of the number of automobiles on the roads?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Mr. Speaker, the government's grant policies are in effect until such time as they are changed.

REFLECTIVE LICENCE PLATES

Mr. B. Newman: Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the Minister of Transportation and Communications. In light of the increased concern for safety on our highways, as evidenced by the government's proposed reduction of speed limits and by mandatory use of seatbelts, is the minister prepared at this time to add another safety feature, that is, reflective licence plates?

Hon. Mr. Snow: Mr. Speaker, that is not under consideration at this time.

MAILBOX SIGN

Mr. McCague: Mr. Speaker, would the Minister of Government Services agree that on the sign on the mailbox downstairs, which says "Mail for Ontario government offices from the private sector," the message would be more appropriately conveyed if it said "from the public"?

Interjections.

Hon. Mrs. Scrivener: Mr. Speaker, the member has made a good point. The answer is yes.

Mr. Lewis: Supplementary: Is there a name on one of those mailboxes reading "Andrew StuParick"?

Hon. Mrs. Scrivener: Mr. Speaker, I don't know.

Mr. Lewis: I just wondered.

Mr. G. E. Smith: Mr. Speaker, I have a supplementary. I wonder if the minister would consider placing similar mailboxes at government offices throughout the province in order that local residents could contact their MPPs or the ministers by mail about local problems during the mail strike?

An hon. member: Use the phone.

Hon. Mrs. Scrivener: Mr. Speaker, well over a week ago I did announce in this House that we had an emergency mail delivery system in effect throughout the province. It is a fact that we are receiving mail at all of our various government offices all over the province for delivery both to these buildings and for exchange through the various systems within government. I believe that if members wish to receive mail from their constituents, the constituents have only to deliver the messages to those offices.

ALUMINUM WIRING

Mr. Warner: Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Energy. How are the repeated assurances of Ontario Hydro regarding the safety of aluminum wiring valid in the light of statements made by the Scarborough Public Utilities Commission chairman that all the receptacles in his aluminum-wired home had to be replaced because they were melting?

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: Mr. Speaker, if the member would read the rest of that newspaper report which appeared in today's press he would find that Mr. Curtis, the general manager of the Public Utilities Commission of Scarborough, reported that aluminum wiring is safe.

EGANVILLE CREAMERY

Mr. Conway: A question for the Minister of Industry and Tourism: Does the minister not find it contradictory that in its first year of operation the Eastern Ontario Development Corp. should make its largest single disbursement to a firm which in the recent past has closed out 22 jobs at the Eganville creamery? I refer to the $1 million loan made by the EODC to Ault Foods of Winchester.

Hon. Mr. Bennett: No, Mr. Speaker, I do not find it strange that we should make the $1 million loan to the Ault creamery. It was obvious that there was a process which Ault had brought into being in this province which was causing both the Minister of the Environment (Mr. Kerr) and the Minister of Agriculture and Food (Mr. W. Newman) some problems. That was what to do with the whey by-product they happen to produce from those factories. They had the opportunity, if they had the proper plant facilities in this province 1, of eliminating an environmental problem; 2, assisting in further revenues for people in the field of agriculture; and 3, for expanding export potential for the market.

Mr. Conway: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker: How does the minister rationalize the fact that the Eastern Ontario Development Corp. is subsidizing a large concern which is closing out 22 jobs?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. That is debating the answer.

AUTOMOBILE INSURANCE RATES

Mr. Swart: A question, Mr. Speaker, to the Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations: Now that the president of the Insurance Bureau of Canada has admitted that by the imposition of compulsory seatbelt legislation and reduction of speed limits there will be fewer automobile accidents and a reduction in the insurance claims level, and in view of the statement by him that they won't do anything about this for at least two years, will the minister now consider instituting a freeze on automobile insurance rates?

Hon. Mr. Handleman: Mr. Speaker, I've seen the statement in the press. Certainly, we'll be talking to the insurance industry concerning the effect of the use of seatbelts on the accident rate and claims rate against the insurance companies. I think the effect of it will show up much sooner than in two years, and certainly we'll keep that in mind when we're reviewing rates for next year.

Mr. Speaker: The oral question period has expired.

Petitions.

Presenting reports.

Hon. Mrs. Birch presented the first annual report of the Advisory Council on Senior Citizens.

Hon. Mrs. Birch: The chairman of that council is a guest in the gallery today. I'm sure that all hon. members of the House would like to join with me in extending their appreciation for the very fine work that this council, through its chairman, has done on behalf of the senior citizens of this province.

Hon. W. Newman presented the ninth annual report of the Ontario Crop Insurance Commission.

Hon. F. S. Miller presented the 1974 report of the Ontario Cancer Institute.

Mr. Edighoffer from the standing estimates committee reported the following resolution:

Resolved: That supply in the following amounts and to defray the expenses of the Ministry of Energy be granted to Her Majesty for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1976:

MINISTRY OF ENERGY

Ministry administration programme	$ 439,000
Energy policy programme	1,562,000
Ontario Energy Board programme	1,153,000
Ontario Energy Corp.	226,000

Mr. Lewis: Mr. Speaker, if I may rise on a point of order or privilege, or whatever you may deem it to be—clarification, I guess: As a matter of general curiosity and particular concern, and arising from some submissions made to the legislative select committee looking into the Camp commission report, would you in your capacity as Speaker report to the Legislature or arrange to have one of the ministers report to the Legislature on the duties of, activities of and explanation of such duties and activities of one Andrew Stu-Parick in his service, I think, in the Ministry of Government Services, so that some of us who are somewhat mystified can have clarification, and perhaps the gallery as well.

Mr. Speaker: That doesn't come within my purview.

Mr. Lewis: Well, it involves the members of the Legislature, however, and it is in a sense—

Mr. Speaker: I think perhaps a question should be directed to the appropriate minister, whoever that might be.

Motions.

Hon. Mr. Welch moved that on the select committee to consider Bill 5, Messrs. Davidson, Samis and Warner be substituted for Mrs. Bryden, Mr. Bain and Mr. Philip.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. Speaker: Introduction of bills.

[3:30]

FAMILY BENEFITS AMENDMENT ACT

Mr. Martel moved first reading of bill intituled, An Act to amend the Family Benefits Act.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Mr. Martel: Mr. Speaker, the purpose of the amendment is to remove any reference to the sex of the parent, thereby enabling either the mother or the father of the child to be eligible for benefits.

Mr. Sargent moved, pursuant to standing order 30(a), that the ordinary business of the House be set aside to consider a matter of urgent public importance, namely, the closing by the Ministry of Health of the Chesley and District Memorial Hospital and the implementation by the Minister of Health of a programme to close 24 hospitals in Ontario.

Mr. Speaker: The Speaker was made aware of this in the proper way at least two hours before the opening of the House. In accordance with custom, a member from each party may have five minutes to discuss the matter as to whether we should set aside the ordinary business of the House. I will call on the hon. member for Grey-Bruce first.

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Speaker, I want to put the Premier at ease. All this mail here is not asking me to run for the leadership of the party.

Hon. Mr. Davis: I might say I am disappointed. I hoped it was.

Interjections.

Mr. Sargent: In a very serious vein, I would like to impart what this is all about. I was notified yesterday that the Chesley and District Memorial Hospital would be closed by Jan. 1, in less than five weeks. In the federal House yesterday, the federal MP, Craw-

ford Douglas, asked the Minister of Health and Welfare, Mr. Lalonde, to ask the Province of Ontario to stall the closing of this fine hospital and to make sure that the Province of Ontario would give adequate health services to all the people of Ontario in view of the fact that $951 million per year comes to this ministry for allocation equitably across Ontario.

Regardless of the fact that 8,000 people are served by this hospital—in Paisley, Tara, Sullivan, Bentinck and all that area—regardless of the fact that the former Chairman of the Management Board, Mr. Winkler, and another Conservative who ran against me as a candidate assured us during the election that the hospital would not close—that was their firm statement—60 people, full and part-time, will be out of work.

This fine hospital was built by the nickels and dimes of the people of Chesley and area and has no debt. It is in the middle of a great area of a snowbelt. Its closing will be a real hardship for the whole area where time factors will cost many lives.

On Sunday all the churches in the area asked their congregations to write letters to the minister to the effect: "Please let us keep our hospital open." I have here, sir, 983 letters received since Sunday morning. I have here 1,650 signatures. Teams went all over the whole area and thousands of miles were covered in this fight, pleading for the right to run our own affairs and to have our own hospital. I ask the minister to take the knife out of our back and quit harassing us.

The Minister of Health told the committee on Friday referring to the mayor of Chesley and the chairman of the board that he has 24 hospitals on his list. That is the quote they had on the air and they verified to me two hours ago that that was the minister's quote.

It is a fact that the ministry does have $950 million federally to allocate on a fair and equal basis here in the Province of Ontario. Forgetting about the chaotic conditions in the city of Owen Sound, where we always have a list of some 350 people waiting to get admitted for surgery, I say to you, Mr. Speaker, I regret the position taken by this government and the minister. I implore him to rescind this closure letter and let this fine hospital continue to remain open.

The town of Chesley is an expanding town. It has 120 new homes being erected now; new senior citizens' apartments are being erected. The two doctors we have there now will be leaving and 8,000 people will have to look elsewhere for hospital care and will have no access to further doctors even though we pay the same hospital rates as people do across the province; in Toronto, Windsor, across the board.

Mr. Speaker: The member has 30 seconds left.

Mr. Sargent: Okay, Mr. Speaker, thank you. I say to all members this could happen to them, too. In view of the mail strike I'm going to put these on the minister's desk in a moment. I say to the minister we have billions of dollars for nuclear power and we have millions of dollars for football stadiums but we are cutting back on small hospitals in the outlying parts of Ontario. I say to the minister and the Premier (Mr. Davis) that they're badly mixed up in their priorities. If the government is in such bad financial position that we have to resort to this let us redirect our priorities and find out exactly what is going on.

Mr. Speaker: Do we have a speaker from the New Democratic Party? Yes. The Leader of the Opposition.

Mr. Lewis: I should like to speak to this motion to propose a matter of urgent public importance, Mr. Speaker. This is a really difficult matter. I understand entirely what prompts the member to put it.

Within the last few weeks, partially at the member's invitation, I was fortunate enough to meet with the administrator, the chairman of the board and leading doctor of the Chesley community hospital when they put their case before me for maintenance of the hospital. I must say the position they took left me a little ambivalent about the response, because I suspect that the minister and his staff, particularly in the context of the financial constraints they feel bound by, can make a fairly effective case on the situation in Chesley and, maybe, even some other community hospitals.

There are some deficiencies in the government's position on Chesley and the broader issue raised by the member for Owen Sound; deficiencies so great that it gives all of us in the New Democratic Party real pause. There seems to be no recognition in the ministry of the need to guarantee, at the very least, a major outpatient facility and community health centre which would provide active emergency care; nothing concomitant with the closing down of the hospital to ensure that.

There seems to be no sufficient appreciation of the impact on a little community like Chesley of the closing down of the hospital.

There seems to be no sufficient appreciation of the snowbelt realities in that part of the world. Above all, there seems to be no appreciation that, as a result of the folly of the government, if Chesley is closed down the patients will be referred, as a matter of course, to the Owen Sound General and Marine Hospital, which, as a result of the imploring of the member for Owen Sound and others of this House, I finally visited late in the day. I feel chagrined about that; I should have done it earlier. But let me stand here now and say to the Minister of Health that the behaviour of the government around the Owen Sound General and Marine Hospital has been absolutely outrageous and the position of the member has been consistently right, and I concede it.

I want to tell the minister, and it arises directly from Chesley, I could hardly believe it when I toured that hospital, when I asked my research associates to assemble material, when I looked at the background, when I read the reports and when I realized the legitimacy of the case. I felt personally a little chagrined that I hadn't entered into it and understood it more fully previous to this.

So given the realities of closing down Chesley and the consequences for Owen Sound, it seems to me the member does rise on a matter which, obviously, to people in his area can be construed as being of urgent public importance. But I take it the step further that it has to be taken to legitimize a debate: It isn't just Chesley; Chesley is a symbol of capricious, quixotic and unpredictable planning of hospital administration across the province. There are all kinds of members in the New Democratic caucus who, within their own constituencies, have little community hospitals threatened with shutdown, without any overall sense of planning or rationalization about hospital beds, hospital facilities and hospital development. It is hard to deal with them in individual and arbitrary ways. Therefore, it is legitimate that Chesley be seen as a symbol of bad hospital planning across the province. The arguments for Chesley may or may not be legitimate; I find it hard to measure. But I do know that Chesley is simply the tip of the iceberg which exemplifies for communities all over Ontario the same kind of frustration and anxiety. In that sense, I think a public debate is legitimate.

You would say, sir, and I'll bring my remarks to an end, how can it be made of urgent public importance when the Health estimates have passed? It is precisely because they have passed and because the nature of the telescoping of those estimates left us between 40 and 45 minutes for the whole discussion of general hospitals in the Province of Ontario. Why is it of urgent public importance when we still have the Throne debate? Because the Throne debate never joins issue in this fashion and never really resolves an issue as a debate of this kind can or might resolve.

On balance, therefore, difficult though it is, but seeing the general point made, we would support the member in his request for a debate of urgent public importance, and see it as a debate on the future of community hospitals right across the Province of Ontario.

Hon. F. S. Miller: Mr. Speaker, we did have some discussion during the estimates about these things and we have it on an ongoing basis. I don't think I would ever rank the closure of a hospital as not being a serious matter. Yet one must look back to some of the statements made in the heat of the election campaign—by the Liberal Party, about the savings of 25 per cent on the bed costs in the province; I think they said $320 million—by the comments of the official critic of the Liberal Party, that in fact we had built too many beds in this province; I believe there were criticisms from the NDP to that same effect; and by our statement, that in fact over the past two years, at least under my tenure as minister, a rationalization of hospital beds in the province had to be made.

In the case of Chesley—and I visited there too and I find them lovely people and they've been very nice to me throughout a very trying time—I have one of two options: Close the existing hospital or build a new one if a hospital is to exist. One must go further back in time and realize that when the new Hanover hospital was built a pre-condition of its building was the closure of Chesley. Chesley doesn't meet any of the fire marshal's requirements, or many of the fire marshal's requirements, as I'm sure the members know.

We have had many discussions with the community. We've talked to them—well before I became minister but certainly since I've been minister—having visited them once and having sent staff at least twice and having met with the delegation last week. The creation of a clinic in the area, or outpatient service of some type, obviously is something we would like.

Normally speaking, the money for this kind of physical plant is put up in the community. And this hospital, I understand, has a $300,000 grant to it right now for some type of facility in the community that could—and probably should—be functioning there for the kinds of

care needed on a short-term basis. If, in fact, you can't justify the closure of Chesley Hospital I am reasonably sure one cannot justify the closure of any hospital at any time in the Province of Ontario.

Mr. Lewis: It has to be part of a plan.

Mr. Good: Tell us your plan.

Hon. F. S. Miller: It is part of a plan and this is the thing I am trying to get across to you. I did not move with any haste in this matter—I have spent a good amount of time on it in the past year.

How many will close? I don't know.

Mr. Lewis: What do you mean you don't know?

Mrs. Campbell: If you don't know, why don't you?

Hon. F. S. Miller: Now, just a second—how may will close, I don't know.

Mr. Lewis: But you should know.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Hon. F. S. Miller: Just a moment now, I didn't interrupt and I would appreciate the opportunity to answer.

I am not sure what kind of time-frame it takes to wind these things down because if one looks across the Chesley matter, the issue of closure has been up for a full 10 or 12 or 15 years. And it took that time to actually get to the painful decision to do something of this nature. I don't like doing these kinds of things.

I can tell you, yes I have an analysis of the needs of this province.

Mr. Lewis: Do you?

Hon. F. S. Miller: Yes, it is 24 hospitals, to be specific.

Mr. Lewis: What are they?

Hon. F. S. Miller: These are hospitals that staff have recommended to me should be closed.

Mr. Singer: Ah, very interesting—

Mr. Lewis: Perhaps you might share it.

Mr. Singer: —that is very interesting.

Hon. F. S. Miller: I have had that within the last 10 days.

Mr. Singer: Why don't you share it with the House?

Mr. Roy: Share it with us.

Hon. F. S. Miller: This is part of the planning process that I am going through right now.

Mr. S. Smith: The estimates were three days ago.

Hon. F. S. Miller: We looked at the number of beds across the province and determined on a fairly orderly basis where closures would be required in addition to that. We are discussing this on an ongoing basis with the Ontario Hospital Association—we are discussing it with the people who should be able to help us, and I think we are making an orderly and systematic approach to a problem of overestimation of needs in the province.

Therefore, I take none of these actions in any light vein. The Minister of Education (Mr. Wells), if he saves a dollar in this province, gains the undying thanks of every single voter—

Mr. Lewis: But we have a right to know your estimate?

Hon. F. S. Miller: —the Minister of Health trying to save a dollar invariably runs into the anger and hostility of the communities affected. The proper way would be to argue the matter as the plan comes forward in the future. I think until that plan comes forward to you, it's premature.

Mrs. Campbell: No.

Mr. Singer: You want 24 debates, do you?

Mr. Lewis: What is the plan? Before you rule, Mr. Speaker, might we ask the minister just to be helpful to the House? This in fact speaks to the problem. Is it possible for the minister to take the members of the Legislature into his confidence about the plan for the possible shutdown of hospitals across Ontario so that Chesley can be seen as a part of that, rather than an arbitrary act?

Hon. F. S. Miller: I said to the board—in fact, that is where the member got his information—that they should realize they weren't an isolated instance.

Mr. MacDonald: We need a debate so you can talk about the plan.

Mr. Ferrier: Are any of those hospitals in Muskoka?

Hon. F. S. Miller: I would say it is premature for me to talk about that plan in detail, yet, because I had mentioned—

Mr. Singer: Because you don't want to give your hand away, you are not prepared.

Hon. F. S. Miller: —I had mentioned Chesley publicly because they were aware of the fact. I had mentioned Windsor's Riverview—

Mr. Singer: They wrote you a letter. You wrote them a letter.

Mr. Ferrier: You are sure none of these hospitals is in Muskoka?

Hon. F. S. Miller: —because they were aware. I don't want any hospital to become aware of it in a premature way—I would like an opportunity to talk to the boards.

Mr. Roy: Which one are you going to shut down in Ottawa?

Mr. Singer: They'll find one day the lights don't work.

Mr. Speaker: This has been a very interesting and I think an important debate.

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Speaker, if I may, sir? Regardless of your decision the House should know the list of the hospitals that are planned to be closed. Because if the divide-and-conquer system comes into effect—

Mr. MacDonald: That is why we need a debate.

Mr. Singer: That is why we need a debate.

Mr. Sargent: —if we know collectively what the minister is going to do, sir, then all hell is going to break loose. In the meantime he is going to knock us off one by one, and it isn't going to work.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I think the hon. member had an opportunity to present his facts and figures, which were very impressive.

As I say, this is a very interesting and very important debate. I think those representing each party have given a lot of information, perhaps sufficient for this particular time. And there is no doubt about the importance of the subject of the hon. member's motion, especially to those people who are directly concerned.

But as was mentioned, I think by the Leader of the Opposition and perhaps by others, we have, just a few days ago, completed a study of the estimates of the Ministry of Health where there was ample opportunity to discuss all related matters. Also I point out something else, that the Throne Speech is not debated at this time—

Mr. Singer: That is not the kind of discussion.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please, order—and the hon. member, if memory serves me correctly, is scheduled to speak, he is almost the next speaker there. I think he could make his presentation then. If there are any further facts and figures at that time—it may be tomorrow as I understand it—certainly there will be many additional opportunities to bring these matters before the House. It would be my considered opinion that we should not set aside the business of the House today to consider this particular matter.

Mr. Shore: I think this is more important.

Mr. Breithaupt: I regret, Mr. Speaker, that I must challenge your ruling based upon the fact that the letter from the hon. minister announcing the closing of this hospital is dated Nov. 17 and that is the same date that the estimates finished here; so there was not the opportunity, unfortunately, to discuss this particular matter. As a result, Mr. Speaker, I regret we must challenge your ruling.

Hon. F. S. Miller: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, there were a number of letters. That was only one of them, and I can give the dates—

Mr. Roy: No, no, we have a challenge.

Mr. Singer: It is not a debate.

Hon. Mr. Davis: I know, but let's have the facts.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. That's information I wasn't aware of. The hon. member for Kitchener challenged the Speaker's ruling.

Mr. Lewis: Regretfully.

Mr. Speaker: Of course, always.

[4:45]

The House divided on the Speaker's ruling, which was negatived on the following vote:

Ayes	Nays
Auld	Angus
Belanger	Bain
Bennett	Bounsall
Bernier	Breaugh
Birch	Breithaupt
Brunelle	Bryden
Davis	Burr
Drea	Campbell

Ayes	Nays
Eaton	Cassidy
Evans	Conway
Gregory	Cunningham
Handleman	Davidson (Cambridge)
Henderson	Davison (Hamilton Centre)
Hodgson	Deans
Irvine	di Santo
Johnson (Wellington-Dufferin-Peel)	Dukszta
Jones	Eakins
Kennedy	Edighoffer
Kerr	Ferrier
Lane	Ferris
Leluk	Foulds
MacBeth	Gaunt
Maeck	Germa
McCague	Gigantes
McKeough	Givens
McMurtry	Godfrey
McNeil	Good
Meen	Grande
Miller (Muskoka)	Haggerty
Morrow	Hall
Newman (Durham North)	Kerrio
Norton	Lawlor
Parrott	Lewis
Rhodes	Lupusella
Rollins	MacDonald
Scrivener	Mackenzie
Smith (Hamilton Mountain)	Makarchuk
Snow	Mancini
Stephenson	Martel
Taylor	McClellan
Timbrell	McKessock
Welch	Miller (Haldimand-Norfolk)
Wells	Moffatt
Williams	Newman (Windsor-Walkerville)
Wiseman	O'Neil
Yakabuski—46.	Peterson
	Philip
	Reed (Halton-Burlington)
	Reid (Rainy River)
	Riddell
	Roy
	Ruston
	Samis
	Sandeman
	Sargent
	Shore
	Singer
	Smith (Nipissing)
	Smith (Hamilton West)
	Spence
	Stong
	Swart
	Sweeney
	Warner
	Wildman
	Worton
	Young
	Ziemba—68.

Mr. Speaker: Order please.

Clerk of the House: Mr. Speaker, the "ayes" are 46, and the "nays" are 58.

Mr. Speaker: I humbly declare the Speaker's ruling—

Interjections.

Mr. Speaker: Now can we get on? I declare the Speaker's ruling not to have been upheld and I now place the question: Shall the debate proceed?

All those in favour of the debate proceeding shall say "aye."

All opposed shall please say "nay."

In my opinion the ayes have it.

I might just point out to those members who may not be familiar with the rules the rule says each speaker who wishes to talk on this may speak for 10 minutes with the debate ending at 6 p.m. or earlier if there are not enough speakers. The debate will proceed in a moment.

Mr. Ziemba: Mr. Speaker, I rise to another point of personal privilege. It relates to the events earlier this afternoon and to the Premier's statement. I feel terribly strongly about alcohol, the drinking age, and the related carnage on the highways. My feelings are so deep that they lead me on occasion to statements which can be both extreme and unfair. Last night's Global Television interview was one of these occasions. I apologize to the Premier and undertake that it won't happen again.

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Speaker, very briefly, sir, I have made my point. There are many more able speakers going to continue the debate. But I would like to say one thing to the minister. It is very important that on the part of all the 24 areas where he plans to dismantle their hospitals, that he let us have the names of those areas. It is most important that we have that before the House.

Mr. Dukszta: Closing of the Chesley hospital is a good example of the totally heedless, unthought out and even dangerous ap-

proach of the government to the question of the health of residents of Ontario. His managerial cut-costs-at-any-price approach has in fact put the health of Ontario and our health system into a real danger.

Let me just go over the point he raised in his reply to the member who brought the question up. It is true that we have more beds in Ontario than in a number of other jurisdictions. We have 5.7 beds, according to the hospitalization international comparison, 1969—much more than the people have in Great Britain. And it is true that this is too many beds for our needs. It is also true that I have personally urged the government a number of times that we must look seriously at the qunestion of health care, the question of beds, and reduce the number of beds. In that sense the minister has been correct in saying that I have urged him to do so. I have not urged him, and I will never urge him, to cut beds without thinking of the alternatives.

In Ontario now, hospital beds are often used inappropriately. People who are chronically ill are often admitted to hospital merely because there is nowhere else for them to go. They are admitted quite often to the hospital beds because there is no way for them to be treated or examined on an adequate basis in an emergency room—out-patient or otherwise. It is quite true that at least one out of five patients who are now in beds in Ontario hospitals generally probably should not be there. But I cannot urge the minister to cut this one in five beds to reduce the proportion unless he proposes to introduce a system of alternative care which will take care of the people who are now in beds.

You simply cannot throw them all out of those beds and say: "Because we have to cut out beds you'll have to go somewhere else." Where will they go? There is no alternative. I'm going to spend a few minutes pointing out there are very few alternatives, indeed, in our health system for taking care of the ambulatory patients, those very patients who, in fact, now occupy one out of five beds needlessly.

Yet, the hon. minister in approaching this, approaches it from only one particular point of view: Let's just cut beds and nothing else. At the same time, he's illogical in many of his approaches because be gives capital and money towards building other hospitals. Thirty-four per cent of all our beds are in teaching hospitals, yet the teaching hospitals receive well over 50 per cent of capital costs. All of the teaching hospitals are largely now in large centres and most of them are in Toronto. It's the big hospitals which receive extra money for beds and facilities. That is not wise. For this the hon. minister pays by having to cut much-more-needed beds in the rural areas.

When we come to the psychiatrical beds, the same situation occurs. There are, in fact, a number of empty beds but again you cannot cut those beds until you produce an alternative. I stress again and again that we're taking a real risk. Both as a health critic and a physician, I want to urge the minister to consider that he, as an engineer, may not fully understand that it is taking a real risk to simply remove a bed. That may appeal to an engineer who has worked in a factory to move something out. That does not apply to the human services and never will.

Not only does he do that but he carelessly and needlessly has been cutting a number of other services. There are alternatives. There are a number of alternatives which would do. You can move towards building community health centres. The NDP has been concerned for some time. It's our policy that one way of solving the question of health problems in Ontario is to move decisively towards building community health centres, which would deal with most of the health and social service problems on an ambulatory basis.

At first, indeed, it may be an expenditure but, in the long run, it is the only way that we can attempt to control the services and the costs of health care in Ontario. He has not done that and I will show, in a few minutes, that he has, in fact, made many approaches towards the community health centre movement which strangles them and sabotages any attempt to introduce this particular way of organizing health care in Ontario.

We need more rehabilitation beds, as has been spectacularly shown in the speech of one of the NDP people during the estimates. He has not fully responded and the ministry attempts to deny the need for it.

We need more nursing beds. You need both an ambulatory-type of service, like a community health centre or a drop-in centre and, at the same time, Mr. Speaker, you need rehabilitation and you need nursing home beds to take care of all the patients who now occupy that one in five beds and need not be in that bed. You cannot, and I repeat this again, you simply cannot remove that bed.

The minister needs both money for training and the change in laws to allow paramedical professionals to take care of patients on an ambulative basis, whether they are

taking care of them in health centres or whether they're taking care of those patients at home. That would be a considerable saving of money. The minister has not done it. On this he again has to be faulted.

The last point, which I would like to speak of in some detail, is that I believe the minister is now actively sabotaging the whole approach to the community health centres. There are about 10 community health centres in Toronto itself and he has now designed a policy which, in effect, will make sure that most of them will die on the vine.

I hate mentioning the names of the civil servants, but in the implementational group in this ministry whether it is under direction of one civil servant or another—Dr. Aldis, is the one I have in mind—or whether it is the minister's directive a policy has been instituted which cuts support to all the community health centres.

[5:00]

Hon. F. S. Miller: No. I don't know who it was.

Mr. Dukszta: I see that the minister is disagreeing with me. Let me just say what the policy means, in effect when it—

Interjection.

Mr. Dukszta: It was Dr. Aldis. Let me say, I don't believe he acts entirely on his own. I believe this is a directive which has come from the minister. So he too cannot hide behind a group. It is the minister's responsibility.

There are two points about his approach, before the minister gives money to the community health centres. These need examining.

One is that the standards which the minister demands from them are infinitely higher than he would dream of demanding from a physician in general practice. He always requires that every physician who works there should be fulltime. Two, he sets up standards of valuation which involve examining patient records to a degree, which again he would never dream of doing if private patients in general practice were involved. That's wrong. Whether the minister likes it or not—and if explanation is given that he proposes to do this as evaluation—I think it is wrong, because he is strangulating. He is not consistent, because some of the community health centres have largely received a different contract than the one I am speaking of. Like the one in my own riding; it is one with a different contract altogether.

Not only does the minister strangulate the community health centres, which would be one way of solving this problem of excess of beds—moving the patients to an ambulatory treatment—but he's also made a very active effort to cut down almost all support services in the community. I will not go through a whole litany of them as I did through the estimates. Let me just remind the minister of three or four major cuts in terms of the psychiatric beds which would undoubtedly affect the utilization of beds. Six months ago he cut up the entire crisis information service in Lakeshore Psychiatric Hospital—very much a prevention-oriented service.

He has also cut down the children's services from 32 to 25 beds; he has thrown them out without providing alternative services in any sense. He has cut down the social service department by his action, he didn't do it directly, by approving what the hospital would do. He has cut down the social services in Toronto General Hospital, and, in effect, he is making sure that once more the patients have to stay in bed because there is no one to place them outside.

Let me summarize, because I think I've got a few seconds left. The Chesley situation is a superb example—

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member's time has expired.

Mr. Dukszta: It is a superb example of the minister's failure to manage our health care system, and he is taking a real risk proceeding on this course.

Mr. S. Smith: The reason that our party believes that the matters being discussed today are of urgent public importance are partly related, of course, to the concern of the member for Grey-Bruce for the hospital in his area. But they relate also to the announcement made in the course of discussion by the Minister of Health that he had a list of 24 hospitals across this province that he is possibly preparing to close, and his further statement that he does not believe it to be appropriate to inform any of these hospitals about the opposition he has on his desk before him, because it might be premature.

He has created, in fact, a situation of panic within the province, whereby every community now has to be concerned as to whether its little hospital is going to be closed or not. The panic is thrice compounded, unfortunately, by the fact that there exists neither criteria nor objectives by

which people can judge whether their hospital has been meeting some reasonable standard and, therefore, will not come under his axe, or whether their hospital by some caprice of the minister might be eliminated tomorrow. If not tomorrow, the day after that. I would remind this House that when we close hospitals we are dealing not only with problems for the community and problems for the patient but we are also dealing with the people who work there.

Hospitals are highly labour-intensive industries and people have moved to some areas believing that the hospital would be there as a permanent structure. They have been encouraged to take training as nurses, as nurses' aides, as orderlies. People have come to take laboratory technician training. Suddenly these people will find themselves without work and not only in Grey-Bruce but throughout the province, it now turns out this is going to happen.

As I said in this House during discussion of the Ministry of Health estimates on Nov. 12, we have a situation in which no criteria have been established by the Ministry of Health by which to judge the efficiency and effectiveness of hospitals and thereby to judge also their deservedness in terms of continuing or being eliminated.

The government has had before it for some time the Deutsch report with several recommendations, including that before any new programmes or facilities be provided a rational plan should be developed to avoid costly and unnecessary duplication. It is all very well for the Minister of Health continually to tell this House that his predecessors unfortunately built too many hospital beds. Who in heaven's name were his predecessors? They are the same people who are sitting there right now.

Therefore, he says, it has become necessary for us to rationalize the number of hospital beds across the province. Let him stand up and shout from the rooftops that the Conservatives have been fooling the people for 32 years by offering these monuments to Conservative government in each riding throughout the province: A hospital here and a hospital there, bricks and mortar for everyone.

It is the same policy with the universities. It's no different.

Interjections.

Mr. S. Smith: The fact of the matter is that we now find—

Interjection.

Mr. S. Smith: —it becomes necessary to close beds. Now the question is by what criteria; under what plan; which hospitals; why those hospitals; why not other hospitals; what are the means by which these things are decided? It has furthermore been told to the ministry there should be the positive encouragement—I quote again from the Deutsch report—"of many more centralized services for hospitals on a regional basis to reduce costly and unnecessary duplication including highly specialized laboratories."

The ministry has within its possession right now and has not seen fit to release to the public, a report indicating that regionalized publicly-oriented laboratories of a specialized nature are much more efficient and much cheaper than privately-run ones. On some misguided notion that it is supporting private enterprise when it supports publicly paid for but privately-run laboratories, the government refuses to make that report public. I look forward to seeing that report being tabled in this House.

The fact of the matter is we cannot sit idly by and watch some capricious decision to choose one hospital here and 23 others somewhere else. What about Meaford? What about Penetanguishene and Barry's Bay? I only mentioned those hospitals because according to the latest statistics available they had longer length-of-stay figures—days per patient—than the hospital which is presently being closed in Grey-Bruce.

The fact is we see the bankruptcy of this government's policy in terms of health. We see a $3 billion budget with neither objectives nor means of measuring whether these objectives are being approached. We see hospitals being picked without a clear idea as to why they are going to be destroyed and eliminated.

We see no alternatives in terms of what the people who have been trained to work in these hospitals are supported to do with their lives now that the government has seen fit to close these things. All we hear by way of admission that the government has for years overbuilt beds in this province is simply, "It is politically difficult not to do that and what would the hon. member have done?"

I can see the truth has caused the Premier to leave the House. I can well understand his desire to flee in the face of it. I can understand his desire to flee in the face of the truth but truth will eventually set him free. The fact is when they overbuilt those beds and gained the political popularity they did, they were setting us up for the present

situation in which people are going to be put out of work, communities are going to be disrupted and panic will ensue in the province.

What we say is this: What is the list of 24 hospitals? Where are they located? And why those? What are the criteria by which those particular hospitals were chosen? How do we know that next year there will not be another 45 hospitals on the list unless we have some good way of measuring the criteria that the Ministry of Health is using? When will the ministry implement the alternatives that we have been calling for for years? When will it make public the reports which indicate that its policies are in fact too expensive and are failing?

These are the questions that my colleagues and I wish to have considered by this House and that is the reason this is a matter of urgent public importance; not merely because of the Chesley situation but because of the other 24 hospitals and because of the bankruptcy of the entire health policy despite its $3 billion budget.

Mr. Wildman: I speak in this debate because there appears to have been a similar lack of overall planning with attention to local needs by the Ministry of Health in my riding. As everyone knows there is a lack of doctors in the north and a lack of medical care. There have been attempts by the ministry to rectify that situation but there are a number of problems in Algoma which seem to have resulted from a lack of planning in doing that. For instance, the ministry maintains that there are sufficient facilities for extended health care for the population of the district of Algoma. Unfortunately, the three facilities which they talk about are all located in the southern part of the riding or in the eastern centres of the district. Thus, people living in places like Wawa and White River have to travel about 200 miles during all types of weather in order to visit loved ones.

Hon. Mr. Davis: I came back to hear the truth.

Mr. S. Smith: You are too late.

Mr. Wildman: Well, I am surprised.

Mr. S. Smith: Here it is. The member for Algoma is giving it to you, so listen.

Mr. Gaunt: You came back just in time for the doctor.

Mr. Wildman: Usually, this means that elderly people just don't get to visit their loved ones very often. Why couldn't the planning have been set up so that there were facilities distributed throughout the district to make it possible for people not to have to travel such long distances? Why isn't there a centre in Wawa, for instance, to serve the communities of Wawa, Hawk Junction, White River, Hornepayne, and Missinaibi and so on? I suggest it is because the ministry officials don't have any real understanding of the geography of the north nor of the needs of rural communities.

Also, because of the shortage of doctors and surgeons throughout the north, the ministry has a programme to attract doctors to the north by subsidizing their salaries if necessary. They have been encouraging local communities to build community health centres, which we support, but ironically they refuse to contribute grants to the building of such centres. They say they are needed to attract doctors to the north but they do not give the money necessary to build them.

They say in the absence of district health councils there is no co-ordination in the construction of such centres. So, in some cases you have a proliferation of centres in one part of the riding and one part of the district. In my case, there is a situation in Bruce Mines where there is a centre which doesn't have sufficient support and the community is now in debt. They don't need the doctors. There was only one doctor when it was set up for a much larger staff, and there is another centre built only 12 miles away in Thessalon.

Hon. F. S. Miller: Who built it?

Mr. Wildman: The local community. There is no planning by the ministry, no direction by the ministry, to indicate what should be done in that area. It's left completely to the initiative of local officials and then the ministry comes along and says: "Well, it wasn't our fault." That doesn't help.

This mess in central Algoma, I believe, is an example of the fact that there is a lack of forward planning and co-operation in dealing with the needs of local communities in rural areas by the Ministry of Health and this certainly seems to be the case in the Chesley hospital and I would submit that that is also the case in many areas of the north and certainly in the district of Algoma.

[5:15]

Mr. Eaton: I'd like to say a few words on this because I can certainly understand the

feelings of the member for Grey-Bruce, having two small hospitals in my riding. For all I know one of these or both could possibly be on the list. It's hard to say. It does leave some uncertainty, but I think I would much rather see the minister retain that list to himself until he does have an opportunity to review it and perhaps make some decisions himself on how he will be moving on the situation before he releases the 24 names and, perhaps as someone across the floor has said, cause a bit of a panic among some of the hospitals which may be on the list but which he might not be deciding to include because of his review of the situation.

I've never seen the member for Grey-Bruce so serious about a subject and I think he presented his case very well. I know, however, the position we're in. The opposition, the Liberals themselves, have said that some of the beds should be closed in the province, and we have to take these things into consideration with the restraint that we face.

Mr. Roy: We want it orderly.

Mr. Eaton: I would perhaps rise to suggest an alternative in the situation that we face. We have developed, in one of the communities in our riding, the Southwest Middlesex Medical Clinic. It has now been in operation close to a year and I think it has been highly successful. It has provided a service in that community where people can go on an emergency basis before they have to go into a hospital. Things can be looked after where normally if they had to be rushed into the hospital treatment might be delayed to the point that it would be too late.

This type of medical centre has certainly been an asset to the community. Many services have been provided there, not only on an emergency basis, but on a regular health care basis. I think this is certainly an alternative that can be looked at in the instance of the problem that the member for Grey-Bruce has presented to us.

I know the minister and the interest he has taken in his ministry and in the operation of some of our hospitals, having had him visit the small ones in my riding where we have problems because of their size. I'm sure also the member up there has problems because of both the size and the age of his hospital. Unlike what the member for Hamilton West was indicating, it probably wasn't a hospital that was built in the last 33 years, it was probably built sometime before that, as were many of our small hospitals around this province.

When it comes to the consideration of the cost of renovating them and of changing them, then perhaps there is some rationale for using some of our larger centres with the facilities available, such as our medical clinics. I know that the minister has shown compassion and will show some in this instance and I'm sure that he will give some consideration to the alternatives. I say to the minister that I'm sure that he realizes the situation being put forth by the member here and I trust that he will give him every consideration and consider the alternatives and the ramifications of the decision being made.

Mr. Roy: You should have been—

Mr. B. Newman: I rise to continue the debate that we've had with the minister concerning the situation in the Windsor area. Unfortunately, in the completion of the minister's estimates on Nov. 17 of this month, just a few days ago, after having sat in the House for approximately 2½ hours, I only had about three minutes to express to the minister my concern over the Windsor situation. At that time, the minister replied to me—and I'm reading from page 641 of Hansard—that a letter was sent to "Riverview Hospital, saying that it should close March 31, 1976, unless the alternative is acceptable, and proposed to us by the end of this month."

As I was talking to the minister earlier, I made mention to him of the confusion. Even with the minister's comments here concerning the closing of the hospital on March 31, 1976, from what we understand with the communication from the ministry much earlier in the year, the decision was going to be made at the end of the year and not before the end of this month. I tried to point out to the minister that he wasn't giving the local community sufficient time to arrive at a satisfactory alternative to what he had proposed and the ministry's proposals, as numerous as they were, never seemed to clear the air.

The latest that I had heard was the complete phasing out of the Riverview Hospital —closing it up, leaving people who need chronic care with no facility other than to be transferred into Windsor Western Hospital, which would be taken off active treatment and made into a chronic-care hospital. If that is the ministry's proposal to save money—this was one of the proposals coming through, from what I understand, from some of the minister's officials.

Hon. F. S. Miller: No, no.

Mr. B. Newman: If it wasn't then the minister can correct it later.

But imagine coming along and closing Riverview and putting the chronic-care facilities in Windsor Western. Imagine all of the physical changes that would have to be made in that hospital—widening the doors, adjusting the washroom facilities and everything of this sort. Actually, you would be building a new hospital on the site. The expense would be far greater than the $4-million saving that the minister wanted at the expense of the community.

In addition to that, just the thought of closing Riverview is not acceptable to the community. Let me tell the minister he will find every single community group opposing that position of his—if it still is his position. Reducing the number of beds could possibly be an alternative, but phasing it out completely and transferring it into another location is not acceptable. Likewise, the breaking up of the health-delivery team in that hospital is not acceptable to the community. They developed an excellent team and dispersing it into four other hospitals in the community is not acceptable.

Just Monday night of this week city council passed a resolution strongly supporting the maintaining of the Riverview Hospital. The Windsor Western staff likewise supported that The Windsor District Labour Council on Tuesday—that's just two days ago—were very much in support of maintaining Riverview, even if the minister doesn't maintain it at its full capacity, at least to the extent of 120 beds, and placing those patients who are not benefiting from any therapy in the hospital in other facilities in the community.

Remember—if there is a surplus of beds in the city of Windsor, it is a result of the decisions of this government in allowing hospital beds to be built within the last five years. The government apparently had no overall plan drawn up around the needs of the community, yet it permitted the construction of a substantial number of beds in the one hospital. Now the minister is confronted with closing the beds. If I'm not mistaken, approximately 100 beds are going to be closed in that one hospital. Naturally it is preferable to take out of Riverview Hospital those patients who are not able to get any type of therapy and place them in the active-treatment hospital in the community.

If the minister is interested in saving the $4 million, why doesn't he look at some of the approaches that are being used in other jurisdictions? For example, the walk-in type of surgery that has been used since 1961 in the city of Grand Rapids, Mich.—US President Gerald Ford's own community. It has saved large sums of money and has been so popular that approximately 2,000 hospitals in the United States use that type of service. They list 40 different operations that can be performed on a walk-in basis so that the active-treatment bed is not used for other than active-treatment. The Watts Hospital in Durham, North Carolina, also is one of the hospitals that uses a walk-in- type of surgery and is also saving substantial funds. The Phoenix Surgacentre is such a hospital. Centralized purchasing, the centralizing of the laundry facilities and so forth are other means that can be used in a community to save funds rather than depriving the community of much needed health delivery services.

Not too long ago the hon. minister made mention concerning Riverview and IODE hospitals, that a chronic hospital should not stand alone but should be integrated with a general and a psychiatric hospital. Yet the hon. minister, in the information that I have, was going to go back on that and change one of the hospitals into a complete chronic care hospital. He can answer that when he has the opportunity.

Just one week ago, on Thursday Nov. 13, there was an editorial in the Windsor Star. I'm not going to read it all because other members want to speak. But its headline is "False Economies in Hospital Plan." I suggest the minister read the editorial, listen to what the people in the community are trying to tell him. We don't disagree with him in saving funds, but let's not save them at the expense of human life in the city of Windsor.

Mr. Bain: I appreciate this opportunity to participate in a debate on medical care in general and hospitals in particular. In northern Ontario and in other rural parts of this province one finds that facilities such as hospitals, schools, churches and so on occupy a much more important position in the community than they do in the larger centres. To withdraw a hospital or a church or a school is a death knell to many of these communities.

The residents of these communities also feel a much greater bond with their hospitals than you would find exists in larger communities. I'm sure that many other members have found this to be true in their own ridings.

A case in point has arisen in the tri-town area that I think is probably more extreme than any other case in this province. Early in the 1970s the minister—or the ministry, to be more exact—decided there was to be one hospital board where previously there had

been two, and that there would be one hospital where previously there had been two hospitals.

In a report commissioned by Kates, Peat, Marwick and Co., it was found that of course there would be fewer employees in this one new hospital than existed in the two that were presently being utilized. And of course as always, there would be fewer beds in the new hospital than in the two existing facilities.

In the process of setting up this one hospital board, this one hospital board also had to determine where the new hospital would be. In this whole process, which took a number of years, the hospital board finally decided on a location, after a great deal of soul searching. But that site was not acceptable to the minister, so he appointed four people of his choosing to the hospital board. Of course those four people, with existing members on that board, ensured that the minister's wishes would be carried out, so the site of the hospital was changed at the minister's insistence.

Not surprisingly, members of the hospital board that did not agree with this change felt that appointing four new members by the minister was not democratic. Therefore, the members who didn't agree with the new site location and didn't agree with the undemocratic action resigned.

Presently we have a very dedicated board of men and women who are trying desperately to build a new hospital that they feel will provide better health care to the people of the tri-town. But they are labouring under great difficulties because of all this past turmoil that has been caused by a long extended process, by intervention by the minister, and by his decision which disallowed the people in the local area making the decision. Even today there are parts of the community that are supposed to be served by the new hospital which refuse to elect any members to the new hospital board.

[5:30]

What I personally find most regrettable in this whole situation is that local people have been turned against other local people, that bitterness has festered over the last few years because of this whole process. What could have been accomplished earlier by a democratic decision of a hospital board would have solved the problem, but that didn't take place.

I believe, because of the unusual severity of the problem that exists, an innovative solution should be utilized. I won't say the minister complains, he has merely mentioned that one of his onerous tasks is to make decisions which often bring him in conflict with the local communities. This happens, for example, when he decides to close a hospital or where a new hospital would be located. I would suggest this whole problem can be resolved by reconstituting the nature of hospital boards along the lines of municipal councils and boards of education. As we have seen in all the speeches that have been made thus far, local people want to be involved in the decisions about their hospitals; so reconstitute hospital boards and allow the local people to make the decisions. The ministry can offer advice and expertise but it should not dictate to local people the way it is presently doing.

Another case in point where local people have been dictated to, and their wishes disregarded, is in the Kirkland Lake area. I have already discussed with the minister in the House the need for Kirkland Lake to have a chronic and extended-care hospital. Such a building exists because the old hospital is now vacant, as the minister well knows. Patients were moved to the new hospital at the beginning of this month.

In Kirkland Lake and many parts of the north there are just not the proper facilities for chronic and extended-care patients, therefore they take up active treatment beds in hospitals and they also stay in homes for the aged. A case in point is in Kirkland Lake where in the Teck Pioneer Residence fully 50 per cent of its residents are now chronic patients who would be better served in a chronic hospital.

My colleague the member for Cochrane South (Mr. Ferrier) has just informed me that in Timmins they are often advised that since there are no chronic beds available they will try and get them a bed in the chronic wing of the Haileybury Hospital. But that hospital, if the minister's plans come to fruition, will be closed and that chronic wing will disappear.

There are fewer chronic beds in the new Kirkland Lake hospital than existed in the old one. The Teck Pioneer Residence has half of its beds occupied by chronic patients. It would be ideal to utilize the old hospital in Kirkland Lake as a chronic and extended-care hospital. It would serve a vast area of northeastern Ontario.

The people of Kirkland Lake—their leaders and the medical community there—would desperately like to get together with the minister. They presented a brief to the government over two years ago. They would

like to plan with him a facility in Kirkland Lake for chronic and extended-care patients; not an expensive elaborate one, but one that would utilize the present old hospital. I think it would be an excellent facility if only he would take the time and effort and sit down with the local community and attempt to plan such a facility.

Hon. B. Stephenson: Mr. Speaker, I thank you for the opportunity of speaking briefly to this subject. I should preface my remarks by the statement that I am pleased to see the hon. member of Grey-Bruce (Mr. Sargent), who felt this was such an urgent matter of public policy, has finally returned to the House so that he can listen to the debate.

I am slightly appalled at two of the previous speakers, whom I would haxe expected to have some knowledge of the standards and the criteria upon which decisions are made regarding the maintenance or non-maintenance of institutions such as hospitals in this province. I am particularly appalled to find that the associate professor of psychiatry from McMaster University has no knowledge of the fact that in fact there has been an accreditation programme for small hospitals going on in this province for the last 11 years.

It has been a most effective method of accreditation, carried out, I will tell you, voluntarily by the Ontario Hospital Association and the Ontario Medical Association. It in fact examines the quality of patient care as well as the plant of the institution. This information has been available—

Mr. S. Smith: Do I take it the 24 hospitals being closed are being disaccredited? Are these hospitals being disaccredited? It is the criteria for closing hospitals that are—

Hon. B. Stephenson: That is not what I said.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Hon. B. Stephenson: The member simply said that there were no criteria and no standards. In fact, there are criteria and standards upon which the decisions are made regarding closure or non-closure of an institution.

Mr. Sargent: Is the minister in favour of closing hospitals?

Mr. S. Smith: That's not accreditation, that's closure.

Hon. B. Stephenson: It's an accreditation programme on the basis of an assessment. I would like the members to read the report of the Ontario Medical Association, the College of Physicians and Surgeons and the Ontario Hospital Association and they will learn what the standards are.

Mr. R. S. Smith: Is the minister saying if they don't receive accreditation, they are closed?

Mr. S. Smith: But that is not accreditation; it is closure. It's not the same topic.

Hon. B. Stephenson: At any rate, in this instance, Mr. Speaker—

Hon. Mr. Taylor: All right, listen.

Hon. B. Stephenson. I am sorry, Mr. Speaker. Unfortunately, apparently some of my medical colleagues are not as well informed as I feel they should be—

Mr. Sargent: Make your point.

Hon. B. Stephenson: —and I shall make an honest attempt to educate the professor of psychiatry from McMaster. It is obviously necessary.

The thing that we must remember is that we are, in fact, suggesting closure of these institutions on the basis of maintenance of good medical care and not for any other reason. There are reasons of finance, of course, but the major reason is the level and the quality of the care which can be provided in small institutions.

Mr. Roy: Oh, don't kid yourself.

Hon. B. Stephenson: When one remembers—

Mr. S. Smith: That's not what the minister said, he said it was money.

Hon. B. Stephenson: When one remembers that the Chesley hospital is exactly eight miles from Hanover—

Mr. Speaker: Order please. Will you allow the hon. member for York Mills to continue?

Hon. B. Stephenson: —and fewer than 30 miles from Owen Sound, in which there are excellent general hospitals with full facilities, with superb staff and with nursing staff—

Mr. Sargent: You talk about knowledge.

Hon. B. Stephenson: —and the range of facilities which is necessary for good medical care, it is inconceivable—

Mr. Sargent: In the kindest way, ma'am, you don't know what you are talking about.

Hon. B. Stephenson: —that one should consider maintaining the Chesley Hospital as an acute general hospital. I am sure that it does have uses. I am sure that it would make an excellent site for a primary care facility, where emergency situations requiring no hospital bed could be dealt with. I am sure that it could be used as a day-care facility for the chronic patients within the community or the psychiatric patients within the community.

Mr. Roy: Yes; well that's it, he doesn't know the—

Hon. B. Stephenson: I am sure that there are many uses to which it could be put. It is not a useful facility for the provision of acute general hospital treatment. I think this must be recognized on the basis of the quality of care which must be provided in this day and age to patients in an Ontario general hospital.

Mr. Roy: The minister hasn't understood it.

Hon. B. Stephenson: This province, fellow colleagues, I would like you to know, is well-known throughout the world because it has probably one of the best hospital systems on this entire planet. I, as a physician, have been proud to be associated with that hospital system.

Mr. Roy: For the best evidence the minister should go on Yonge St. and University Ave.; there is a big hospital shortage.

Hon. B. Stephenson: There are problems within the system and I would remind members that the special Committee on the Healing Arts, which reported in 1967, suggested closure of small hospitals which could not maintain the level of quality care. The Mustard committee, of which I was privileged to be a member, recommended exactly the same thing.

We are pleased the ministry has seen fit to begin to use the standards of assessment, which have been set by those people acutely aware and primarily concerned with the level and the quality of care, to make decisions on these very small institutions, which cannot in any way, in this day and age, provide the kind of service which the people of Ontario deserve. I think that we should all be grateful that the minister has made a list. He will in his own good time I am sure, discuss this with the boards of those hospitals to which he is referring. I know that it has been discussed with the Chelsey board in the past—

Mr. Reid: I'll bet he waits until after the next election to do that.

Hon. B. Stephenson: —because about seven years ago the concerned citizens of Chelsey came to Toronto to discuss the possible closure of that hospital since they felt it wasn't necessary either at that time.

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Speaker on a point of order.

Hon. B. Stephenson: I think the minister is doing a good thing and I think it is probably just as well the member for Grey-Bruce brought the subject up because I think some of this should be aired and clarified for the members of the house.

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Speaker on a point of order.

Mr. Speaker: Does the member have a point of order?

Mr. Sargent: With the greatest respect for Madam Minister, that is the first time in history I have heard that statement. In the 13 years I have been in this House—

Mr. Speaker: That is not a point of order. You may disagree with the Speaker, but it is not a point of order.

Mr. Sargent: She made a statement that was not right. She made a false statement.

Mr. S. Smith: She made 10 false statements.

Mr. Sargent: I take back the wording of that—she made a wrong statement. The fact is that I have for 13 years been fighting to keep this place open. The board is continually asking me to keep the place open.

Mr. Speaker: That is not a point of order. The hon. member for Grey has the floor.

Mr. Sargent: For the record, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. S. Smith: I hope she handles the Ministry of Labour better than that.

Mr. R. S. Smith: Her credibility is going down.

Mr. Speaker. The hon. member for Grey.

Mr. McKessock: I want to take a minute to point out to the Minister of Health that this hospital in Chesley also serves the people from my riding. I have received many petitions, and letters and telegrams from council, senior citizens and very concerned people about this hospital closing.

This government is very concerned about preserving the Niagara Escarpment in our area. The people there just can't understand why you don't want to preserve the people.

I would like to point out that the care given in the Chesley hospital is of very high quality. I met the Minister of Health at the opening of the addition to the Mount Forest hospital, and at that time he mentioned that he wished he were head of a ministry with more sin in it. Well I kind of wish that he had moved to another ministry, because I feel that he is bringing sin into this one.

Mr. Roy: The minister is a dirty old man.

Mr. R. S. Smith: One says it is care, the other says it is fun.

Mr. McKessock: I think it has been pointed out to the minister that—

Mr. R. S. Smith: I take it the more you can get, the—

Mr. McKessock: —it would be a sin if Chesley hospital was closed. I think it was also mentioned that there are a number of Mennonite families in Sullivan township, wihch is in my riding. who have no other means of transportation than the horse and buggy. These people rely on this hospital for health care.

Instead of being a sinner I would like the minister to be a good Samaritan. Keep this hospital open and do not let these people die by the side of the road.

Mr. Godfrey: I would like to talk more about the general theme rather than the Chesley hospital. I can't understand why the House is so empty today with four eminent members of the medical profession speaking at length; it would seem to me that the benches would be full.

Hon. B. Stephenson: That it why it is empty.

Hon. F. S. Miller: If they were here they would be asleep.

Mr. Godfrey: Maybe the members, particularly on the other side of the House, have been persuaded by the hon. minister—

Mr. R. S. Smith: We have had the hon. lawyers going.

Mr. Godfrey: —that doctors don't know anything about medical care and that it should be left to engineers; maybe that is saying something about what is going on. The shedder of sweetness and light, the minister, disarms everybody by saying, "Maybe I run a better Ministry of Health because I am not a doctor." I would point out to him, without being malicious at all, that he better give second thought to that.

I am concerned about the general theme and I would like to know a few things.

Mr. Roy: We will be calling for Dick Potter.

Mr. Godfrey: No, it's not that bad.

Has the Chesley hospital been disaccredited? If the Chesley hospital has lost its accreditation, this sheds new light on the minister's decision. Does this mean that every hospital in the province that is not accredited is going to be under the threat of being closed; does it say that the minister and his ministry are going to do something about helping these hospitals to become accredited?

I don't really think the hospital has lost its accreditation. I would appreciate specific comments from the Minister of Labour if she can back up her statement.

[5:45]

I do feel the birds have come home to roost very quickly. Only a few days ago I was persuaded by the Minister of Health that he had the best possible approach, the best possible budget—given certain terms—with which to work. But it must be obvious to him that this first tiny putting of the toe into the water on closing down medical installations, has caused a division in the House and caused a very powerful party to be outvoted for the first time in many years. I would hope and I would plead with him that he not proceed any further in this enterprise in this manner; otherwise we are going to have more divisions.

It's all very well for him to say: "Really, if I don't cut medical dollars, I'll be the most popular man in the province," but he can't budge out of the problem that way. I am concerned about his embarassment by the fact that he picked on possibly the smallest, weakest hospital in the province on which to descend with all his ministerial might, and therefore called forth every Don Quixote on this side of the House to ride to that hospital's aid. I do protest, though, that I am not speaking about Chesley, because frankly I don't know enough about it. But I do know enough about the principle involved that you cannot—

Hon. F. S. Miller: Then why does the member have so much to say?

Mr. Godfrey: Oh no, sir; I take my example from the minister. I have a great deal to say even though I know nothing.

I am surprised at the minister, and particularly surprised at the Minister of Labour, who obviously has never practised in a small hospital, who obviously doesn't realize,—or if she has, she has spent too much time doing medicine and not enough time speaking with people—who realizes that the fabric—

Interjection.

Mr. Godfrey: —of a community may oftimes be tied around the hospital. I would sincerely ask the minister to answer the following question: What alternative uses does he have for the Chesley hospital installation? Where are the people who are working there at present, and in the other 23 hospitals he is going to close, going to find jobs? What are the minister's provisions for work for those people? What are his plans to ensure the physicians who are there because the hospital is there are going to stay in that community? Because as it has been suggested, the physicians will move on and we already have a programme which is having difficulty putting physicians into small towns. Is the minister really being shortsighted?

Now maybe if the minister had been a physician or health worker—he doesn't have to be a physician to be qualified in this—he would realize there is a basic, instinctive urge in people, which Sir William Osler, a physician who never did join OHIP at any time pointed out, there is an innate urge for humans to undertake the study of medicine and there is an innate urge for them to do that, usually, around a hospital installation. And it does break down the fabric of that community when the hospital closes.

I would ask if he has considered the following: If I had an industry in my riding which employed 60 people, with spinoff employment for another 60 people, and I closed out that industry, what would his government say about that? Would they ask for a reckoning as to the reasons why? The industry might be able to say: "Well, we are losing money;" but I don't think that his health service is losing money up there when it is equated with the dollar value they get.

I would ask him as well, what are his criteria for not getting better health care in that region? He apparently feels that closing the hospital will mean there is better medical care at the Owen Sound hospital. Can he assure us that the catchment area, which the Chesley has been supplying up until now, can be taken over by the new Hanover and the new Owen Sound hospitals? I have reports, and I do not have the research staff the minister has, which would suggest to me that the Owen Sound hospital has an occupancy rate, fairly continuously, of something about 92 per cent.

You know when we talk about standards of health care, and we discussed the health budget so quickly the other day that I was not able to get to this, what are his criteria of health care, for dollars put in?

The Minister of Labour (Hon. B. Stephenson) has already pointed out we have an accreditation committee which has two or three very simple parameters of what is good health care. One of them is the number of autopsies that are done per year per admission—that's a great one.

The other is the average length of stay; and as you know our drive has been to reduce the average. For some reason or other, if you reduce the average length of stay in a hospital, that is better health care. The other is the number of tonsils and adenoidectomies carried out in that particular region.

These are sort of criteria as far as health care goes. There are others—fire regulations, and other things like that, which we won't go into.

The minister knows, and he himself has admitted, that he has no way of gauging whether our health care is of such and such a level. He has two research teams working at present to determine those parameters. Yet now he says the level of health care given by this institution is not enough. I suggest the only value that our friends across the room have to put on health care is the amount of money it costs to deliver. If it costs too much, then obviously the health care we are getting, the health level we are developing, is not sufficient to justify it.

Let me give you an example of what I mean by putting dollar values on health care. I don't know the average age of the patients in Chesley but I dare say many of them are senior citizens. Senior citizens have many osteoarthritic conditions. Osteoarthritis is usually treated, and well treated, with Aspirin, a fair amount of Aspirin. Because older people have a certain amount of gastrointestinal problems—I am explaining this to you, sir, because you are not a physician and you may not realize the full thrust of what I am saying.

Because they have gastritis, sometimes Aspirin causes an irritation of the stomach lining. In order to overcome that, the usual prescription is coated Aspirin. This is a rock

rib treatment and the best possible treatment of osteoarthritic pains of that type and many other problems. At present, a senior citizen who wants relief and is prescribed coated Aspirin is, by direction of the drug benefit formulary August, 1975, given an asterisk in the column to indicate the medication of choice by the dispensing pharmacist—a medication called Novasen which is an enteric coated Aspirin. Novasen is given because it is the cheapest, the dollar value is less for that.

Mr. Speaker: About 30 seconds.

Mr. Godfrey: Novasen for the last three years have been shown by Quad Review—a prestigious document put out by the federal government—to be unsatisfactory. It does not come up to standards qualifications. This is what I mean by putting dollar value on medical care. The senior citizens of our province who are in Chesley and are being prescribed this are getting inadequate medication, which has never been titrated. Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. minister.

Mr. Martel: The minister has his hands full.

Hon. F. S. Miller: Yes, I only have seven minutes to do it in.

Mr. Speaker, decisions of this type are not taken lightly nor without planning. The fact that some of the speakers have claimed they are not aware of criteria does not mean criteria do not exist. In fact, we have been using a number of bed standards and planning standards for some time, and we have very thorough and comprehensive lists of the bed needs, area by area, municipality by municipality, in this province.

Mr. Dukszta: Why doesn't the minister say those things to his colleagues, so that they know what to do?

Hon. F. S. Miller: I have a certain number of problems. One can either say there should be no limitation upon the spending of health and therefore no need to look for alternative ways of spending today's money—and let me tell you, Mr. Speaker, the first party which said we must do that is the Liberal Party. The Liberal Party has consistently said we spend too much on health care, and at the same time that we have to spend the money—and I can quote at length from Hansard.

Mr. Roy: Sure; but you don't spend it well, that's the problem.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Hon. F. S. Miller: Let me quote the member for Ottawa East on Oct. 30:

> Surely you are going to have to make some hard decisions. The doctors, for instance, in this province may not be pleased and obviously a lot of communities will not be pleased when you start cutting the number of beds in their hospitals.

Mr. Roy: Right.

Hon. F. S. Miller. And on, and on, and on.

Mr. S. Smith: We know that. It's immaterial.

Hon. F. S. Miller: I am doing it after a great deal of thought. The alternative in this particular community was the—

Mr. R. S. Smith: What we want to know is what the—

Hon. F. S. Miller: May I please speak?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The hon. minister has a very few moments.

Hon. F. S. Miller: I have listened very patiently to all of the members and I am trying to explain.

I am fully aware of the unpleasant nature of the decisions being taken. But if, in fact, some of the programmes so glowingly reported or described by the members during my estimates are to have their proper place within my estimates, then I must take some decisions of this nature.

I accept the criticisms made in good faith. I do need to spend more money on children's mental health programmes. I do need to spend more money on a number of other programmes—VD control and rehab medicine and a whole bunch of other things.

It is an acknowledged fact that this province has probably got more active treatment beds than almost any other jurisdiction in the world. I have been told consistently by those opposite that, in fact, we don't need them all. I am taking some of the steps to effect these changes. They will be painful on an individual basis.

I have a list of 22 hospitals—and don't jump to conclusions that that means that they are going to be closed. It simply means that staff, in giving me advice internally in response to a request given to them saying: "How would you save so many dollars and transform it into other programmes whilst maintaining the level of care and accessibility that we need," have come up and said: "You could do it by these means."

Mr. Sargent: The minister is changing his pitch now. He said there were 24 hospitals to be closed.

Hon. F. S. Miller: I have no intention of seeing 24 closed. The member asked me how many were on the list. Each one will, in turn, be told, in negotiation, if it's being considered. Each one will have the option and opportunity to discuss the merits of closing with me and they will learn it in that order only after I've decided there's some reason to consider the problems with them.

Let me look at the comments made by the member for Parkdale (Mr. Dukszta) just last week. He said: "We don't need the number of beds we have."

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Speaker, a point of order.

Hon. F. S. Miller: That's on page 434 of Hansard.

Mr. Speaker: Is it a point of order?

Mr. Sargent: Will the minister accept a question here?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The hon. minister just has a few moments left.

Mr. Sargent: I know that, sir. One short question.

Mr. Speaker: Everyone else had the opportunity to ask. If there's time at the end, maybe. You may ask a question if there's time at the end.

Hon. F. S. Miller: Let me quote the member for Hamilton West (Mr. S. Smith) on page 448 of Hansard last week—

Mr. Dukszta: On a point of order.

Mr. Speaker. The hon. minister has the floor.

Mr. R. S. Smith: On a point of order—

Mr. Speaker: The point of order doesn't interrupt a person who has the floor.

Hon. F. S. Miller: The member for Hamilton West said:

> Now the politically courageous thing to do if the federal government is wrong, and I think they are wrong in not cost-sharing these ambulatory programmes, the politically courageous thing to do is put the patient in more efficiently run place—

Mr. Dukszta: I have a point of personal privilege.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The hon. minister still has the floor.

Mr. Dukszta: But I have a point of personal privilege.

Mr. Speaker: It doesn't matter. Unless the hon. minister wishes to yield the floor? If not, carry on.

Hon. F. S. Miller: No, I don't at this time, because I've only got two minutes left.

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Speaker, have the rules in this House changed? We can't get up on a point of order?

Mr. Speaker: The rules have not changed. The hon. member is wasting time.

Mr. Sargent: Have the rules changed?

Mr. Speaker: The hon. minister.

Hon. F. S. Miller: And he went on to say:

> The politically courageous thing to do is to put the patient in the more efficiently run place anyhow, and then to demand of the population that it take note of the fact that a saving has occurred and the province demands its share of that savings from the federal government. That would be the correct, the moral and the politically courageous thing to do.

Mr. S. Smith: Absolutely right. Is the minister telling us the ones he is closing are inefficient? And if so, by what criteria?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Hon. F. S. Miller: Please let me talk. The member had his turn and I try to obey the rules, okay?

We have made that assessment. We made the decision that that hospital, because of its physical plant, was not a safe place—

Mr. Sargent: It was a political decision and the minister knows it!

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Hon. F. S. Miller: Every decision I make is political because I'm a politician and I'm proud of it.

Mr. Riddell: Even though it's not in the best interests of the people of Ontario.

Hon. F. S. Miller: It's not in the best interests of my party, but it's in the best interests of the people of this province. It's time some of the members realized we're making decisions of that nature today.

Mr. Sargent: The minister doesn't believe that.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Members opposite should have the guts—I mean the intestinal fortitude.

Hon. F. S. Miller: Why else would I do it?

Mr. Riddell: The minister's own conscience tells him—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. Does the minister have further remarks to make?

Mr. Roy: Try to convince the public of your intestinal fortitude.

Hon. Mr. Davis: The member wouldn't know what it is.

Hon. F. S. Miller: Mr. Speaker, we have discussed with that community the fact that we believe they should have some community health clinic or something of that nature in the area. We are willing to consider that building being used for that purpose.

The funds would need to be provided by the community. The doctors are already there; we welcome, encourage and assist in that area, and we have told them that already. We would do that with any other community in which such a change was contemplated, because we intend to maintain the best level of health care possible at the dollars we can afford.

The House recessed at 6 p.m.

ERRATUM

No.	Page	Column	Line	Should read
16	643	2	59	permanent voters' lists tend to be the ones

CONTENTS

Special programme review, statement by Mr. McKeough 748

Toronto teachers' negotiations, statement by Mr. Wells 750

Toronto teachers' negotiations, questions of Mr. Wells: Mr. Lewis, Mr. Singer, Mr. Foulds, Mr. S. Smith 752

Dryden Chemicals Ltd., questions of Mr. McMurtry: Mr. Lewis, Mr. Singer 754

Mental retardation programmes, questions of Mr. Taylor: Mr. Lewis 755

Anti-inflation programme, questions of Mr. McKeough: Mr. Breithaupt, Mr. Shore, Mr. Lewis, Mr. Bullbrook 756

Offshore oil supplies, question of Mr. Timbrell: Mr. Breithaupt 758

Interest payments on Ontario securities, question of Mr. McKeough: Mr. Breithaupt 758

Krever report, question of Mr. F. S. Miller: Mr. Leluk 758

Air pollution study, question of Mr. Kerr: Mr. Martel 758

Lindsay apartment building permit, question of Mr. Kerr: Mr. Eakins 759

Oil and gas prices, question of Mr. McMurtry: Mr. Philip 759

Student housing programme, question of Mr. McMurtry: Mrs. Campbell 759

Lead levels at GM plant, question of Mr. F. S. Miller: Mr. Breaugh 759

Violence in hockey, question of Mr. McMurtry: Mr. Roy 760

Highway 400 extension, questions of Mr. Snow: Mr. Dukszta, Mr. McClellan 760

Book publishing by Centennial College, question of Mr. Parrott: Mr. Reid 761

Anti-inflation programme, question of Mr. McKeough: Mr. Mackenzie 761

Reflective licence plates, question of Mr. Snow: Mr. B. Newman 761

Mailbox sign, questions of Mrs. Scrivener: Mr. McCague, Mr. G. E. Smith 761

Aluminum wiring, question of Mr. Timbrell, Mr. Warner 762

Eganville creamery, question of Mr. Bennett: Mr. Conway 762

Automobile insurance rates, question of Mr. Handleman: Mr. Swart 762

Report, Advisory Council on Senior Citizens, Mrs. Birch 763

Report, Crop Insurance Commission, Mr. W. Newman 763

Report, Ontario Cancer Institute, Mr. F. S. Miller 763

Resolution re Ministry of Energy 763

Motion re select committee to consider Bill 5, Mr. Welch, agreed to 763

Family Benefits Amendment Act, Mr. Martel, first reading 763

Motion to consider matter of urgent public importance, Mr. Sargent, agreed to 763

Re closing of Chesley and District Memorial Hospital, Mr. Dukszta, Mr. S. Smith, Mr. Wildman, Mr. Eaton, Mr. B. Newman, Mr. Bain, B. Stephenson, Mr. McKessock, Mr. Godfrey, Mr. F. S. Miller 768

Recess 782

SPEAKERS IN THIS ISSUE

Bain, R. (Timiskaming NDP)
Bennett, Hon. C. Industry and Tourism (Ottawa South PC)
Birch, Hon. M. Provincial Secretary for Social Development (Scarborough East PC)
Bounsall, E. J. (Windsor-Sandwich NDP)
Breaugh, M. (Oshawa NDP)
Breithaupt, J. R. (Kitchener L)
Bullbrook, J. E. (Sarnia L)
Bryden, M. (Beaches-Woodbine NDP)
Campbell, M. (St. George L)
Conway, S. (Renfrew North L)
Davis, Hon. W. G. Premier (Brampton PC)
Dukszta, J. (Parkdale NDP)
Eakins, J. (Victoria-Haliburton L)
Eaton, R. G. (Middlesex PC)
Evans, D. A. (Simcoe Centre PC)
Foulds, J. F. (Port Arthur NDP)
Gaunt, M. (Huron-Bruce L)
Godfrey, C. (Durham West NDP)
Good, E. R. (Waterloo North L)
Handleman, Hon. S. B. Consumer and Commercial Relations (Carleton PC)
Kennedy, R. D. (Mississauga South PC)
Kerr, Hon. G. A. Environment (Burlington South PC)
Leluk, N. G. (York West PC)
Lewis, S. Leader of the Opposition (Scarborough West NDP)
MacDonald, D. C. (York South NDP)
Mackenzie, R. (Hamilton East NDP)
Mancini, R. (Essex South L)
Martel, E. W. (Sudbury East NDP)
McCague, G. (Dufferin-Simcoe PC)
McClellan, R. (Bellwoods NDP)
McEwen, J. E. (Frontenac-Addington L)
McKeough, Hon. W. D. Treasurer, Minister of Economics and Intergovernmental Affairs (Chatham-Kent PC)
McKessock, R. (Grey L)
McMurtry, Hon. R. Attorney General (Eglinton PC)
Miller, Hon. F. S. Health (Muskoka PC)
Newman, B. (Windsor-Walkerville L)
Newman, Hon. W. Agriculture and Food (Durham North PC)
Parrott, Hon. H. C. Colleges and Universities (Oxford PC)
Philip, E. (Etobicoke NDP)
Reid, T. P. (Rainy River L)
Renwick, J. A. (Riverdale NDP)
Rhodes, Hon. J. R. Housing (Sault Ste. Marie PC)
Riddell, J. (Huron-Middlesex L)
Roy, A. J. (Ottawa East L)

Sargent, E. (Grey-Bruce L)
Scrivener, Hon. M. Government Services (St. David PC)
Shore, M. (London North L)
Singer, V. M. (Wilson Heights L)
Smith, G. E. (Simcoe East PC)
Smith, R. S. (Nipissing L)
Smith, S. (Hamilton West L)
Snow, Hon. J. W. Transportation and Communications (Oakville PC)
Stephenson, Hon. B. Labour (York Mills PC)
Swart, M. (Welland NDP)
Taylor, Hon. J. A. Minister of Community and Social Services (Prince Edward-Lennox PC)
Timbrell, Hon. D. R. Energy (Don Mills PC)
Warner, D. (Scarborough-Ellesmere NDP)
Welch, Hon. R. Culture and Recreation (Brock PC)
Wells, Hon. T. L. Education (Scarborough North PC)
Wildman, B. (Algoma NDP)
Yakabuski, P. J. (Renfrew South PC)
Ziemba, E. (High Park-Swansea NDP)

No. 20



Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT — DAILY EDITION

First Session of the Thirtieth Legislature

Thursday, November 20, 1975

Evening Session

Speaker: Honourable Russell Daniel Rowe
Clerk: Roderick Lewis, QC

THE QUEEN'S PRINTER
PARLIAMENT BUILDINGS, TORONTO
1975

CONTENTS

A list of the speakers taking part in the debates in this issue of Hansard appears, in alphabetical order, at the back of this issue.

Daily contents of proceedings also appears at the back of this issue. Reference to a cumulative index of previous issues can be obtained by calling the Hansard Reporting Service indexing staff. Phone 965-2159.

Hansard subscription price is $15.00 per session, from: Sessional Subscription Service, MGS, 9th Floor, Ferguson Block, Parliament Bldgs., Toronto, M7A 1N3. Phone 965-2238.

LEGISLATURE OF ONTARIO

The House resumed at 8 p.m.

Clerk of the House: The seventh order, resuming the adjourned debate on the motion for second reading of Bill 20, An Act to provide for the Review of Rents in respect of Residential Premises.

RESIDENTIAL PREMISES RENT REVIEW ACT (concluded)

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: Mr. Speaker, I find this a rather strange way to proceed with this legislation. I'm not sure whether I'm in estimates or whether I'm in Bill 20.

Mr. Stokes: The minister is not usually confused. He shouldn't let it worry him.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: Mr. Speaker, I am a bit taken back by the fact that the deputy Speaker is heckling me; I find that rather difficult to appreciate.

Mr. Stokes: I am trying to help the minister.

Mr. Deans: And he knows the rules of the House.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: Mr. Speaker, there seems to be a misconception among some of the hon. members opposite. I would like to make it very clear to them that I am not, as the hon. member for Bellwoods (Mr. McClellan) suggested, a recent convert to socialism. I would like to assure him, for the sake of his sanity—

Mr. Deans: The minister was a recent convert to the Conservative Party.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: —that I am not a recent convert to socialism and I doubt very much whether I ever will be.

One considers some of the positions put forth by members opposite during discussion of this bill—

Mr. Haggerty: It's the minister's bill.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: —and it is extremely interesting to hear what has been said. I might point out that my friends in the Liberal Party—at least I know where the NDP stands; I understand they are socialists—but I'm not sure of what the third party is.

Mr. Makarchuk: That's okay, they are not sure either.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: They are like a utility hockey player. They have played left, they have played right and they have played centre. And on this bill they have played all three positions at the same time.

So I hope to be able to clear up in your minds that I am not a socialist nor do I consider this bill to be socialism. As the member for Bellwoods waved his hand and expounded the virtues of socialism, one could tell immediately from the way he was addressing himself to the very important topic of the principle of the bill that he is without a doubt a very sincere socialist. We appreciate the fact, because there are so few. It's important to all of us.

In the course of the discussion, the question about the principle of the bill seemed to have been forgotten. The principle of the bill is a process to review rents, a process that has been accepted by all sides of this House as being desirable at this particular time in our economic history.

Mr. Deans: It was desirable eight years ago.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: It's here for the House to consider and to accept as it has been presented, as being a good piece of legislation to meet the need at the present time. But to say that I or my colleagues have been dragged kicking and screaming in here with this bill is totally untrue, totally incorrect. Because I am quite happy to stand and defend the bill I am presenting to you. The only thing I find difficult is why the socialists immediately tried to grab onto the philosophical aspect of this thing and not talk about the principle of the bill. In the course of the debate, this came out so clear—

Interjections.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. Let's get on with the bill.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: —it came out so clear by what was happening. The hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Lewis), after saying some very nice things about the minister and the bill, immediately went on to comment on the fact—and I want to make sure I quote him correctly because he does not like to be misquoted, as members of his own caucus know—but in the course of the debate he made the comment that he believes in land being a public utility, or housing was a public utility.

That certainly is a very socialist approach. In fact it's exactly what was said in the British Columbia report that was produced by those very well known leftists, to quote again the Leader of the Opposition—Mr. Jaffray and Mr. Brewin—that housing should be a utility and land ownership should be a utility.

Mr. Samis: The minister sounds like Darcy now.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: I don't subscribe to that philosophy and I'm sure the majority of people in this province don't subscribe to that philosophy, that land or houses should be owned only by the state.

Mr. Martel: Why should it be owned by the speculators?

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: What members opposite would do is deprive people of the right and opportunity to own their own homes. That is what they would do.

Interjections.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please; order, please.

Mr. Stokes: What about the cottage programme? How many of those has the minister sold lately?

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: So that they are continuing on with this business of the state owning everything. Mr. Speaker, let me say this to you also—

Mr. Cassidy: This is Donald Irvine speaking, this isn't John Rhodes.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: This particular bill is introduced for the purpose of reviewing rent in the Province of Ontario—

Mr. Martel: Did Donald Irvine wind the minister up over the dinner hour?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I am very interested in the response here.

Mr. Reid: Nationalize Eli Martel's house. We haven't enough money in the treasury to do that.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please, the hon. minister will continue with his response. If we had fewer interjections, I think we'd all get more out of it.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This particular bill is designed to take care of a situation that is here with us now. It is not considered to be long-term. We have a termination clause in the bill. The purpose of the termination clause is to emphasize that we consider this to be a short-term necessity as part of the overall endeavour of the people of this country to fight inflation.

Mr. Deans: That is offensive.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: We recognize that this is an important part of the cost of living in this province and this country. So there is a requirement to control rents at this time, to have a review of the rents.

Mr. Cassidy: The minister didn't say that during the campaign.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: Mr. Speaker I had hoped to go ahead and touch on each of the questions that were raised by the various members who spoke. But I am not going to because I think we'll do that in some depth once we get into committee. However, there are a couple of points I would like to make.

First of all I want to touch on the point made by the Leader of the Opposition when he said he had read the first 70 pages of the British Columbia report very carefully. By using the content of that report—and he was, of course, aided by other members opposite—he could say that the allowable increase in rents should be at six per cent. I heard on numerous occasions that great, in-depth studies had been carried out. I don't know by whom or where, but these in-depth studies were carried out and obviously six per cent was the figure that should be arrived at and not the eight that we have in the bill.

Mr. Haggerty: That was for 1948.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: But let's talk about what the BC study did produce. The study that he read so carefully, unless he had an edited version, says that the allowance for operating costs, other than taxes to a landlord, should be 3.5 per cent. Then it says that the allowance for taxes—and this is an average—would be at 2.9 per cent. That totals up to 6.4 per cent.

Then it says adding the allowance for increased return on investment to the above items the allowable increase will equal the anticipated rate of inflation. So if nine per cent inflation was assumed, you'd have a figure of 2.6 per cent, which of course adds up to nine per cent as being the total rent increase. If eight per cent inflation is assumed, then the above total becomes eight per cent.

If that's the case, why did the Leader of the Opposition leave out that third and very important factor? Because it is included in the BC report which says that it should be a very integral part when you calculate the particular rents to be allowed.

Mr. Cassidy: He said specifically why—

Hon. Mr. Rhode: He did not bother. He left it out entirely.

Mr. Shore: The minister knows why he left it out?

Mr. Cassidy: Because they've had rent control for over two years.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: The report says, and I quote from page 45 of the report:

> If the government does not use a formula, or accepts unrealistically low anticipated rates of inflation, then it would be doing so as an act of government to selectively control rental housing inflation or to redistribute income between landlords and tenants.

If that's correct, it follows that the claim of six per cent is probaby enough to provide for increases and operating expenses, taxes—and don't forget that the Leader of the Oppoition (Mr. Lewis) said: "and also an additional component of return on investment."

It just isn't right; it isn't correct. It does not provide for any amount of return on investment. So the six per cent figure, with the greatest of respect to my hon. colleagues, is just not realistic.

If you look at the same report that you thought was so valuable and so accurate, and again to quote the Leader of the Opposition: "was even readable and understandable"; read it and understand it then, because it's there. It tells you exactly that the six per cent figure you're talking about is totally unrealistic. So much for the NDP research on that particular item.

Mr. Riddell: Sock it to 'em.

Mr. Deans: I'm absolutely devastated by the minister's arguments.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: No, my arguments may not be devastating but they're accurate.

Mr. Martel: Since when.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: They're accurate and the figures are in front of members. I have the pages of the reports. The reports are available to members. Read them and find out what they say.

The question of roll-backs; where do we stop with roll-backs?

Members opposite suggest we roll back to July 29. Other hon. members say the first of the year; the Leader of the Opposition suggested that perhaps we should roll back to Jan. 1, 1974.

Mr. Cassidy: We'd like to.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: I'm sure one could continue to go back and back in history and find isolated cases where perhaps a roll-back of some nature is needed.

Mr. Cassidy: They're not isolated, they're rampant.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: We picked the date of July 29 as a date to roll back to. We think it's fair and equitable. Ask the hon. member for Sudbury East (Mr. Martel). He has a difficult time with this one.

Mr. Martel: Who?

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: He has a very difficult time with this one because he is trying to represent two constituencies. With all due credit to him he is trying to do it well, except he tried to pass the buck on one side.

Mr. Martel: Not at all.

Mr. Deans: He is trying to do the minister's job and his own.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: Talk to the landlords in his particular riding and the problem they face, even with the roll back to July 29. You see, there are two constituents we all have to serve. Hopefully we will all do it well. We must serve those persons who are tenants in these various buildings. We recognize that. At the same time there are a lot of constituents, of all of us, who have invested sums of money in apartment building and are hoping to be able to retain the ownership of those buildings and not operate them at a loss.

I had constituents from the hon. member for Sudbury East's riding here in Toronto to meet with me. He arranged the meeting and I give him full marks for that. They discussed with me and showed me figures that they had, and I believe they showed the same figures to the hon. member, to show that those people are in really difficult situations.

Mr. Martel: Does the member want to tell the rest of the story now?

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: They stand to lose substantial sums of money, if not lose their buildings in some cases.

Mr. Cassidy: Bull. They are weeping all the way to the bank.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: You cannot take all of the landlords, as the hon. member for Ottawa Centre would love to do, and lump them all into one big group as the ogres who own all the big highrise buildings. That's not the case.

Interjections.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: There are many people in this province today who own rental accommodation; who are making a very reasonable return on their investment—

Mr. Reid: Some of us are making very little.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: —making a very reasonable profit.

Mr. Cassidy: There is nothing about that in the bill.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: But if you roll back that freeze further—even to July 29—it's going to do a lot of financial harm to those people who don't deserve to be hurt.

Mr. Martel: There is nothing to cure the problem though, particularly in Sudbury.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: And if you roll it back they're going to be hurt again. You're talking about a total roll-back. You're talking about people who have not unconscionably raised their rents. They have done so in an orderly fashion, many of them trying to regain losses they've suffered at the time they built those buildings in bringing them on-stream.

I'm not here to defend the large developers and large corporations. They can defend themselves.

Mr. Cassidy: The minister is doing a good job, yes.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: I'm not trying to do that. But I am trying to be reasonable in my thinking about the people who own smaller accommodations. These people can be hurt and hurt badly. Members opposite know it and I know it. I was pleased to have it admitted, too, by those opposite, that rent control is not necessarily the answer.

Mr. Martel: That's right.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: I think we agree, and that's why we've got a termination date in this bill.

Mr. Warner: The government doesn't have a housing policy.

Mr. Martel: They don't have a housing policy.

[8:15]

Mr. Speaker: Order please. Everyone had an opportunity to make their comments before this. Will the hon. minister get on with his reply?

Mr. Samis: He sure interrupted us when we spoke.

An hon. member: No, he didn't.

Mr. Samis: Sure he did.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: There can be no doubt that at the present time there are some problems facing not only Ontario but right across this country; however don't blow those problems out of proportion. I recognize they are very difficult and very real here in Metropolitan Toronto; there is no question about that. But in many communities across this province there is not the problem.

There are vacancies—three, four, five, six per cent vacancy rates in apartments. The hon. members who represent the Kitchener area and the London area will tell the House that's true. Those from Hamilton will tell members, I believe, that there are considerable vacancy rates in apartment facilities in that city.

Mr. Deans: That doesn't keep the rents from rising unnecessarily.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: We don't have that major problem on a province-wide basis. but what we are doing is applying this legislation in a universal manner, as part of an anti-inflation programme and part of a way to keep costs down. One of the great cries

from the New Democrats, both federally and provincially, has been we are controlling everything but prices. This, I think, does control prices.

Mr. Deans: That's true.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: I have no qualms at all about introducing this type of legislation.

Mr. Martel: That is not true.

Mr. Deans: Unlike his predecessor.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: Let's talk a little bit about—

Mr. Ferrier: He thought he had a better way than the minister is giving us.

Interjections.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: Mr. Speaker, I wanted no part of that. Yes, I thought I did. I thought I could find a better way of doing it, a way which would not be harmful to anyone, a way which would be equitable. I attempted to find it. I couldn't. I admit without any fear that I couldn't find a better way of doing it than to have the review process. I fully admit that I thought there was a way it could be done. I thought that a straight percentage increase would be adequate to handle the situation.

Mr. Shore: There will be some suggestions to help the minister.

Mr. Good: A few amendments.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: It just wouldn't do it and I am the first to admit that; but by golly I sincerely hope the hon. member for Cochrane South would not criticize me for trying. I hope he wouldn't criticize me for admitting I couldn't do it.

Mr. Martel: I am glad to see the minister move over.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: I want to come back to this six or eight per cent, because I understand from what several members have told me that this is a very strong position which their caucus is taking. I hope they would reconsider—and I sincerely mean this—before we get into debate of this thing clause by clause. I sincerely hope they will reconsider their position.

There is a gentleman by the name of Cragg who did a report for the British Columbia rentals man. Perhaps members have read it. In one part of his report he says: "The increase in rents needed to compensate fully for the cost changes is estimated to be 30 per cent, given the eight per cent increase in 1974." That's a report from Mr. Cragg to the British Columbia rentals man.

Mr. Cassidy: That report was drastically outdated and the minister knows it.

Hon. Mr. Rhode: He said:

> Such a large increase for most rental accommodation without specific justification might well appear unreasonable, indeed, outrageous. It is not suggested that the allowable rent increase be 30 per cent. Instead it is suggested that the effects of dramatic changes should be spread over time. Doing so at a moderate basis would still give an allowable rent increase of 21.2 per cent.

The hon. member for Ottawa Centre wants to disregard this report because it doesn't fit his figures. I am just reading the report that went to the BC rentals man. I am not making it up.

Mr. Cassidy: Yes, and the BC government threw it out because it was no good.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: He said, "A more extreme form of distribution over time would produce a figure of 16 per cent."

Mr. Riddell: Now they are going to get thrown out.

Mr. Cassidy: Not by the Liberals.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: And then, "Before embracing extreme distribution of changes over time with enthusiasm, either in terms of the 16 per cent figure—"; I am not going to read any more because members know what happened. The British Columbia government, the member said, threw it out; but they did vote for a 10.6 per cent ceiling, presumably as a result of considering this report. They have not gone to eight per cent as yet, despite the report which has come out from Jaffray and Brewin and all of the other people who took part in that report.

They still haven't accepted that report either, so don't sit there and tell me that the BC report has been taken in by the British Columbia government and applied wholesale. It has not. They still are at a 10.6 per cent increase for 1975, remember that.

As for housing starts, rental starts, the word is there is not going to be any problem; rent control is not the problem. Perhaps it isn't. We will soon find out. We will find out whether or not there are starts.

Mr. Cassidy: We have no control over those starts in the province right now.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: Perhaps I should pass along a comment which came from another report which I am sure, again, the hon. members have read. It's from the Fraser Institute report, Rent Control: A Popular Paradox:

> In the 1970s, there has been something of a housing revolution in Sweden. The gradual abolition of rent controls since 1958 when council houses were exempted has meant a gradual reduction in the housing shortage and in the 1970s the shortage has been replaced by a surplus.
>
> In the face of a growing surplus the rate of construction has decreased from an all-time record of 110,000 dwelling units in 1970 to 70,000 in 1975. The last remnants of rent control were removed in 1975.

Some glimpses of this somewhat surprising development are presented later in the report. They didn't work in Sweden.

Mr. Young: They removed controls because they built enough housing.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: The member for Yorkview knows quite well what happened in Sweden.

> The Swedish government, in 1965, made a bold promise according to which 1,000,000 new dwellings would be built during the decade 1965 to 1974. Until then the hunger for new dwellings had seemed insatiable. The government did not provide for the possibility of the surplus of housing. Thanks to our over-dimensioned building industry and extensive subsidies, the over-ambitious programme could be fulfilled.
>
> The gradual abolition of rent control, plus extensive new construction, laid the base for a surplus, but from 1970 it became really distressing. However, a political promise is a promise and in spite of growing surpluses the building programme had to be fulfilled. A Swedish construction record of 110,000 new dwelling units was reached in 1970, after which construction went on at a decreasing rate. According to our socialist Swedish government, housing construction must be controlled in order to prevent the ups and downs of private unregulated production.
>
> In spite of strict control, construction in Sweden went down from 110,000 to 70,000 dwelling units in five years.
>
> In 1976, according to starting statistics, new construction will probably be no more than 55,000, which means a decrease of 50 per cent in six years.
>
> Swedish socialist government in recent decades have been hostile towards owner-occupied single-family houses, an individual, middle-class sort of housing—[and where have I heard that before? About an hour and a half ago, two hours ago]—individualistic middle class sort of housing. So new construction of such houses was restricted. What it really boils down to is that the tenants themselves—about 650,000 Swedes, are members of the tenants association, from the beginning were fanatical defenders of rent control; but the experiences of rent controls were so disheartening that some 10 years ago the association changed its policy and began lobbying for repeal of the controls.

Mr. Ferrier: The minister is arguing against his own bill.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: No, I am not arguing against my bill. I am saying that what we are bringing in here today is a part of the anti-inflation programme to help keep costs down and to help hold down the costs people are facing to rent accommodation.

Mr. Deans: Nonsense.

Mr. Samis: Political survival.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: It isn't going to provide more housing. I agree with what was said opposite that rent controls are not the answer. They are not the answer. The Swedish experience, looked upon with such great favour by the member for Yorkview and others, is not that heartening either when the tenants themselves ask: "Please, please take the controls off."

Mr. Martel: Why doesn't the government build houses?

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: That is what they want. Well, let's go on to another point.

Another point that members have taken me to task on is the question of why we won't control the rents on public housing. I know the member for Ottawa Centre (Mr. Cassidy) has spoken on this earlier, as have others. Let's talk about public housing.

The purpose of rent review legislation or any type of control legislation is to prevent undue profits. It clearly should not apply, then, to government-owned and government-subsidized housing because there is no profit. By the way, the British Columbia report, in fact it suggests that they not be controlled;

and the Metro Toronto Social Planning Council suggests government-subsidized housing be not controlled. But members opposite feel it should be controlled.

Mr. Shore: Why should they go up 20 per cent in one year then?

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: Because their rents are adjusted annually according to the changes in the person's income. In Ontario it is roughly 25 per cent of the person's annual income. And that rent goes up and down according to that person's income.

Remember as well that if you went to a rent control programme which allows the pass-through of costs, it is costing about 23 per cent per year on the increased costs to operate Ontario Housing units.

Mr. Shore: Twenty-three per cent?

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: If you pass that 23 per cent increased cost to the individual owner they couldn't afford the rents.

Mr. Good: You really have poor management.

Mr. Shore: Who is absorbing the difference between eight and 23 per cent?

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: We are talking about 25 per cent of their incomes, and that's a fair and equitable way of treating it on the subsidized programme.

Just for example, and I want to read this as an example:

> In some instances incomes rise substantially and rents are adjusted accordingly. If an eight per cent ceiling on increases were applied, considerable inequities would occur where families with identical incomes would pay widely differing rents. For example, family A with an income of $8,000 per annum currently pays $2,000 rent or 25 per cent of income. If family B increased its income from $5,000 to $8,000, rent would rise from $1,250 to $2,000. If increases were limited to eight per cent, the rent of family B would be $1,350 or 17 per cent of income.

So you have inequities in subsidized housing.

In limited-dividend housing, again we don't think there should be any controls, because initially the rents must be as low as possible in relation to market and represent good value, as appraised by the Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation. As for non-profit housing, I think the definition itself is clear; it is non-profit and really should not be subject to the rental controls.

I would ask you to rethink that particular position you have taken, because I don't think it does apply. I think these people's rents will go up if their income goes up; that's the whole purpose of Ontario Housing —to provide housing where we can for people who are not able to meet the market rents; their rent goes down if their income goes down, and it is only fair that it should work that way.

Included in their rental as well, remember, are their utilities; and no matter whether the rates of those utilities increase or decrease, their rents remain based upon their income and not on the increases of pass-through of utilities.

Mr. Bounsall: Some of them only.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: On Ontario Housing geared-to-income units?

Mr. Bounsall: Some of the utilities only are covered and then only in some projects.

Mrs. Campbell: Senior citizens.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: Senior citizens, with the exception of—oh, telephones? Does the member want to talk about telephones? I can't be involved in telephones.

Mr. Bounsall: We are talking about heat and light.

Mr. Samis: Townhouses.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: I am talking about heating, water, electricity—they are all part of it.

Mr. Bounsall: No, they are not. Is the minister making a commitment to that?

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: Again, I don't believe rents geared to income should be subject to the rent controls; they do have the controls now. They are controlled.

Mrs. Campbell: Fifty-one dollars to $104; just unbelievable.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: Any increase that is experienced by people in those particular units, the rent-geared-to-income units, is as a direct result of their income going up. Surely there is some merit to the fact that we hold them at 25 per cent. I see nothing wrong with that. On that particular point, I really believe that you should consider those positions again before we get into committee.

I do want to say that since the bill was first introduced, I have looked at the question of not having controls on fourplexes or smaller

units. I felt there was a need to keep the controls off a part of the market in order to encourage that type of development to take place. I recognize from the figures we produced in the ministry that a large number of people in this province were living in these small units. I must really admit to you, I did not realize so many people in Ontario were living in units of four or less on a rental basis. They comprise about 40 per cent of the total people who are renting accommodation.

The point that was made by the hon. member for Cochrane South (Mr. Ferrier) is a very valid one, that in many of the small communities they don't have large highrise buildings; many of them are fourplexes, triplexes, duplexes and single units. So I am quite prepared to amend the legislation to include those units under the controls.

Mr. Good: Any single-family rental unit. Is that what you're saying?

Mr. Samis: Good move!

Mr. Cassidy: Congratulations. That's a welcome move.

Mr. Martel: You're horse-trading tonight.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: No, there is no horse-trading going on at all. I am simply asking you to take a look at what appeared to be hard positions you have taken, and I think that really you should rework those positions.

If you are talking about the percentage increase, I think the eight per cent increase is a fair increase. I was asked, "How did you arrive at the figure?" As I said earlier in this debate, I arrived at the eight per cent like you arrived at the six per cent—you pulled it out of the air; right? But that's not really correct. My eight per cent was arrived at, quite frankly, as a result of discussions we had in Ottawa, and that was the figure that was being put forth as being applicable across this country.

Mr. McClellan: What about the appeal process?

[8:30]

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: Let's talk about the appeal process. First of all, one of the members —I think it's the member for Oshawa (Mr. Breaugh)—one of his questions was why the eight per cent as a figure? Why did we want to change that figure again in 1976? Well perhaps for the same reason that British Columbia has moved their figure around—because you try to find out what is a fair figure to be used.

Mr. Bounsall: Perhaps.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: But the other thing is that the figure really doesn't mean anything. The figure doesn't mean anything on Jan. 1, 1976. There is an appeal process both ways from it. So really the figure doesn't mean a blessed thing.

Mrs. Campbell: Yes, we are here too.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: If the tenant feels the eight per cent is too high, he can appeal for a lower rate, can appeal anything from zero up on any increases imposed by the landlord. The landlord, on the other hand, is in the same position. If he feels he requires more than eight per cent, he must go to the review officer and ask to have that particular rent increased. So, the figure of eight, nine, 10 really doesn't matter too much; except for the particular freeze-time period from the end of July to the end of the year. So those figures had to be fair.

Mrs. Campbell: There could be 108 per cent.

Mr. Cassidy: It affects the balance between the tenant and the landlord. The higher the figure, the tougher it is for the tenants.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: That's a matter to be seen and that's, perhaps, one of the reasons we want to have an opportunity to rework that particular figure come the middle of 1976.

Again, I don't want to prolong this because I know there are those who want to get back at the estimates of this. I am not going to try to answer all of the questions again. I think we'll have a chance to answer them all when we get into committee.

The review process: I want to touch on that for the member for Bellwoods. We want to set up that review process; we want to have it all set to go by the time Jan. 1 is here, in all of the areas of this province at the same time, not to have it develop here in Metro first and working out. We have experienced that in the past, and I know other members from outside Metro will agree.

The rent review officers should be in place immediately. Their particular duties I think, or their scope of responsibility and their authority, is fairly well outlined in the bill; but there will be regulations produced to go with the bill, and at the same time they will be instructed how to carry out their responsibilities. The bill provides, I think quite fairly, for both parties to have access to professional

and technical advice in their hearings; they'll have that opportunity.

You may ask, well, why both parties? Well, again, there are many small landlords, with family-operated businesses, who really will need, and should have, the opportunity to avail themselves of the free service of professional and technical advice when they go before a review officer or eventually on to the board.

In the course of the debate the question was asked about commercial renting. We decided not to include commercial in the bill, as you can see—

Mr. Deans: Because, after all, it doesn't contribute to rising costs, does it?

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: The reasons for that, of course, is that in the commercial area there is no shortage of space in Ontario today; there is a good competitive market, and after all the marketplace is still the best regulated, which hon. members opposite have admitted in the course of the debate yesterday and the day before.

Mr. Deans: That doesn't make any sense—what the minister just said.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: There is no need to do it. The leases in the commercial area are long-term leases for the most part, usually a minimum of three years and up to 10- and 15-year leases. And as for many of these horror stories that I've heard about the commercial leases—no one at any time ever told me whether the individual was coming off a one-year lease, a five-year lease, or a 10-year lease.

The one that was talked about, I understand, was coming off a 20-year lease and was objecting because the rent was being increased. I would hope to think that the rent would be increased, whether it is by a municipality or whoever it is, after 20 years. Many people are going on into five- and 10-year leases and beyond. We just don't think it is necessary to control the rents of commercial establishments, not simply for the purpose of putting them under control.

Mr. Speaker, I believe this is a good bill to accomplish the things it was set out to do—with the amendment that I propose; and I am sure there may be other discussions on other amendments. I believe that the bill, as presented, will meet the needs the people are facing today.

This is not a rent-control bill. It will control them for a while, but basically it is a review bill.

Mr. Martel: A rose by any other name.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: It is a review bill and I think—

Mr. Reid: Does the minister want to bet on that?

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: And it should very well terminate by the middle of 1977.

Mr. Reid: The minister is a dreamer.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: Hopefully that's what will happen.

Mr. Martel: As soon as we get the housing.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: The housing programmes will continue and hopefully they will meet the demand.

Mr. Martel: How can the government continue with the housing programmes? They haven't started.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: But this sort of bill is not going to encourage rental accommodation to be built in the Province of Ontario. I have listened to some of the things that have been said over the last few days, especially by the Leader of the Opposition, and I want to make this clear. I'm sure members will all appreciate that over the past six to eight months the Leader of the Opposition has been unbelievably sweet and lovable and kind and smiling and moderate.

Mr. Haggerty: He is in bed with you fellows there.

Mrs. Campbell: He is in bed with you.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: Just listen to him speak as he has over the last couple of days on this bill, hailing his socialist friend and colleague, the member for Bellwood, hailing that great socialist over there, who is competition for the leader. But I'm convinced that deep inside the Stephen Lewis of 1975 there is, simmering and bubbling and churning and just dying to burst forward, the Stephen Lewis of 1971; and don't anybody forget it, it's there.

Interjections.

Mr. Eaton: The minister has them chirping over there.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The hon. minister has the floor.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: Mr. Speaker, I look forward to the discussion we are going to

have when we get into the bill clause by clause where I'm sure we'll have a lot more questions to answer at that time.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

Mr. Speaker: Shall this bill be ordered for third reading?

Mr. Cassidy: On a point of order, I believe it is customary to call for the yeas and nays on the bill. Is that not correct?

Mr. Speaker: No, it is not correct.

Mr. Cassidy: I believe that can be requested.

Mr. Speaker: I asked that the vote be recorded and there was no dissent, so I carried it. Are you voting against the bill?

Mr. Cassidy: No, of course not.

Mr. Speaker: I asked the question in the normal way. Everything is in order, and the bill is carried.

An hon. member: He is just a new boy.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Mr. Cassidy: Given the problems of conscience that some members expressed, they should have the opportunity to vote.

Mr. Speaker: No one rose to the occasion in time. I carried the bill. Second reading of the bill was carried.

Which committee is it going to, Mr. Minister?

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: It is going to a select committee.

Mr. Speaker: Select committee, so ordered.

Hon. Mr. Welch moved, seconded by Mr. Deans, that a select committee of the House be appointed to consider Bill 20, such committee to have authority to sit concurrently with the House and to be composed as follows: Mr. Williams, chairman; Messrs. Cassidy, Good, Gregory, Johnston, McClellan, Mackenzie, Morrow, Norton, O'Neil, Stong and Swart.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. Good: Could the House leader indicate what timetable we might expect on this committee so that delegations can be notified?

Hon. Mr. Welch: To respond to that, it is my hope that during the time the Minister of Housing is before the standing committee on estimates, the select committee might have time to organize and give some consideration to their procedures with respect to advertising and their timetable. Hopefully they can start their meetings a week from today. The Minister of Housing will be before the standing committee on estimates until at least Tuesday and I hope the committee will have some chance to get organized in the interim.

Mr. Reid: The minister doesn't like that suggestion.

Mrs. Campbell: You better talk to your minister. He can't do it.

Mr. Reid: The minister is shaking his head. That means no.

Mrs. Campbell: He says no.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Hon. Mr. Welch: What is that?

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: Carry on.

Mr. Stokes: The House leader orders the business.

Hon. Mr. Welch: On Tuesday we will be considering Bill 26, and it would be my plan to refer Bill 26 to this select committee as well.

Mr. Cassidy: Just on a point of order, though I haven't had a chance to check this with my own House leader—but he needn't shake—is it okay for the committee to include in its advertising on submissions that it will also be inviting submissions on Bill 26, so that the advertising can precede the second reading?

Hon. Mr. Welch: I think that as long as we can proceed on the assumption that Bill 26 will have approval in principle on second reading we could do that.

Mr. Reid: The minister is much more humble in these circumstances.

Mrs. Bryden: Mr. Speaker, may I ask a question for clarification? I hope the committee will be authorized to spend the money for advertising, unlike the committees on Bills 4 and 5 which appeared not to be able to do so.

Hon. Mr. Welch: I think the confusion as far as that committee is concerned is confined to that committee. There's certainly no problem with respect to other committees doing this and that matter's been clarified. I would think there would be no problems,

although the chairman of that committee has, in fact, directed a question to the Speaker of the House today. I'm sure that will be clarified tomorrow.

The standing committee on the estimates will resume now.

[8:45]

Clerk of the House: The sixth order, House in committee of the whole.

ASSESSMENT AMENDMENT ACT

House in committee on Bill 8, An Act to amend the Assessment Act.

Mr. Chairman: Are there any questions, comments or amendments to any section, and if so, to which section?

Bill 8 reported.

Hon. Mr. Welch moved that the committee rise and report.

Motion agreed to.

The House resumed, Mr. Speaker in the chair.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Speaker, the committee of the whole House begs to report one bill without amendment and asks for leave to sit again.

Report agreed to.

THIRD READINGS

The following bills were given third reading upon motion:

Bill 8, An Act to amend the Assessment Act.

Bill 1, An Act to amend the Judicature Act.

Bill 9, An Act to amend the Bills of Sale and Chattel Mortgages Act.

Bill 10, An Act to amend the Assignment of Book Debts Act.

Bill 11, An Act to amend the Conditional Sales Act.

Clerk of the House: The 12th order, House in committee of supply.

ESTIMATES, SOCIAL DEVELOPMENT POLICY FIELD

Hon. Mr. Welch: Mr. Chairman, I assume it would be in order for the Provincial Secretary for Social Development to occupy a seat in the front row to make it convenient.

Mr. Chairman: Would the committee concur? Agreed. Would the hon. minister have a statement?

Hon. Mrs. Birch: Yes, Mr. Chairman. I would like to make a few remarks in introducing the estimates of the Secretariat for Social Development.

Mr. Ruston: Turn the mike over.

Mr. Lewis: What? Is there something sacred about that seat to your right that you couldn't sit there?

Hon. Mrs. Birch: I'd feel very uncomfortable.

Mr. Lewis: Really?

Hon. Mr. Welch: There is only one person qualified for that seat.

Hon. Mrs. Birch: I don't think I could hope to qualify for that seat.

Mr. Lewis: You might do better at it than the present incumbent.

Hon. Mrs. Birch: I doubt that very much.

Mr. Chairman: Order, please. The hon. minister will continue.

Hon. Mrs. Birch: Mr. Chairman, I would like to make a few remarks in introducing the estimates of the Secretariat for Social Development. The Social Development Secretariat is a small unit in government but I think an important one. It was established in 1972 on the recommendation of the Committee on Government Productivity and has come to compromise—comprise four elements.

Mr. Martel: Compromise is right.

Hon. Mrs. Birch: That was a Freudian slip.

Mr. Deans: I think you were right the first time.

An hon. member: I can't hear anything here.

Mr. Deans: You're not missing anything.

Hon. Mrs. Birch: You can't hear?

Mr. R. S. Smith: Move over to the Premier's (Mr. Davis') place. He won't be there.

Hon. Mrs. Birch: I'll move over here, but this is as far as I am going—that's close enough.

Mr. Reid: You look right at home there.

Hon. Mrs. Birch: Thank you very much.

First is our secretariat staff, a small group of analysts who assist me, the cabinet committee on social development, and the five ministries—Colleges and Universities, Community and Social Services, Culture and Recreation, Education, and Health—all in the social policy field, in seeking to initiate, co-ordinate and improve policy.

Secondly, there is the Youth Secretariat, which was formerly my responsibility and which I was pleased to welcome back this year.

Thirdly, there are our four advisory councils—for the status of women, for multiculturalism, for senior citizens, and for the physically handicapped. Our estimates provide the direct cost of these councils and their support staff.

Fourth is my own small staff.

The policy fields were established to provide for the co-ordination of policies. Co-ordination is perhaps an over-worked word these days, but it is increasingly acknowledged as an essential ingredient in modern government. One way or another most governments are now establishing formal procedures for policy co-ordination. They take various forms, although they have almost all the same roles and responsibilities. Not only must we strive for increased consistency as between the various policies of different ministries, but we must also pay increased attention to the need for making different policies and programmes in various parts of government interlock effectively. This process can also serve to clarify responsibilities and avoid duplicated efforts.

A couple of examples of the process are to be seen in the conception control programme and in our review of policy relating to residential institutions. After careful review, the policy field established the framework for the conception control programme. This was given to the Ministry of Health to operate. Residential services in Ontario are now being provided under 26 different Acts. A major review of all these is being directed by the policy field committee and will, I hope, lead to both simplification and rationalization.

Of course, the context in which we address issues in social policy in Ontario is difficult and demanding. Existing programmes and commitments are most often compelling and great pressures arise both for enlarging the scope of present programmes and for adding new programmes to serve new needs. There are complex linkages, not only between programmes in various ministries, but also between our programmes and those of the federal government and those at the municipal level. All of this makes change and development slow and often difficult.

In the past 15 years there has been an enormous increase in the range and scope and cost of the programmes and services provided by the ministries within the social policy field. During the 1960s we were criticized for not spending enough, although the rate of spending and of taxing increased most rapidly during those years.

In the 1970s there have not been so many new programmes, and our efforts have been directed most frequently to improving the effectiveness and efficiency of existing programmes. It is, of course, just in this area where the co-ordination of the efforts of different ministries and agencies becomes most critical. Hence the need for the policy field system in recent years.

It is of interest to note that in 1971, the year before the policy field structure was established, the programmes and the services that now fall into the social policy field cost an amount equal to about 10.5 per cent of Ontario's gross provincial product. This year they will cost an amount equal to 10.3 per cent of the gross provincial product. It has been, we think, a significant accomplishment to make the many improvements that have been realized without increasing the relative costs of these programmes.

Mr. Martel: Come on. You've left programmes to die all over the ball park.

Mr. Chairman: Order, please.

Hon. Mrs. Birch: In this process, and with the advice from our councils, we have been refining our goals for social policy. We are more than ever convinced that we must foster independence rather than dependence. There will always be an essential role for institutions, but we believe we must take care that the individual retains the authority and the responsibility necessary for making decisions on his own behalf. We must take increasing care that the means we adopt for supportive, essential institutional services do not inadvertently create incentives for people to become unnecessarily institutionalized.

I meet many groups and delegations that seek government grants. I have to remind myself and some of these groups that there are no government grants, there are only taxpayers' grants. Canada and Ontario are trying to fight the cancer of inflation. A little

over two weeks ago, the Treasurer (Mr. McKeough) indicated to this House how Ontario would support the national anti-inflation programme, and he went on to indicate that the target for expenditure growth for the next year had been fixed by the government at 10 per cent.

Earlier today, the Treasurer tabled the report of the Special Programme Review Committee, and those of you who've had a chance to leaf through that report will realize that it contains many powerful recommendations concerning social policy in Ontario. The consideration of such recommendations and the massive work required in considering expenditure constraints both require the most careful co-ordination between the ministry and the programmes of the social policy field. This co-ordination has become one of the major aspects in the work of the cabinet committee on social development, assisted by the Social Development Secretariat.

Mr. Martel: Mr. Chairman, I am delighted to learn that one measures social policy by constraints, and that's the degree to which one judges the effectiveness of the policies. If you can keep it around 10.3 per cent then you're judged to have a good programme. I've never heard such junk in my life and I'm going to talk about it and—

Mr. Reid: You have such a sensitive touch.

Mr. Martel: I don't have any intention to be sensitive about it when I deal with human needs. The little gurgling that just emanated from you doesn't deal with human needs.

Mr. Chairman: Order, please. Could we deal with the estimates?

Interjections.

Mr. Martel: Mr. Chairman, I'm dealing with them and I don't intend to be—

Mr. Reid: I understand human needs.

Mr. Martel: We'll just judge what the minister says and how accurate it is. I want to go back to a statement she made on June 4, 1974. We might as well pick the pieces up. During the election, I tried to get a report, the progress report, the second report of the advisory council on day care. We'll measure that programme by its success. This was printed in June, 1975. The irony was that throughout the entire election, of course, one couldn't get one's hands on it. John Anderson kept saying every day that it was going to come out. There was nothing controversial about it, but they managed to keep it under wraps until after the election.

Mr. Samis: Shame.

Mr. Martel: The reason is obvious. I want to quote a couple of statements the minister made in her statement on June 4 and then a couple of the recommendations, which is evidence as to why this report did not see the light of day during the election campaign.

On about the fourth page of her statement made about one year ago—the two real issues in this statement were, of course, qualifications of the staff, and ratios—the minister said:

> To encourage more participation and parent involvement in all-day programmes, the ministry has increasingly been approving staff on the basis of individual competence and experience rather than by relying on any particular set of professional qualifications.

What the minister was laying the groundwork for was destroying any qualifications which were really necessary for day care.

The recommendations on qualifications which came out in the second report and, of course, fly in the face of everything the minister stated on that day, are:

> Staff qualifications: Trained or qualified staff should mean those who have obtained the equivalent of the following components: thorough knowledge of the basic principles of child development from birth to adolescence; an understanding of the application of this knowledge to the daily activities of the children; adequate supervised practice in the application of (a) and (b) in the daily work with children.

It goes on and on and there are about nine points to the qualifications suggested by the group which did the study.

In her statement in June the minister was dealing with ratios. We were never able to find out why the minister took the position she did but she refused to table the documents—the working papers which were used. She never did give those to anyone and they never saw the light of day.

I am quoting the minister:

> The present regulations require all-day nurseries to have at least two people on staff. Obviously that is sensible, and we will retain the requirement but we will make the following changes in other ratios required under the regulations.

The minister went on to list a whole series of regulations which, if they had been accepted, would have watered down the daycare programme a great deal.

What are the recommendations of the advisory group? It says of staff-child ratios,

"Present staff-child ratios should be maintained." That flies in the face of what the minister wanted to do. She brags about maintaining quality of service when, if she had had her way, she would have destroyed what service existed.

I remind the minister that in another part of her statement she stated three very admirable aims but very little has been done about them. The first was, "First priority is the establishment and delivery of daycare service to handicapped children"; the second was, "To assure that children from low-income families and native children have access to daycare services"; and third, "The use of public funds and facilities in the more rapid development of daycare service so they can be made generally available across Ontario."

To this point in time I think we have something like 40,000 daycare placements most of which came as a result of a campaign promise in 1971 followed by a $15 million contribution in 1974 which will run to 1976 before it is used up. It means we have not moved ahead in day care.

[9:00]

I understand there are five projects approved in the Ministry of Community and Social Services to deal with the handicapped and the mentally retarded. They have been on the drawing board for some time. The money has been allocated for some time but every time one moves ahead to introduce the programme it is held back for yet another reason. The minister shakes his head.

The programmes I am referring to and which I only learned about recently indicate, I am told, that these are programmes using the Victorian Order of Nursing or public health nurses which would identify the children who are in fact afflicted while they are infants. Then the hope is to work with the mother and the day care so that in fact the mother learns to handle the children properly at an early age, preventing depression within her, malnutrition and a whole series of other things which occur.

In these five programmes the money has been allocated and yet none of them have gone ahead. It would be interesting to know when they come off the drawing board. That's part of the promise for the handicapped from the minister when she made her statement on that occasion. It was her statement for the handicapped and we have got five pilot projects, none of which has started.

Well, that's significant. We have about 40,000—I am using ball park figures—we have about 40,000 children—

Hon. Mr. Davis: Which ball park?

Mr. Martel: Well, Yankee Stadium.

Hon. Mr. Davis: I thought you were an economic nationalist. What are you doing referring to Yankee Stadium?

An hon. member: Jarry Park.

Mr. Martel: There are about 40,000 young people in day care.

Hon. Mr. Taylor: Forty-eight.

Mr. Martel: About a third subsidized, though. Isn't that the important point? Because in the study out of England under the Child Welfare Act and it is called "Nursery Education, the Need for Research," it says—let me just quote one sentence:

> The failure of many children to benefit fully from their total school experience and to respond adequately to challenges and opportunities with which they were daily presented has, in the light of research findings, been attributed to the inhibitory and handicapping influences associated with development in uncongenial environments.

And we in Ontario subsidize approximately a third of the young people who are in day care—a third. The Minister of Labour shakes her head. I suspect she's wrong.

Hon. B. Stephenson: I suspect you are.

Mr. Martel: No, I don't suspect I am. About a third—when we reached 40-odd thousand, we were subsidizing in the neighbourhood of 12,000 children.

Hon. Mr. Taylor: Oh no.

Mr. Martel: Oh yes. And what we have failed to do of course is to provide day care for the group that needs it most. If there are budgetary restraints, surely to God it must go to those who need it and that's the handicapped. Surely it should go to those where there are working parents and where in fact we would have to be subsidizing. But we don't subsidize more than a third, which in effect means that those people who are deriving the most benefit from day care are the people who can afford it to some degree. Those who are deprived and who need it most are the very children who are not receiving that type of care.

Mr. Laughren: Can't get it.

Mr. Martel: They can't get it; it doesn't exist. That was the second of the minister's great statements on that occasion.

You know, the Minister of Labour keeps shaking her head in disbelief. Would somebody tell her, so she doesn't die of apoplexy over there, that in fact there are about a third of the children in Ontario subsidized to some degree?

Hon. Mr. Davis: I will tell you her life expectancy politically and every other way is much longer than yours.

An hon. member: Put up a wager.

Mr. Martel: Would you like to wager a little bet on that?

Hon. Mr. Davis: I would not do that in this House—

Mr. Samis: A moral wager. Non-monetary.

Hon. Mr. Davis: —with my background.

Mr. Martel: So we have two of the first three points that she spoke about which were going to be of great benefit. In fact, we haven't moved, but she bragged, "We kept it within the 10.3" And, of course, the numbers. The minister says 48,000—

Hon. Mr. Taylor: Forty-eight, I said.

Mr. Martel: Forty-eight thousand are in day care today. What's the need—300,000 roughly in Ontario?

Hon. Mr. Taylor: No, no.

Hon. B. Stephenson: No such figure.

Mr. Laughren: Four hundred thousand.

Hon. Mr. Taylor: No substantiation.

Mr. Laughren: Oh, yes there is. At least 400,000.

Mr. Martel: I talked to a couple of people in the civil service the other day who tell me that in fact if schools were used as they are being more used in the United States now, for day care – particularly the elementary schools and the high schools which have many empty rooms – without any capital cost, or very little, we could put another 100,000 kiddies in day care. For three years I have begged this government, as the former Minister of Community and Social Services is aware, to utilize high-school facilities to provide day care—and with very little capital cost. We could use the elementary schools at the same time at very little capital cost, particularly to provide some type of day care during the lunch hour, and maybe from 3:30 until 6 p.m., until the parents are home from work. If we were sincere, if we were interested, we would do something in day care. We brag about 48,000 places. Well, you know, it's sheer nonsense. Sheer nonsense.

An hon. member: It's a disgrace.

Mr. Martel: With very little capital cost we could probably introduce another 100,000 places. But we won't even look at it, really. I'm told that Ontario secondary school teachers agree with this concept. Surely, the role of the policy ministry is to start co-ordinating what goes on in this field. But no, she issued a statement—the most backward statement of the century—on June 4, 1974.

There are other ideas that are floating around within the ministry itself which never see the light of day. One of the suggestions being bandied about over there is that when you deal with a programme for fewer than five children in the home, then the easiest way to reach as many families as possible is to develop first-rate television programmes. This would teach the mothers who are looking after three or four children in the home on ways to care for children. And it can be done—but that's too simple.

We use educational television all the time for a variety of other things. Why couldn't a programme like that be developed? Experts in the field could do the preparatory work for it, and then beam it into all the homes as a public service. This we could be doing to guarantee a better environment for young people who are in homes of five or less children. But the people who have advocated this over in the ministry, I am told, don't get to first base.

And, finally, the Queen's Park experience. I'd like to know where that one has gone—the day care for Queen's Park; the one for 20 places. That's not making much headway either, is it? It was announced with great fanfare, but there is not much in substance.

Finally, one of the daycare areas the minister must look into has been covered in a study that came out of the ministry. What do you intend to do with the graduates from the community college? How do they fit into the educational system? The 1975 report was called the "Junior Kindergarten Study." Let me just quote it.

> The question of the certification of degree holders who attend the CAATs or Ryerson is more complex. One solution of the problem of defining their status, which was often suggested by representatives of all groups, and which has been shown to possess some viability elsewhere, has to do with the establishment of a tribunal to assess qualifications and to recommend certification.

Surely this is a role for the policy minister, because it has to deal with a number of ministries—the Ministry of Education and the Ministry of Colleges and Universities. I suspect that this has not been acted on either. So, in the daycare field your track record is less than impressive. The programmes you have for the mentally retarded are still in mothballs. They are going to come, but they are always shelved, though, for some reason—five of them. You really haven't attempted to utilize the high schools or the elementary schools, which at very little capital cost would provide you with a great increase in the number of placements. You haven't really done much with homes where there are less than five children; you're not doing much to train that group. In fact, if you've got three or four children in such a daycare situation, it virtually becomes babysitting. There's no real learning experience when there are only three or four—the type of learning experience that one would hope for in the proper type of day care.

I want to talk about another subject for a few moments. I introduced a bill this afternoon—it is not a very difficult bill for the government to grapple with, although I argued long with the former minister in Community and Social Services—on the right for a man, if the situation warrants it, to draw family benefits, if he, in fact, has to raise the family. I introduced this last year. The only men who succeeded, of course, in getting this have been those men who have gone on TV with the "Ombudsman" and then an order in council comes across the table providing that man with family benefits.

I fail to understand—I really do—I fail to understand why the simple amendment that I moved today, which simply removes any reference to mother or father, couldn't be enacted quickly, so that in case the father was left in a position where he had the responsibility to raise the children, he should not have to go through the torment that that gentleman up in Penetanguishene last year went through; he had to go on television, he had to fight like mad and, of course, an order in council was passed to silence him.

That's not the way to cope with it. Surely you move a minor amendment and remove discrimination from the Act, and if he so chooses to raise his children surely that individual, that man, should have the same right that we know hundreds of thousands of women are enjoying today. I don't suspect the number would be very high. I believe there are about seven or eight cases pending, but they would have to scream like mad, get on television and so on, when a simple amendment to remove the inequity would solve it. Of course, the interesting part is I have heard the former minister tell me, "Well, you know, a lot of men might do that." I am not sure there are that many men who are that brave, who are willing to stay home with kids 24 hours a day, seven days a week. It takes some type of heroic—

Interjections.

Mr. Martel: Well, the Premier (Mr. Davis) might have that opportunity shortly.

Mr. Samis: In a Bay St. boardroom.

Hon. Mr. Davis: I am getting a little too old for that.

Mr. Martel: Oh, you never can tell, you know. Surely this government can move on that and this minister should lead the way in that sort of thing, to remove the inequity.

The Child Welfare Act—and I am moving into topics that would take a considerable amount of co-ordination, as the minister herself said—I am delighted I have received a letter from the Minister of Community and Social Services (Mr. Taylor), who indicates he is willing to reconvene the meeting that we established about six months ago. We met in the Macdonald Block, with, at the former minister's agreement, representation invited from a wide variety of fields, where the opposition party members, the critics, were in fact granted the right to have names of people they wanted at that meeting. He very kindly agreed to that, I understand it went to the policy minister. I'm not sure what is going to happen except that the minister himself, the new minister, has agreed to reconvene a second meeting.

I just want to quote—it is something that really disturbs me—from a book called "Poor Kids" and it is put out by the National Council of Welfare. In this province, one of our problems in this whole social field is we are institution crazy—we want to institutionalize everything; put them in homes for the aged, put them in rest homes, put them somewhere, hide them, get rid of them; if you can't see them they don't cause you any anguish. This study, in dealing with children, indicated that Ontario has a track record that is enviable, really enviable, dealing with juvenile delinquents. In page 32 of the report, I'll just quote one paragraph:

> It is not necessary that of those who were found to have committed a statutory offence—as opposed to simply being found

to have committed a delinquency, which can be insignificant, such as truancy from school—almost half of the 619 were placed under section 8 of the Training School Act, which authorizes such placements where no statutory offence has been committed. What then was the basis on which the courts exercised their discretion? If it wasn't what they had done, was it who they were? This appalling possibility may very well have been the case, because a study of training schools in Ontario has found an incredible 92 per cent of those committed to these institutions were from low-income or working-class families.

[9.15]

Ninety-two per cent of those incarcerated came from working-class families or low-income families.

As we pick the threads up of what I have already said when I talked about day care and say that about one-third of those who are in day care are subsidized, who are missing that great range, we understand then why there are problems for this group of children. We also understand that they are the first ones thrown in the jug—92 per cent of those committed under section 8 are from low-income homes.

What is considered a misdemeanour for middle-income families is a violent crime by some thug from Cabbagetown—the same offence. That child ends up in a training school. The minister shakes her head. She has problems. The statistics are there. I'm not suggesting this minister. I'm talking about the Minister of Labour. She is suffering apolexy over there. She is. She is shaking her head and it bothers me.

Hon. B. Stephenson: Oh, no I am not. I am just concerned about all the gross errors.

Hon. Mr. Davis: She really is getting to you.

Mr. Martel: It is the carryings on. I am afraid she is going to have a stroke or something like that. I wouldn't want it on my conscience.

Hon. Mr. Davis: You should be so lucky to have such talent over across the way. You really should.

Mr. Martel: I wouldn't want it on my conscience that she would suffer.

Hon. Mr. Davis: I could say, "What conscience?" but I won't.

Mr. Martel: Well, don't.

Mr. Moffatt: They can practise self-healing for a while.

Hon. Mr. Auld: That is a question we might ask.

Mr. Martel: What this does prove, for my friend the Minister of Community and Social Services (Mr. Taylor), is that the meetings we're suggesting, which might be co-ordinated because they are going to involve the Training Schools Act and people from a variety of ministries, must be done through this ministry or through the Minister of Community and Social Services quickly. We've got to break away from what the present Child Welfare Act does in this province and the Training Schools Act.

The Child Welfare Act, of course, actually is almost a weapon which breaks up families. It is not preventive in nature. It is not rehabilitative in nature. In fact, it's a destructive process. Totally destructive. And the government is dragging its feet. Hopefully, the new minister working with the policy minister, will bring the people together where we can get a council which will make a total review of the Child Welfare Act, which will keep young people out of prisons, which will reinforce the natural family, which will be anything but destructive as is the present legislation.

I only want to make two more points, I believe. I want to talk briefly about the gap, and the policy minister must get involved in this. We have a number of young people who attempt to get some type of education where there is no financial assistance whatsoever. Let me give the minister a typical case. A mother-led family where the mother is working and has an 18-year-old daughter who wants to take hairdressing. This can be done rather quickly in an eight- or 10-month course. But the mother-led family, which earns about $350, has three other children. So she can't afford the $100 tuition or the $70 a month carrying charges for a period of eight months.

She can go to the Ministry of Colleges and Universities and they tell her that there's no financial assistance possible. She can then go to the Ministry of Community and Social Services and, under the Act which they administer, they can't provide assistance either. The minister tells me he'd like to, but he can't provide assistance. And he's right, it belongs either in Colleges and Universities or the Ministry of Education.

The point is, this young lady shouldn't stay in limbo. She needs the training now so that she can become self-sufficient. By the way, I must advise the minister that the federal Department of Manpower also will not provide assistance for this type of person. I just don't know what to do. Why is it that we're willing to provide financial assistance for people to attend universities, community colleges and some private schools, and yet we have this kind of case, a mother-led family where we can't provide assistance? We can't even provide room and board—we can't even reduce the costs by that amount.

It seems to me it's crazy in this province in 1975 that there should be loopholes by which young people who do need financial assistance, to get the type of training they need, cannot find it anywhere. Surely this must be overcome.

I'll just throw in a second example very quickly. The 20-year-old who has returned to school after being out two years and has run out of unemployment insurance—where does she go? No assistance. She can attempt to make a loan, but not necessarily if she's returning to take her grade 13. At a time when we talk about students moving in and out of the school system, for some students there's no financial assistance possible to do it. Surely we've got to plug up the various loopholes that prevent this.

Finally, I want to make reference to what the leader of the New Democratic Party raised this afternoon—the rather intriguing bit of chicanery that's going on—the $50 million that's just sitting. We never did get a thorough explanation as to whether the money that's coming under the Canada Assistance Plan is being fully utilized for the mentally retarded or if it is going back to the consolidated revenue fund and being utilized by the Treasurer (Mr. McKeough) for some other programme.

I find it more than a little offensive to learn that we're getting this type of money while at the same time we have some of the worst type of mausoleums in existence—such as those at Smiths Falls and Orillia. Yet we can't find a way to get rid of that $50 million in the next calendar year. Except that I suspect it's being utilized by dear old Darcy for some other purpose.

I'd feel a little more comfortable if I knew that it was in the vault somewhere, earmarked and collecting interest for the use of the mentally retarded when the programmes the minister speaks about are ready to be unveiled. Then when he unveils them there's not $50 million, but possibly $75 million or $100 million. But he did not. He was very careful this afternoon not to state specifically where that money was going.

Mr. Lewis: That money will come in at the level of $35 to $45 million every year. It's just a regular flow they are pocketing.

Mr. Martel: Yes, and Darcy's using it, I suspect, for something other than the mentally retarded.

Mr. Lewis: You are getting $35 million to $45 million a year designated for the retarded and you're using it presumably to pave Highway 400.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Now, you know better than that.

Mr. Lewis: I don't think so. It's coming into general revenue.

Hon. Mr. Davis: I haven't seen any paving on 400.

Mr. Martel: You always fly, though.

Mr. Lewis: Well, I gather today this is what your minister said.

Mr. Martel: The next time you go north, you might get the pilot to come down a little lower and you can see the ground.

Hon. Mr. Davis: I could say something, but it would be embarrassing.

Mr. Martel: No, no, go ahead. Be provocative.

Mr. Chairman: Order, please. Would the Premier and the Leader of the Opposition allow the member for Sudbury East to continue?

Mr. Lewis: This is the first time the member for Sudbury East has allowed us to interject.

Mr. Martel: It disturbs me, though, because I just know from past experience that money slides away from programmes unless it's earmarked and spent. It just reminds me of the $15 million. We only found out this past set of estimates in Community and Social Services that it wasn't a one-year shot in 1974. The ministry was very careful to say it is spending $15 million but, in fact, it is committed from the budget for 1976 even; 1976—it's spread out over three years. And I suspect that that's what is happening here. I've talked to various associations for the mentally retarded and they are crying for funding. They are crying for financial assistance and it's not forthcoming, in the amounts

necessary, to do the type of programmes they want. I think a programme that needs vital assistance is the homes for special care, if the minister were sincere.

The mentally retarded are being taken out of places like North Bay and are put in homes for special care where the per diem is $8.15. The hostesses in those homes must look after those people 24 hours a day and can never leave them alone. And the clients do not even have a comfort allowance; not one red cent. Not one. They can't even buy a stamp; they can't buy a package of cigarettes; they can't do anything. And there's $8.15 for those people coming out of the various mental institutions and hospitals like North Bay who are in the homes for special care.

It's $8.15. It's $47 a day in Smiths Falls now, I believe, for one child or one person. We're paying someone who is looking after them in a home for special care—24 hours a day—for $8.15. Do you know what that is an hour? About 34 cents.

Mr. Lewis: It matches the quality of care.

Mr. Martel: That's right. They're not trained. I suggest to you that that is going to be the next big scandal in Ontario. Because they are in these homes and there's no system for checking them. They never get a medical again, really.

The one I got wind of was just south of North Bay and they had allowed this man out of the hospital in North Bay and he left North Bay needing treatment for his teeth which hadn't been looked at in about 10 years. His sister, who is a nurse, came to me. He was sleeping in a room, with an old Quebec heater in it, on a plywood board. He left North Bay in November with the clothes that he had on when he arrived, such as a light jacket.

We pay those hostesses, without any training, $8.15 a day. We expect them to carry on a programme of looking after these people—some of them middle aged, some of them fairly elderly. We don't give them an adequate amount to even hire anyone to help. Who could you pay, on getting $8.15 a day? Who would you hire, when there's barely enough to buy the food for them?

We don't give them a comfort allowance. We don't buy them magazines. We don't do anything for them. It's a disaster area. And the minister brags about what they've been able to hold the lines on.

But there's $35 million or $40 million, Mr. Minister, and through you to the policy minister. Surely, some of that can go to the homes for special care so that we have an improved programme there. It's a disaster area; it really is. I would urge the policy minister to look into it immediately and ask the Minister of Community and Social Services (Mr. Taylor), who now has the funding to spend, to increase that per diem.

[9:30]

I don't know what a decent rate is. I am not going to stand here and say make it $17 or make it $12. I don't know, but I will tell you one thing—I know that $8.15 a day per person isn't sufficient to provide the type of care I would want for any of my relatives or, I suspect, none of you over there would want for any of your relatives. You would want a comfort allowance and you would want some of the amenities for these people. I suggest to you that unless you move you have a disaster coming in this province in that area.

The unfortunate part, I am told, is that in many of the homes which look after these, when the husband is sick, they use this as a type of income and they are not having the type of care that is necessary. I leave those with you, to the minister.

I have talked about four or five areas, all of which involve co-ordination, as the minister said. I hope the minister would look again and I will review them: daycare, providing it in a more sensible fashion for those who most need it particularly; the five programmes for the mentally retarded which I am told keep getting shelved; I would ask that she consider moving immediately to adopt the bill I moved today which would remove discrimination so that a father could look after his family; I would urge that, in conjunction with the many ministers who are going to be necessary, the meeting of the various interested groups be reconvened quickly so that we can get at the Child Welfare Act and do the things which should be done—prevention and rehabilitation.

I hope we would move very quickly in the homes for special care. I have been writing for three years—interestingly enough I wrote on behalf of a woman who runs an absolutely superb home. Someone found out I was writing on her behalf and do you know what someone from the Ministry of Health did? They sent an inspector and threatened that woman and said they would take her licence away if she came to me again.

Do you know what she wanted? She wanted a comfort allowance and some reading material for the patients; she has 12 of them. She was threatened with losing her

licence. She is independent enough—do you know what she told them to do with the licence? She still has it. That is the type of thing which bothers me in that programme.

Here is a woman who wanted to try to teach some of these patients, some of whom had been in institutions for 20 years and should not have been there in the first place. There is no way of assessing whether they belong in these institutions so they go into the homes for special care. Many of them, it is her contention, should be out but nobody wants to talk to her. It is such a closed shop.

Finally, there is assistance for some people who cannot get to school. Surely, in 1975, if there are loopholes for young people who can't get financial assistance this minister, because she co-ordinates all of them, should be in a position to eliminate those possibilities.

Mr. R. S. Smith: I will be shorter than the previous speaker I expect because I didn't realize until yesterday or the day before that I was going to look after this task tonight. I have put a few papers together and I will make a few remarks.

The minister, in her opening remarks, referred particularly to the COGP report which established the policy secretariats which have since that time, I believe, gone nowhere but down. I think perhaps yours is the last surviving one which is really active or could be really active. The one in the field of the ministries concerned with the law, etc., has certainly disappeared and has become joined with the Solicitor General. We see no activity from it whatsoever. The one to do with—what's the second one? I think Mr. Irvine is the minister—resources development, of course. When it was taken over from the former member for St. David it just marked time for six or eight months until his retirement. Of course I think that's about all it did all the years it was in place anyway. Not St. David—Mr. Grossman anyway—

An hon. member: St. Andrew-St. Patrick.

Mr. R. S. Smith: I'm sorry, I don't remember the names of all these people and where they come from, but I certainly can recall their faces.

Anyway this is the way those two secretariats have gone; perhaps yours is the only one left that we seem to hear from once in a while.

In your opening remarks tonight, you indicated that your total activities, as far as I could tell, have been in two areas: bringing together what is happening in the ministries under your purview—that had to do with conception control and I think the other one was the use of some of the facilities in certain areas that could be moved about from one ministry to the other.

Under the COGP report No. 3 which established these secretariats, the reason for them was particularly to establish a method by which we could look to the ministries for the development of policy. It was felt that each ministry had become too complex in its day-to-day operations to be responsible for the development of policy within itself. There were other reasons as well—the government had become too big and too complex. I am not quoting directly, but it is all indicated in the third report of COGP—government departments could no longer act independently of each other.

Of course, we had all known that for years as we watched the overlapping of services from different ministries grow and grow. It finally became very obvious that something had to be done. Many people thought the establishment of the secretariats would do away with a lot of those problems and provide people in government who would be developing policy.

But this hasn't happened in the secretariats. At least, I don't believe it has, and I have been unable to see it happening, from any of the three that I mentioned tonight—including the one we are discussing now. I fail to see the development of policy at that level. There may be policy which is still being developed in the individual ministries and then passed on to your level where it is discussed at some length before it goes to cabinet. But the actual development of the policy is not taking place within the secretariats where COGP envisaged that it would.

So from the point of view of their usefulness within the process of government, I would think that it would be best if the Premier (Mr. Davis)—and I am glad that he is here tonight, because often I have spoken in the House and haven't been able to suggest things to him because he hasn't been here. But I would suggest to him that the first move in cutting the expenditures of government might be to look again at COGP and see how it has worked. Then perhaps one of the first things that could be done would be to do away with the secretariats.

I look at the estimates of this secretariat and see the growth over the years to where the cost is now almost $1⅓ million. And I see that according to the COGP report the

secretariats were intended to be small, with appointments made for a specific renewable term. A "specific renewable term," in my mind at least, would be appointments of people for two- or three-year periods to do a specific job and develop specific policies in the area of the secretariat's work.

If you look at the staff that's been built up over the 2½- to three-year period of this ministry, you'll find there are three full pages of full-time staff none of which, I believe, is on a renewable term contract. Most of these people, as I understand it, are full-time employees of your ministry.

Your own office has seven or eight people in it. The secretarial staff consists of another 25 to 30 people and your advisory council consists of another eight people. Besides that, you have Youth Secretariat personnel—about 15 people—more or less on a permanent basis and that's not to mention the other people on the advisory council on senior citizens and the other three advisory councils within your ministry. I would think the people being paid through your ministry would amount to at least 150. That's quite a growth in a couple of years and a half. That's pretty good.

That includes the advisory councils. I'm not saying they're being paid on a weekly or a monthly basis but they're all on a per diem basis and they're all on expenses. Those per diems and those expenses are usually quite adequate to say the least and in many cases would equal the salaries of a permanent civil servant. When you look at this whole thing, you will see we're spending $1½ million and what are we getting for it? That is the real question, I believe, insofar as this secretariat is concerned and the other two or three still in existence.

I hesitate to be very critical of some of the staff people who have become attached to your ministry on a permanent basis because one of them, I see, was born a block from where I live and I grew up with her. Another one, I see, was a babysitter for my children for about five years so there are a couple of people there—

Mr. Gaunt: Nothing like early training.

Mr. R. S. Smith: —I'd hate to see without a job but I'm sure you could find something else for both of them. That's an aside to the real problem.

The real problem is that it appears this ministry has almost become a fifth wheel in the process. The ministries themselves are still settling the policy. If they're not, I would like the minister to indicate to me after I'm finished what her input has been in the two policies of most significant importance which have been established in this province over the past few months or the past year and a half or so. That is the question of the ceilings which have been placed on education and the ceilings now within the jurisdiction of the Ministry of Health.

Of course, these are the types of policies which, although they have to do with the Treasury, also have to do with the operation of those specific ministries. They are policy decisions which should be initiated by the policy secretariat rather than the ministry. I don't believe you or your people or your secretariat have had one bit of input into any of those decisions. I think both those decisions have been decided by the ministries themselves, perhaps in conjunction with the Treasurer (Mr. McKeough) rather than the secretariat.

If that's the case, we still have people going off in their own directions and each ministry leading its own way. We still have a jungle insofar as the development of services to people across the province is concerned because if, in those important areas, there's not going to be the input of the secretariat certainly we're not going to look in areas of lesser importance for the input of the secretariat. Obviously, power flows from the top and when the decision is made up there on major issues, the decision on minor issues is also going to be made within that same—what would you call it—upside-down pyramid. That is why I believe that within this ministry its input has been very little.

[9:45]

Certainly you have operated the Youth Secretariat and it's back in your purview again, although it moved, I guess when they didn't have anything else to do, to the present Minister of Energy for a year or two. They thought they would give him that to do and that moved away but it is back again. Of course, that operates experience 75. Other than that, I really don't know too much about what it does.

There are also a couple of other areas I would like to question you on. Since, according to the COGP report policy is to emanate from the secretariat perhaps you could explain that to me on the basis of some of the reports—just a few of the reports—which have come out in the last couple of years and which have been very significant but from which has flowed very little in legislation or policy change.

Your own deputy minister was most instrumental in the report of the Commission on Post Secondary Education and it is per-

haps the most massive document we have seen in this Legislature in regard to education. I would like to know what discussions have taken place in your secretariat and what recommendations have gone from the secretariat to that ministry on that report. What specific recommendations, what initiatives have been taken by the ministry on the recommendations of the secretariat? What did we get for all the money we spent?

Another report was the task force on industrial training which came out in 1974. It recommended that we change our industrial training methods and perhaps move back a few years to the point where the younger people would be trained industrially on the site rather than in our secondary schools and in our post-secondary schoools at the community college level.

I realize that any implementation of that report would have caused a great disruption within the growth of the educational system, particularly at the post-secondary community college level. I know the government was anxious to spend as much money as it could at that level in as short a time as it could to show it was doing something, regardless of what the results were.

That report, I believe, has been stood aside and nothing has been done with it. It is a report your secretariat should have acted upon and the secretariat should have had a green paper on. That is another thing. The COGP indicated that one of the prime responsibilities of any secretariat would be the production of green papers based on reports which have been and would be received by government. I think we have seen only one green paper out of your ministry; at least to my recollection that is all I have been able to find. I just don't know what all these people are doing, really.

I go over this because it is 2½ years since you started to implement the COGP report and I think it is time we had a little examination of what goes on or has gone on since then. We spent a lot of money on the report. We spent a lot of money to implement it and now I think we should be trying to see what the results are after that length of time. Personally, I find the results are something like the report—they cost a lot of money but they haven't really done anything.

Another on behalf of the field of health was the Mustard report. I don't know what your involvement has been in that, even though it comes under your secretariat.

There are other areas and other working papers, many of which come to your ministry, from which we have not seen any results, at least as members of the Legislature. This may be all internal: you may be hiding it all under the table or something. But wherever it is, nobody can find it, let me tell you.

There was also a recommendation at the beginning that a communications expert be established within your ministry in order to bring together the five ministries that made up your secretariat. I would like to know who that communications expert is, what kind of a job he did and the results of his work. I know by a sheet I have here that your executive assistant, to whom I referred a while back, is now the acting communications adviser, until a replacement is found. I should think that by this time your communications adviser would have established the communication lines or channels between your ministries and that his usefulness would have been far past. As the COGP indicated, he or she should now be passed the specific renewable stage.

But apparently any of the guidelines that were set out by GOGP, and by which that whole programme was sold to this Legislature, have been just almost thrown out the window, because it's very difficult to find where any of those things have really come to pass.

I notice the minister finds this rather amusing, and for the kind of money she is getting she should find it amusing for what she has really done.

Hon. Mrs. Birch: Did you ever break my time down by hours, though?

Mr. R. S. Smith: Pardon?

Hon. Mrs. Birch: Would you like me to break it down into an hourly rate? I don't think I would make the minimum wage.

Mr. Roy: You are a very nice person but that—

Mr. R. S. Smith: Perhaps we should refer that to Ottawa and let them decide whether you are making enough.

Hon. Mr. Kerr: Oh, the member for Ottawa East is here. There is a train at 11:30.

Interjections.

Mr. Chairman: Order, please. The member for Nipissing will please continue.

Mr. Roy: The member for Ottawa South better get back home.

Hon. Mr. Bennett: I'm here from Monday to Friday.

Mr. Roy: Yes, you should spend more time in your riding.

Interjections.

Mr. Chairman: Order.

Mr. R. S. Smith: I would like to refer a bit to the report that we had today—which I read after supper—with regard to the advisory council on senior citizens. I find this rather worthwhile and perhaps one of the better efforts to come out of your secretariat. I think you should hold that up and say: "That's what we should have been doing the past 2½ years." But where the hell are the other 50 or 60 like that that we might have had? There is just nothing else besides this and a few other documents around, and they really don't mean that much.

I've looked; I went to the library to look. I went to different places to look. I looked through my own library. I keep all my mail; and it's very hard to find things like this. But there are many recommendations in this that are worthwhile, and I hope will be passed from your ministry to the specific ministries to which they refer.

I find it difficult to understand why the report was given to you on April 30, and we just received it today. I just find it very difficulty to understand why we have to wait six, seven and eight months to get these reports. In that interim, some of the recommendations could have already been put into effect, if one looks back to see some of the recommendations, particularly in the field of health and also in the field of community and social services and in the field of home care—which I was particularly interested in because of our interest in keeping elderly citizens of this province in their own homes if they wish to remain there, rather than in institutions or even in large towers of senior citizen housing.

I do believe the recommendations within this report, if instituted, will not only provide a much happier senior citizen in this province but will also provide to government a much more reasonable way to deal with senior citizens. There is no question in my mind that the costs for senior citizens in institutions as compared to the costs of a good home care or home health programme would be astronomical. There is no question that home care and a home health programme would be a much more reasonable way and we would have a much more satisfied senior citizen, who would perhaps live a little longer in the milieu in which he has lived most of his life and would be much more content.

I was not going to speak on this, but the member for Sudbury East (Mr. Martel) spoke of the homes for special care and he was referring to homes that are in my area. I have visited a good number of those homes. I find there seems to be growing, within that area, almost a—I want to be careful because I don't want to say something that is going to hurt the programme insofar as those people who have been institutionalized at the psychiatric hospital moving out into the community, because I support that part of the programme; I don't want to put that into jeopardy, particularly in the community where these people have to be accepted. You know as well as I that five years ago the biggest difficulty with that type of programme was not the people themselves, but you and I and the other people who lived on the street who did not want that type of community home set up in our area.

I think that most people are over that, except that I believe you are setting up a reaction in the community that is going to be very hard to control, unless you provide enough funds for those people to get properly cared for.

As I said before, I visited some of those homes, I visited five or six of them—or it may be more, seven or eight maybe, if I could think back, it was some months ago. I found, strangely enough, believe it, that there are people who are setting out to establish ownership of a goodly number of these homes and operate them almost on a volume basis like Loblaws. They don't operate them themselves, but they own the home and they own the licence, or they in some way control the licence, perhaps through the mortgage on the home. I found that there were one or two people who in some way or other had some type of control over seven or eight of these homes—I shouldn't say seven or eight; I visited seven or eight—over about five or six of the homes that I visited. I asked around and made inquiries through some other friends of mine as to other homes in the area that were operated in the same way. Sure enough, the same names keep popping up here and there.

I look at that and I look at $8.15 a day, and I could say there is no way that anybody would want to get into that type of business to have a return on their funds, but sure enough there is a way.

[10:00]

What you do is buy the house. You get it licensed some way through the ministry concerned. You then get a couple in; usually a

couple, one of whom is disabled or both of them have been on family benefits for some time at $260 a month. They see an opportunity to make $400 a month and look after six or seven of these people; and this is what they do. They go to work for this—I don't know what you would call this person—I find them almost indescribable.

I looked around these homes; and I wasn't too welcome, I'll tell you, in some of them. I spoke to many of the people who were in there. I asked them specific questions, like: "What type of medication are you taking?"; or, "Are you taking medication steadily or under the direction of the outpatients clinic at the North Bay Psychiatric Hospital?" From many of them I got an answer that they were and that everything was fine in that regard. But there were a goodly number who said: "To be honest, nobody cares if I take it or not. So I don't take it."

Do you know, that is why you have many of these people who are ready to move back to where they were before. What kind of care are they getting where there is not even the most basic desire to see that these people are even taking their medication.

I couldn't understand it. I feel there is going to be a problem sooner or later. That problem is going to be big and it is going to hurt the community and set a good programme back a considerable length of time. I feel sorry for those people who are trying to make the programme work. You have to have good people at both ends. You have to have good people in your institution who are trying to get these people out and you have to have good people on the outside who are going to make sure that they are well looked after.

I am not critical of these people on the outside who are operating these homes, many of whom are trying to do the best they can for these people. They just do not have any training. They don't have enough money to go on. They just don't have anything to work with in order to provide a service to these people who need it.

Mr. Martel: It's a disaster area.

Mr. R. S. Smith: I just wanted to bring that up because the member for Sudbury East referred to it. Although it comes under one of the ministries under your purview, it is not really within this discussion. But it is such an important issue. It has arisen over the last year or year-and-a-half, almost insidiously, in the community. I don't believe it is any different in any other community because if you are paying $8.15 a day you are getting the same service everywhere.

So, with these few remarks I will close, but I do have some questions as we go along on the votes. Thank you.

Mr. Chairman: Before we start dealing with the vote item by item, perhaps the hon. minister would like to respond to the comments made by the critics.

Hon. Mrs. Birch: Mr. Chairman, to the hon. member for Sudbury East, I am very much reassured by his attitude toward me and what we are attempting to do in the policy secretariat. I think it has softened and I appreciate—at least I felt that. You are looking surprised?

Mr. Lewis: Softened?

Mr. Martel: Insulted.

Hon. Mrs. Birch: I thought not. I was quite surprised as a matter of fact—

Mr. Bounsall: That really got to him.

Hon. Mrs. Birch: I had been quite reassured that perhaps we were able to make an impression on him finally. To convince him that we really are most sincere and—

Mr. Lewis: They nationalized Inco yesterday. He is feeling mellow today.

Hon. Mrs. Birch: Oh, that's why he is mellow. I wondered what the reason was, but whatever it is, I am very grateful for it.

Of course, the issue of day care arose again and the hon. members are well aware that was dealt with in the estimates of the Ministry of Community and Social Services. I would like to say that I make no apology for the daycare programme in Ontario. I think we are progressing. I think we're in a very positive stance. We're up to 48,000 places for children now across this province, and it will continue to develop as more and new innovative ways are brought to our attention in the provision of day care.

Mr. Martel: Try the schools.

Hon. Mrs. Birch: The schools are being used. In my area there are schools where they're providing early—

Mr. Martel: They haven't even got serious about using the schools.

Hon. Mrs. Birch: Well the schools in my area are being widely used.

Mr. McClellan: For day care?

Hon. Mrs. Birch: For day care, yes. Children are arriving there at 7:30 in the morning, they're being looked after, they go to school, there is a lunch-hour programme and an after-school programme—

Mr. Lewis: Do they have pre-school day care, too?

Hon. Mrs. Birch: Yes.

Mr. Lewis: It's nice to know the Scarborough schools are being used.

Hon. Mrs. Birch: We are really encouraging this and it's being very beneficial to a great number of working parents.

We're also, of course, encouraging the development of more and more home day care, because we feel that a very positive way to provide day care for children in their own neighbourhood, where they aren't subjected to long trips by bus early in the morning and again in the evening. We're attempting to encourage the development of that particular kind of day care across the province and there's a tremendous, positive response to this.

You did mention the daycare programme for Queen's Park. I'm sure the hon. member has the information, but just in case he hasn't I'd like to read—

Mr. Martel: Yes, I have it.

Hon. Mrs. Birch: You have the information on it?

Mr. Martel: Put it on the record.

Hon. Mrs. Birch: I'll put it on the record then.

Mr. Lewis: It's about time. It's about 1½ years later now.

Hon. Mrs. Birch: In response to an employee group called the Queen's Park Daycare Committee, Management Board established a special task force chaired by the executive co-ordinator of women's programmes to study the need and the feasibility of a 40-infant daycare centre in the Queen's Park complex. The proposed centre received intensive study during 1974. The final study undertaken found that the expense would be prohibitive.

Mr. Lewis: Oh, indeed.

Hon. Mrs. Birch: It was $221,000 in renovation costs; that's over $5,000 per child.

Mr. Lewis: What are you talking about? Where were you going to put them?

Hon. Mrs. Birch: They already had the spot located, and those were the renovation costs for that particular building.

Mr. Lewis: A quarter of a million dollars to renovate for a daycare centre? What a committee!

Hon. Mrs. Birch: Yes. And at an annual operating deficit of $30,000, with a parent fee of $7.50 per day, that was a subsidy of $1,000 per child per annum.

Mr. Lewis: No wonder you abandoned it.

Hon. Mrs. Birch: In February, 1975, they decided not to proceed with the centre. In December, 1974, they initiated a five-month pilot project to provide daycare counselling. In the first four months, 108 employees received assistance. Emphasis is being given to locating supervised family day care, which is becoming a very popular alternative to group day care. In view of its success, they have decided to continue the daycare counselling services. We feel that this is a much more appropriate way to—

Mr. Martel: Not everyone agrees with that.

Mr. Lewis: You have to remember that Marge Pinney now works for the NDP caucus. We know something about your daycare arrangements at Queen's Park.

Hon. Mrs. Birch: Yes, I remember her.

Mr. Chairman: Order, please. The hon. minister will continue.

Mr. Lewis: You can have my office for nothing if you set up a daycare centre. Why don't you think about it?

Hon. Mrs. Birch: We might take you up on that.

Mr. Reid: With some of the members you've got you're already using it for that.

Mr. Chairman: Order, please.

Mr. Lewis: If you'd like it, Pat, I'd heat a bottle for you.

Hon. Mrs. Birch: The hon. member mentioned the difficulties for children or young people in motherless families specifically, having opportunities for upgrading their academic programmes. I would like to draw to his attention that Manpower does have the discretionary power to provide this for grade 13.

Mr. Martel: Grade 13, right.

Hon. Mrs. Birch: Also, within the Ministry of Education there is a fund established to provide help.

Mr. Martel: For loans, yes. All they have to do is get grants now.

Hon. Mrs. Birch: No, I understand there are bursaries available within the Ministry of Education, so perhaps if you are not aware of that we could provide you with the information.

Mr. Martel: I have the minister's letter before me.

Hon. Mrs. Birch: I'm very disturbed, of course, about some of the conditions that you described in your particular area regarding the mentally retarded. I would just point out that the Minister of Community and Social Services (Mr. Taylor) today explained to you one of the reasons for the apparent slowness in providing more facilities for the mentally retarded in the province.

We do have the funds, but it's very important to move with the community—to make sure there is community support and community resources available. I know the minister is most anxious to proceed as quickly as possible in providing the resources to the mentally retarded in this province.

I hope I've answered all of your questions. I'm having difficulty reading my own writing. To the hon. member for Nipissing (Mr. R. S. Smith), who questioned the value the government was receiving from my services, I would just like to read into the record a job description, if I may.

Mr. Lewis: What about your curriculum vitae?

Mr. R. S. Smith: I want a description of what your secretariat is doing.

Mr. Lewis: Yes, please read.

Hon. Mrs. Birch: You did question the advisability of my being maintained as the Provincial Secretary for Social Development, so if you don't mind: I provide leadership and coordination for policy analysis and review of studies, either by encouraging interministerial collaboration or by proposing studies for consideration by the cabinet committee on social development. These studies would then be discussed by the cabinet committee and recommendations made to cabinet for approval of a government policy.

I represent the social development policy field at both the policy and priorities board and the Management Board of Cabinet. This role entails responsibility for inter-field policy plannning, programme funding, priority setting and monitoring the adherence of programmes to government policy.

I meet with delegations from community and municipal agencies to discuss issues of multi-ministry character and of relevance to the social development policy formulation of the provincial government. In this way, I can improve the process of communication between the citizens of Ontario and the government with respect to the real social concerns that we all share.

With regard to the Ontario Status of Women Council, the Ontario Advisory Council for Multi-Culturalism, the Ontario Advisory Council on Senior Citizens and the Ontario Advisory Council on the Physically Handicapped, I provide liaison with government ministeries for follow-up on their recommendations.

I provide leadership and direction to the operating ministries within the policy field in the establishment each year of the multi-year plan for the field and its operating ministries. The multi-year plan is the device used by the government to ensure the orderly implementation of policy by examining not only its immediate fiscal impact, but the effects over an extended time horizon. The financial impact of the first year of each multi-year plan is presented for approval each year in the form of ministerial estimates.

As the cabinet minister responsible for International Women's Year, I am co-ordinating special programmes that are being undertaken by the Ontario government to mark this occasion.

Mr. Lewis: Better hurry, it's almost over.

Hon. Mrs. Birch: I'm encouraging review of policies and legislation on a government-wide basis that are of special concern to the women of this province.

Those are just a few of the duties expected of the Provincial Secretary for Social Development.

Mr. R. S. Smith: Now would you answer the question.

Mr. Lewis: That's a job description. Now what do you do?

Hon. Mrs. Birch: Some of the studies that you—

Mr. R. S. Smith: Could I apply? Where's the application form?

Mr. Chairman: Order please, could the minister continue her statement.

Hon. Mrs. Birch: Some of the studies that have been done within our policy field as a result of meetings within the cabinet policy field include: a council for emotionally disturbed children has been formed and it is working in many areas to provide facilities and help for those children who are emotionally disturbed or have learning disabilities.

We've also established, out of concern for some of the very questions that you've raised here tonight about residential services, a committee which is studying the whole residential service area and we expect a report early next month.

Again in the home care area, many of you indicated that this is an area you feel is very important so that we can continue to provide for the sick and the elderly within their own homes, rather than continuing to institutionalize them.

[10.15]

A study was undertaken in co-operation with the advisory council on senior citizens. Sister Audrey Mantle of that particular advisory council went to Europe and studied some of the plans there. Some of the recommendations from the advisory council for providing home care for the senior citizens of this province are being co-ordinated right now by the Ministries of Health and Community and Social Services. We are looking forward in the not too distant future to being able to make progress in that particular field.

I did point out—you asked again—about the responsibilities for providing the ceilings for education and the budgets for the other ministries within our field. This is all part of the MPY approach something we are very involved with at this very moment.

You didn't have too much to say about the youth secretariat. I assume from that you are in favour of the government providing experience-based jobs for the youth of this province to help them to gain experience in future employment possibilities as well as to earn money to continue their education.

You asked about recommendations from the post-secondary report suggesting that the secretariat impose on the ministry recommendations from the report. It is up to the individual ministries to implement the recommendations they feel they should implement.

You also mentioned the Dymond report and you wondered where that might be at this moment. The period for public response has just ended and we anticipate the report will be back at the cabinet level for discussion.

You asked about green papers published by our policy field. We have published two green papers, one on the status of women and one on mental retardation. You asked about the Mustard report. That has received a great deal of attention within our policy field. Not only have we had discussions with Dr. Mustard and the people who were involved in making up the report, but many meetings have been taken up with the involvement of all the ministries within our field discussing the ramifications of the Mustard report. The Minister of Health (Mr. F. S. Miller) is at the moment looking at many of those recommendations with a view to implementing some.

You mentioned the communications advisers associated with the social policy field. A communication adviser meets weekly with the information officers of all of the ministries in an effort to make sure the programmes that are available throughout the ministries within our policy field are well advertised to the recipients of many of these programme.

I was very pleased that you seemed to be favourably inclined toward our advisory councils, specifically the advisory council for senior citizens. I am very proud of the members who make up the advisory councils. They are not full-time members. They work on a per diem, usually meeting for two days a month. They come from all areas of the province and they come from all walks of life. They come from all political persuasions and they are doing, I feel, a tremendous job on behalf of the senior citizens of this province.

I am very pleased with the newsletter that the senior citizens have taken upon themselves to distribute to every senior citizen within this province. We have had literally hundreds of letters from senior citizens thanking us for this publication, which is put together especially for them. They find it very informative and we are delighted with the response this newsletter is receiving.

I am particularly pleased with the advisory council for the physically handicapped. It is fairly new; it is the latest advisory council that I have. Again, the recommendations that are coming forward are very reasonable. I think it's time the physically handicapped people of this province had some of the same opportunities the rest of us take so much for granted. I am thinking in areas of employment opportunity, housing accommodation and transportation.

Mr. Deans: What are you doing in that area? I must have missed something. What are you doing in regard to that?

Hon. Mrs. Birch: You were busy talking when you should have been listening.

Mr. Deans: I have been trying to listen. You speak very quietly. Would you elaborate about the handicapped people part? I would like to hear that again.

Mr. Chairman: Order, please. Perhaps the hon. minister would finish her statement and then they could question her under the item, vote 2401.

Hon. Mrs. Birch: Mr. Chairman, I think I have finished my statement. If the hon. member has any question about the physically handicapped—

Mr. Deans: Would you be kind enough to elaborate on the last part again, the handicapped people part?

Mr. Chairman: May I point out that we are considering vote 2401. I assume we deal first with item 1, social development policy. I understand the hon. member for Peterborough had indicated she would like to speak.

Mr. Lewis: How many speakers do you have?

Mr. Chairman: I have three indicating they wish to speak at the present time.

Mr. Lewis: If I can rise. Were we supposed to conclude at 10:30 p.m.? Mr. Chairman, if I may rise, not to pre-empt but on a point of order to put things in context.

Mr. Chairman: Yes.

Mr. Lewis: We would like this ministry to go beyond 10:30 p.m., that is, to come back next week. I want to tell you why. We are deeply concerned that there is no rationale for this ministry. Therefore, we want some time, as a caucus, to consider the traditional reduction of the minister's salary to $1, which in this case, given the remarks that have come from the other opposition party, might well pass and would therefore affect the future functioning of the ministry. I don't want to do that precipitately, having listened to what was said tonight. We would like to give it some thought over the weekend, so we would appreciate a return on Monday. That's why it would not carry at 10:30 p.m.

Mr. R. S. Smith: Were you on a point of order?

Mr. Lewis: Yes, I just wanted to say why we would like to go into the next week.

Mr. Chairman: That's a point of order.

Mr. R. S. Smith: We certainly have not had the fullest of answers. It seems to me that every year, over the past two or three, we always come down to about 2½ hours on this ministry. As far as I am concerned, I would go along with the Leader of the Opposition and ask that we go past 10:30 p.m. tonight or that we start again on Monday at 2 o'clock. It doesn't—

Hon. Mr. Welch: There is no imposition of time. There are 13 hours, 30 minutes on the order.

Mr. Lewis: That's true. It's just that it was generally thought that it would close again.

Mr. R. S. Smith: I realize that.

On vote 2101:

Mrs. Sandeman: Mr. Chairman, I have heard the minister speak to us about priorities, about programme funding, about communications with the people of this province. I heard her briefly mention the needs of the handicapped in this province and it is to that area of policy that I would like to address myself this evening. I see in that area of policy concerning the handicapped and the disabled in this province, many inconsistencies, discriminations and even cruelties. I am sure they are not intentional cruelties but no less cruel when they take place.

I would like, if I may, to give some actual examples to document the kind of areas in which I feel the ministry is not meeting the avowed policy aims, is not supplying or guaranteeing dignity and self-respect to the handicapped, and is certainly not assuring any measure of independence to many of our handicapped people in this province.

Consider, for example, if you will, an accountant—a successful businessman with a wife and three children who is blinded in middle age. He enters a vocational rehabilitation programme, they consider his case, and at great expense, and very sensibly I think, he is sent to university. It is expensive to put a blind student through university. It takes him longer than a normal student. He has to have help from an audio-visual library, he has to have a reader, he has to have special equipment. It probably costs several thousands of dollars—probably $50,000, maybe even more—to put this fellow through university and, even more, to support his family while he is there. But at least he has the

feeling that he is being retrained, that with his university degree he will be able to continue to support his family as he has done in the past.

However, after graduation several things happen: The first thing is that he cannot find an immediate job through the help of the vocational rehabilitation department so he goes on a disability pension. And that means that several things immediately happen to his family, the first of which most obviously happens to his wife's income.

She is a working woman, a bookkeeper, and she discovers that when the women she works with get a raise in pay, and she does too, immediately her husband's pension amount is reduced. She feels, rightly or wrongly, this is in effect a reduction in her earning power. She feels slighted. She has worked hard, she has been given a merit raise in pay but in effect, however much more she earns, her income is cut back to the point where in effect she is earning less than the minimum wage. She feels like saying to her employer, "Don't bother giving me a raise; it's not worth it. Because what you give with one hand, the Ontario government takes away nearly all or it with the other." Her self-respect is being eroded daily.

Her husband, who did well at university and has not yet found a job, decides—indeed the university tells him—that he has some skills in research. He applies, as people with skills in research are apt to do, for a Canada Council grant; and he discusses his new plans with the Ministry of Community and Social Services. They say, "Fine, but when your Canada Council grant comes through, you realize that that will be treated as income and your disability pension will be reduced or cut off."

He's slightly surprised to hear that, because he doesn't believe that his friends who are professors at university, and who applied for a Canada Council grant to support their research expenses, find their incomes reduced because they have some money for research expenses. This is indeed what he had applied for, a Canada Council grant, and he hoped to get the princely sum of $3,000, $4,000 or $5,000. But that would be counted as income and his pension would be cut off. He decided, wisely or unwisely, depending on your point of view, to refuse the Canada Council grant. He still can't find a job.

This struggle has been going on for several years. It has become an increasingly bitter struggle for him and his family. Now, after all this expense of putting him through university, after his wife's struggle to maintain the family and after his increasing bitterness, he finds that the only course open to him is to go to a short sheltered workshop course. I suspect that he is going to come out of that sheltered workshop and told that now he's perhaps capable of making brooms or something similar.

What has happened to this man, of course, is that he has become defined by his physical handicap. It seems that the departments with which he is dealing are incapable of seeing him in any other way than as a blind man. He is totally defined by his handicap—not by his needs, not by his skills, not by his experience or potential, but by his handicap. There are many other people who go through the vocational rehabilitation programme in this province and find that, in fact, what defines them is the handicap and not the skills.

To take a very different kind of example, where perhaps the policies of the ministry are slightly more successful—

Interjection.

Mrs. Sandeman: It has been suggested that I break until Monday, if I may, to continue this saga of disaster and despair.

Mr. Lewis: That was a first-rate presentation.

Hon. Mr. Welch moved the committee rise and report.

Motion agreed to.

The House resumed, Mr. Speaker in the chair.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Speaker, the committee of supply begs to report progress and asks for leave to sit again.

Report agreed to.

Hon. Mr. Welch: Mr. Speaker, before moving the adjournment of the House, may I report that tomorrow we will address ourselves to order No. 5.

Hon. Mr. Welch moved the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to.

The House adjourned at 10:30 p.m.

CONTENTS

Thursday, November 20, 1975

Residential Premises Rent Review Act, Mr. Rhodes, second reading 789

Assessment Amendment Act, reported 799

Third readings, Bills 8, 1, 9, 10, 11 799

Estimates, Provincial Secretary for Social Development, Mrs. Birch 799

Motion to adjourn, Mr. Welch, agreed to 817

SPEAKERS IN THIS ISSUE

Auld, Hon. J. A. C. (Chairman, Management Board of Cabinet (Leeds PC)
Bennett, Hon. C., Industry and Tourism (Ottawa South PC)
Birch, Hon. M., Provincial Secretary for Social Development (Scarborough East PC)
Bounsall, E. J. (Windsor-Sandwich NDP)
Bryden, M. (Beaches-Woodbine NDP)
Cassidy, M. (Ottawa Centre NDP)
Davis, Hon. W. G., Premier (Brampton PC)
Deans, I. (Wentworth NDP)
Ferrier, W. (Cochrane South NDP)
Gaunt, M. (Huron-Bruce L)
Good, E. R. (Waterloo North L)
Haggerty, R. (Erie L)
Kerr, Hon. G. A., Environment (Burlington South PC)
Laughren, F. (Nickel Belt NDP)
Lewis, S., Leader of the Opposition (Scarborough West NDP)
Makarchuk, M. (Brantford NDP)
Martel, E. W. (Sudbury East NDP)
McClellan, R. Bellwoods NDP)
Moffatt, D. (Durham East NDP)
Reid, T. P. (Rainy River L)
Rhodes, Hon. J. R., Housing (Sault Ste. Marie PC)
Riddell, J. (Huron-Middlesex L)
Roy, A. J. (Ottawa East L)
Ruston, R. F. (Essex North L)
Samis, G. (Cornwall NDP)
Sandeman, G. (Peterborough NDP)
Shore, M. (London North L)
Smith, R. S. (Nipissing L)
Stephenson, Hon. B. Labour (York Mills PC)
Stokes, J. E. (Lake Nipigon NDP)
Taylor, Hon. J. A., Minister of Community and Social Services (Prince Edward-Lennox PC)
Warner, D. (Scarborough-Ellesmere NDP)
Welch, Hon. R., Culture and Recreation (Brock PC)
Young, F. (Yorkview NDP)

No. 21



Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT — DAILY EDITION

First Session of the Thirtieth Legislature

Friday, November 21, 1975

Speaker: Honourable Russell Daniel Rowe
Clerk: Roderick Lewis, QC

THE QUEEN'S PRINTER
PARLIAMENT BUILDINGS, TORONTO
1975


10

CONTENTS

A list of the speakers taking part in the debates in this issue of Hansard appears, in alphabetical order, at the back of this issue.

Daily contents of proceedings also appears at the back of this issue. Reference to a cumulative index of previous issues can be obtained by calling the Hansard Reporting Service indexing staff. Phone 965-2159.

Hansard subscription price is $15.00 per session, from: Sessional Subscription Service, MGS, 9th Floor, Ferguson Block, Parliament Bldgs., Toronto, M7A 1N3. Phone 965-2238.

LEGISLATURE OF ONTARIO

FRIDAY, NOVEMBER 21, 1975

The House met at 10 a.m.

Prayers.

Mr. Speaker: Statements by the ministry.

CREDIT CARD PAYMENTS

Hon. Mr. Handleman: Mr. Speaker, I would like to expand on a newspaper article in this morning's Globe and Mail which quotes me as saying that credit card holders do not have to pay their accounts until they have received itemized bills.

The mail strike has caused problems for many Canadians and business is especially hard hit. Some large companies in the credit card or revolving account business appear to be attempting to add further to the consumers' problems by charging interest on accounts when these companies have not been able to inform consumers of the exact amount owing or the mechanism established for making payments.

My legal advisers have informed me that unless the lender has furnished the consumer with a written statement of account as provided for in the Consumer Protection Act, the consumer is not liable to pay interest charges under the provisions of the Act. Consumers do have a responsibility to keep up with their debts; people using credit cards are always issued with a receipt and, by some simple addition, could calculate the approximate payment. I would encourage consumers to keep their charge accounts and credit payments as up to date as possible. It goes without saying that unpaid bills will be even harder to pay after the strike if they are allowed to accumulate.

There is responsibility on both sides. Business should not attempt to take advantage of a situation and the consumer should not try to postpone his obligations.

DISTRIBUTION OF GAINS CHEQUES

Hon. Mr. Meen: Mr. Speaker, as you will recall, on Nov. 12, I informed this House of the arrangements my ministry made for the distribution of November GAINS cheques during the mail strike to some 272,000 pensioners.

I would like to give you now a progress report at the half-way point in this massive undertaking and to ask for continued co-operation by members, municipalities and the media to ensure its successful completion.

First, outside Metropolitan Toronto 161,000 GAINS cheques have been successfully distributed for pickup at local municipal offices and at operating rural post offices. Current reports are that these cheques are moving out very rapidly. In seven major cities we have used ministry retail sales tax district offices, and by Wednesday nearly 19,000 cheques of 50,000 cheques had already been picked up.

Second, distribution in Metropolitan Toronto is a particularly difficult task. GAINS cheques were available Monday to Wednesday of this week at the St. Lawrence Market, 92 Front St. E. By Wednesday 13,000 cheques of 61,000 had been picked up. The system at St. Lawrence Market has been operating very efficiently and I am impressed that it generally takes less than three minutes for pensioners to pick up their cheques once they enter the door.

The St. Lawrence Market distribution centre was in operation from Monday to Wednesday of this week and will be in operation again on Monday and Tuesday of next week. In anticipation of possible confusion caused by this break in the distribution procedure, my staff in GAINS made arrangements to assist those people who mistakenly arrived at the market yesterday and today. Therefore, we are using ministry cars to transport these people to the GAINS office at 77 Bloor St. W. so that they can obtain their cheques there without returning a second time.

I would also add that if institutions such as nursing homes, retirement homes or hospitals prepare lists of recipients who are unable to pick up their cheques, our staff will take the lists and deliver the cheques to the institutions the following day.

We have had excellent help from municipalities. Also, in response to my requests for co-operation from the media, I want to say we have had extensive and valuable coverage

across the province. They have been extremely helpful in informing people of our arrangements and, therefore, in ensuring the success of this most worthwhile undertaking by my ministry.

We are quite prepared to repeat this service to our GAINS recipients should the postal strike continue into next month. This first experience will ensure an even smoother operation next time. In this event, we will issue details to the media and once again ask for both the members' and the media's continued support in our efforts.

In conclusion, I might add we have already made a commitment to have December GAINS cheques available at our distribution points for pickup by recipients before Christmas.

Once again I wish to thank the members, the municipalities and the media for their contribution to the success of our distribution arrangements.

Mr. Young: Could I ask the minister in respect to the picking up and delivery of credentials and cheques to senior citizens' homes, do I understand that if the head of an organization, such as the Association of Senior Citizens' Homes, will make a list of those who have not already picked up cheques, a car will go, pick up that list and then deliver the cheques?

Hon. Mr. Meen: That is correct.

Mr. Young: The cards are not necessary then, just the list?

Hon. Mr. Meen: In those circumstances, if the head of a home brings us a list of the intended payees and we can confirm their addresses, I think it would be appropriate for the cheques to be delivered to the homes just as though they were being delivered in the mail boxes at the home.

Mr. Speaker: That was a question for the question period, but it has been asked and answered now.

RENT CONTROLS

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of privilege.

Mr. Deans: Another one? That is the second one this week for this minister.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: This morning on the electronic medium—

Mr. Roy: Which electronic—TV or radio?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please, the hon. minister.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: This morning on the electronic medium—the radio stations for the clarification of those who don't know the difference—

Mr. Breithaupt: Radio is TV without the picture.

Mr. MacDonald: Don't be so condescending in your explanations.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: —it is being reported that I had agreed in the House last night to an amendment to Bill 20 which would extend rent controls to luxury apartments, to Ontario Housing units and to others.

Mr. Singer: It said it in the papers, too. That is the printed medium.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: I haven't read the papers. I want to make it very clear to you, Mr. Speaker, and to the members of this House, and to those of the media who were not present last night, that no such amendment was proposed by me, no comment was made concerning that either in the House or outside the House. The only comment made is found on page 20 of the instant Hansard—and I will read it again—in which I say, in part, "I am quite prepared to amend the legislation to include those units under their control;" and I am referring to the fourplexes, triplexes, duplexes and single family units.

Mr. Cassidy: That's right.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: At no time was any reference made to any of the other exemptions which are included in the bill as it now stands. I would hope that the information which has been erroneously put out to the public will not have caused any confusion or concern.

ST. THOMAS HOCKEY COACH

Hon. Mr. McMurtry: Mr. Speaker, yesterday it was suggested that the Ministry of the Attorney General had issued a directive to a Crown attorney, I believe in St. Thomas, to withdraw as a coach in amateur hockey —a voluntary coach. I want to assure the House that no such directive was ever issued.

I am advised that the Crown attorney from St. Thomas in fact asked advice of our director of Crown attorneys with respect to whether or not there might possibly be a conflict of interest in relation to a prosecu-

tion he might be called upon to conduct arising out of a game in which he might have coached one of the teams. I am advised that the director of Crown attorneys simply advised the Crown attorney in St. Thomas to exercise his own good judgement and that there was, in fact, no such directive.

Mr. Roy: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order, I think in the provincial interest.

Mr. Speaker: Is there anything out of order at the present time?

Mr. Roy: No, but you had better listen. It's a point I am sure you would be interested in.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. We have to get on. Is it something that can be handled during the question period?

Mr. Roy: No, it is not a matter for the question period, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: I had better hear the hon. member then.

Mr. Roy: Mr. Speaker, it involves the—

Hon. Mr. Meen: It involves the leadership.

Mr. Roy: No, it involves the college bowl tonight and the Ottawa Geegees, and I am sure all members will join with me in wishing the Geegees the very best. They are defending Ontario's interests in this and I would ask all members to join with me in wishing them well.

Mr. Speaker: I'm sure that's true.

Hon. Mr. Davis: I hope they do much better than the Rough Riders.

Interjections.

Hon. Mr. Parrott: I would like to rise on a point of order. I cannot have a special relationship with any of these institutions, so if this is the wish of the House I trust you will excuse the Minister of Colleges and Universities from that.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you very much. We will get on with the question period now.

Mrs. Bryden: May I ask the House to welcome to this sitting 35 pupils from Glen Ames Senior Public School in my riding, who are in the east gallery with Miss MacKenzie.

[10:15]

Mr. Speaker: Oral questions.

DISTRIBUTION OF GAINS CHEQUES

Mr. Deans: Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the Minister of Revenue, born from his statement this morning: Has the minister considered the implementation of an optional direct deposit system in the Province of Ontario which would allow the GAINS programme cheques and other cheques to be deposited, at the option of the recipients, in a bank or institution of their choice, thereby avoiding problems like the ones we are having at the moment and in some ways perhaps even reducing the total administrative costs of the programme?

Hon. W. Newman: We would have to know their bank account numbers.

Hon. Mr. Meen: One of the main problems in all of this, and of course the reason for the whole exercise, is communications; namely to obtain the information from 270,000 GAINS recipients as to the bank of their choice or to have them communicate that information to us. We did weigh a number of alternatives before we concluded that this was the best way to get cheques to the vast number of people throughout the province.

Mr. Renwick: The minister is not listening; he should listen to the question before he answers.

Mr. Deans: The minister has got me wrong. A supplementary question: Ignoring the current mail strike, does the minister think that it might be possible in the future to introduce an optional direct deposit system in the Province of Ontario? Surely to God, when he sends the cheques out every month he can put in, "Would you like it deposited in your bank?" and they can write back and tell him? That doesn't require many brains.

Hon. Mr. Meen: I agree it doesn't, and that is something I think we might take under advisement.

TORONTO TEACHERS' NEGOTIATIONS

Mr. Deans: I have a question of the Premier, which I would have liked to ask the Minister of Education but he is not here: Given there seems to be some confusion over the role that Mr. Hartt played and the way in which he viewed his role as a fact-finder—that he is not a mediator, not a conciliator, not an arbitrator, but simply a person who is supposed to look at and to place before the parties the facts—and given that the role he did play has caused some problems

with regard to a settlement, does the Premier not now think it might be useful if he, the Premier, and the Minister of Education—who is just coming into the House—might call the parties together, including Mr. Hartt, and set out clearly what it was that he in fact did?

Hon. Mr. Davis: I am sure the hon. member wouldn't mind repeating his question now that the Minister of Education is here, and direct it to the Minister of Education.

Mr. Speaker: Do you wish to do that?

Mr. Deans: Do you want it verbatim?

To the Minister of Education: Given there is some confusion at the moment about the role played by Mr. Hartt in his role as a fact-finder—given that he wasn't a mediator, a conciliator or an arbitrator, and given that his responsibilities as set out in the Act were to lay the facts of the case before the parties, not to choose or to try to determine what might be acceptable—and also recognizing that part of the difficulty we currently face is the result of that role and the way in which it was played, does the Minister of Education not now think that it might be useful if he and the Premier, or he alone, or he in conjunction with anybody else, were to sit down with both parties and the fact-finder and discuss what his role was and the conclusions he came to and how he came to them?

Hon. Mr. Wells: No, I don't think that would be of any use at all now. I think what we need now is bargaining. Let's not quibble over whether the fact-finder did or did not do th kind of job that we thought he should do. I think my friend will recall that in the Act his direct operational mode was not defined. It was left up to the Education Relations Commission, and I think they are going to have to review what fact-finders have done. Let's not focus in on one fact-finder; there were 48 or 50 of them appointed in this province.

Mr. Deans: I am talking about the current situation.

Hon. Mr. Wells: A lot of them have brought settlements about. Let's not zero in on the fact-finder. What is needed now is for the parties to get back to the bargaining table in this particular dispute. I think they will be doing that very shortly.

Mr. Deans: A supplementary question: Since the minister also told us on Monday he thought they were going to get back to the bargaining table very soon,—

Hon. Mr. Wells: They were back.

Mr. Deans: —could he give us some indication as to the current situation with regard to them getting back to the bargaining table? On Monday he was vague; now I would like to know, on Friday, whether he knows anything positively or whether he is guessing.

Hon. Mr. Wells: Let me trace the scenario for my friend. I mentioned on Monday they were considering getting back. As the member knows they had a meeting for about three hours on Wednesday which resulted in an offer by the board to have the teachers accompany them to Ottawa to talk to the Anti-Inflation Board. The teachers declined the offer; the board went.

One party to the negotiations feels that it's at least of some value to get some determination from that board. I think the Anti-Inflation Board has indicated, as the member will have noticed on television last night and from other sources, that it would be happy to be of some help in this matter.

That meeting was held yesterday. I believe the parties are talking to one another about how they can resume bargaining across the table in the very near future but I can't tell you anything more than that. I think the parties themselves will have to make any statement about that.

Mrs. Bryden: Mr. Speaker, now that the Ottawa Anti-Inflation Board appears, according to the story in this morning's Globe to have taken on a new role, which is to rule on proposals rather than on signed contracts, this could create long delays in the negotiations.

Mr. Speaker: Your question?

Mrs. Bryden: Is the government therefore considering bringing in legislation to bypass this process and bring the public sector employees under provincial anti-inflation guidelines, which would mean there wouldn't be these long Toronto-Ottawa/Ottawa-Toronto negotiations and we might get a settlement quicker?

Hon. Mr. Wells: No, we are not, because we don't believe it could be done any faster even if we had our own boards or our own parallel operation in this province.

Mr. Renwick: A supplementary question: In the initial statement made about the guidelines to the Minister of Education, there was

a reference to a public service panel of the Anti-Inflation Board and an invitation to the province to make an appointment to that sector. Is it the intention of the government to appoint or to suggest the name of a person who would represent the public sector from the Province of Ontario on the public sector panel of the Anti-Inflation Board?

Hon. Mr. Wells: Yes, it is.

Mr. Roy: Any name in mind?

Mr. Renwick: Got anybody in mind?

Mr. Roy: The minister has a lot of friends who don't have jobs.

SPECIAL PROGRAMME REVIEW

Mr. Breithaupt: First of all, a question of the provincial Treasurer with respect to his statements concerning the report of the Special Programme Review Committee.

Since that committee has now reinforced criticisms made of the government over the years by the opposition parties, and since the Treasurer has requested further comments and suggestions on the report from interested parties, is the Treasurer preparing now to suggest to the government House leader that time be set aside in the House so that this Legislature might debate the contents and relevance of that report?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: That's a very interesting suggestion, Mr. Speaker, which I am sure the House leader will take under consideration. There is of course the Throne Speech debate; there is of course the public accounts committee.

Mr. Sargent: Supplementary to that, Mr. Speaker: In congratulating the Premier on setting up the committee on government spending and commending the Treasurer on his awareness that we are now in a financial nightmare, I would like to ask the Treasurer about the proposed layoff or retirement of 1,500 civil servants in the next four months; the report also recommends the merging of three or four of the ministries. Is the Treasurer going to follow through on a simple, fair basis? If he is going to retire 1,500 civil servants is he going to take his front row and cut them down too? Is he going to do that?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Mr. Speaker, the report is under consideration and we are not in a position, as I indicated yesterday, to give answers to any part of it. As decisions are taken they will be made clear to the House.

I would, however, correct the member's thought that we are about to lay off, 1,500 civil servants. As I recall, the turnover means that we hire something like 7,000 or 8,000 new civil servants a year, and its unlikely that it would be necessary to lay civil servants off. New ones, in certain categories, simply are not being hired. That happens to be a section of the report which is being implemented now and which has been implemented for the last eight months—for the last year and a half, really—in terms of the freeze and in terms of the complement reduction; and to date there have not been any layoffs.

Mr. Sargent: Supplementary.

Mr. Speaker: Order; our discussion is ranging far and wide here. Is this a true supplementary?

Mr. Sargent: In view of the fact that New York has laid off 38,000, this government is really not serious in cutting back 1,500 jobs, is it?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. That is not a question.

Mr. Sargent: It's very important. It's in the report, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Oh, absolutely. The member for Ottawa East, does he have a supplementary question?

Mr. Roy: Yes, Mr. Speaker, my question is to the minister: Without having even read this report, was it not exceedingly obvious to the minister that, for instance, he has three ministries—that is, three policy secretariats—that are really not needed in this province? Why doesn't he get rid of them right away?

Mr. Speaker: That seems to be more of a suggestion than a question.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Mr. Speaker, I would have to say that I welcome—and I am sure we all do on this side of the House—the obvious enthusiasm of those in the third party for cutting costs—

Mr. Roy: Well, that is not new. We have talked about this for two years.

Mr. Sargent: You agreed to it.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: —by a variety of methods. I am sure that same support will continue to be exhibited to the government as we attempt to deal with the matter of costs. For example, in the health field, I say to my colleague that I know he is going to

have the support of the Liberal Party, which is entering into this with such great enthusiasm.

Mr. Roy: Most of this is our policy anyway.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Mr. Singer: The Treasurer has had better cracks than that. That was not his best.

Mr. Cassidy: Since the Treasurer appears to be laying the ground for an attack on every programme that has been built up in the province over the last 15 years, in order to take us back—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. May we have a supplementary question to the original question, please; not a debate?

Mr. Cassidy: —is the Treasurer also intending to bring in tax amendments that will ensure that sectors of the corporate economy in particular—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Mr. Cassidy: —that have been undertaxed for many years—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. That's a new question.

Mr. Shore: Supplementary question.

Mr. Speaker: Is this a supplementary?

Mr. Shore: Yes, it is—if I can recall what the original question was. In view of the minister's statement, will the cabinet be undertaking an immediate review on this programme, and will the minister be reporting back to this Legislature, and if so, when? Could I have that?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: We have the report under review and I think rather than a definitive report, which I don't preclude at some point in the future as to a yes or no to each recommendation, that might happen—but I rather suspect that the decisions will be taken, and as they are taken they will be announced, and that will happen in the fullness of time.

HOSPITAL REVIEW

Mr. Breithaupt: Since the Treasurer has referred to the Minister of Health, perhaps I might ask the minister if he is now able to provide us with the list of proposed hospitals to be closed, or whose work is to be changed around to some extent, that was requested of him yesterday during the special debate?

Hon. F. S. Miller: I am not sure whether the hon. member was present during the debate or not yesterday afternoon. Was the member for Kitchener present?

Mr. Breithaupt: Not during the minister's remarks.

Mr. S. Smith: I was present the whole time.

Hon. F. S. Miller: I must admit that the member might have had some trouble hearing me.

The fact is I stated then, and I restate now, that I have no intention of issuing that list publicly until (a) I have reviewed it; in effect, I want to talk to all hospitals; and, (b) until I have had an opportunity to discuss the problem with the hospital itself. I really don't want any hospital to find out it's on the list by a discussion in this chamber. I think it's only fair that we hold preliminary discussions. No concrete decisions have been made in any sense on any hospital.

Mr. Sargent: Supplementary: I take it that the minister will agree that his system will be—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please; just supplementaries.

Mr. Sargent: Would he agree then that his policy is to keep the list secret and he will divide and conquer? In other words, if we had collective opposition from 24 hospitals, then he would be in trouble. So he is keeping it secret and he will—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Mr. Sargent: —knock them off one by one. Is that right?

Mr. Speaker: The hon. minister has already answered that question.

Mr. Sargent: I would like to know the answer, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: In my opinion the hon. minister answered the question when he stood up a moment ago.

Mr. Sargent: No, he didn't answer me.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Mr. Sargent: This is public information and I would like to know why they can't know that.

[10:30]

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The hon. minister has answered the question—

Mr. Sargent: Let him run his chair and you run your chair!

Mr. Speaker: Does the member for Kitchener have further questions? If not, we'll move on.

Mr. Sargent: You're always protecting the government.

Mr. Roy: I have a supplementary question of the minister. Given that the decision to close hospitals is a very difficult one, does the minister not feel that even politically speaking he might make it much easier if he took the members of the Legislature, especially the members affected, into his confidence and gave them prior notice of this cutback?

Hon. F. S. Miller: When in fact I start conversations with any hospital I'll be pleased to have the individual member made aware of it.

ONTARIO COUNCIL ON UNIVERSITY AFFAIRS

Mr. Breithaupt: A question of the Minister of Colleges and Universities: With respect to the operation of the Ontario Council on University Affairs, can the minister advise us under what authority that council is presently operating, given the fact that the legislation giving them a special legitimacy was allowed to lapse?

Hon. Mr. Parrott: I would think that the authority is very similar to the authority under which the predecessor of that particular body operated. They are an advisory council to myself and they do not have legislative authority at this time. However, I think the important point to be considered is the fact that they are indeed an advisory body and we accept their advice on a good number of occasions.

Mr. Breithaupt: Since they have a budget and since the initial legislation of 1974, Bill 68, was given only first reading, is it the opinion of the minister that while persons have been appointed and moneys spent they are operating entirely within a framework satisfactory to the minister?

Hon. Mr. Parrott: I think it's correct to say that we are still considering the possibility of legislation to change their particular status at this time. However, I am satisfied that the correct response is presently in place, I am responsible for their budget, and at estimates time I'm sure you will be able to get the information that you might wish to seek on budgets, if that's the particular concern.

Mr. Breithaupt: With respect, it's not a matter of finding out how they are spending their money. I am interested in the reason and the authority under which they are operating, because it would appear—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. Is there a question coming?

Mr. Breithaupt: Yes—that duties or funding are not provided for, since Bill 68 was in fact allowed to lapse.

Mr. Speaker: I didn't detect any question in that. Are there any further questions?

Mr. Breithaupt: No, no further questions.

DAYCARE BUDGET

Hon. Mr. Taylor: The member for Bellwoods (Mr. McClellan) asked a question on Monday concerning the daycare capital expansion programme.

The first part of the question queried why the daycare capital expansion budget was reduced from $5.75 million to $3.35 million. In response to the hon. member I would like to point out that the figures he quoted are for the fiscal year 1974-1975. During the current fiscal year, 1975-1976, in which I think the member is interested, the amount budgeted is $9.5 million. This does not include funding under our regular capital programme, where $1 million has been budgeted.

The second part of the member's question requested a projection of the number of new supervised daycare placements which will be created during the current fiscal year. The response to this is a total of 3,500 daycare places, with 3,000 of these spaces being funded at 100 per cent under the daycare expansion project and the other 500 being funded under our regular capital programme at a rate of 80 per cent for renovations and 50 per cent for new buildings.

I would like to question the figure of 400,000 places. which is a needs estimate attributed to the Ministry of Labour. After considerable research, I can't accept that figure as being accurate.

Mr. McClellan: On a point of order.

Mr. Speaker: Is there a supplementary?

Mr. McClellan: I will ask a supplementary. I think first I will raise a point of order. Since the minister disputed my figure of 400,000, I have a document in my hand entitled, "Working Women in Ontario, a publication of the Ontario Ministry of Labour, Women's Bureau, Summer 1971," which estimates the need—

Mr. Singer: It's not a point of order, it's a debate.

Mr. McClellan: —for child care in Ontario at 330,000.

Mr. Renwick: It is a point of order.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I think if there's a supplementary question, we should get to that.

Mr. Deans: The minister said the member was wrong; the member is rising on a point of order.

Mr. McClellan: Mr. Speaker, I merely wanted to correct the record. If I may ask a supplementary, I had asked deliberately, not accidentally, why the 1974-1975 capital expansion budget was reduced. Why was it reduced?

Hon. Mr. Taylor: I'm sorry, does the member have a question?

Mr. Cassidy: You didn't answer the question.

Mr. McClellan: I'm sorry, Mr. Speaker, I'll repeat it in full.

Mr. Speaker: I'm not sure if that was included in the minister's answer or not.

Mr. McClellan: I asked the minister originally why the capital expansion budget was slashed in 1974-1975. The minister seems to think I asked accidentally. I asked deliberately and I'd like an answer.

Interjections.

Mr. Speaker: Perhaps the minister could take it as notice, in case he doesn't have the answer ready.

Mr. Deans: We want to know the answer to that.

Mr. Cassidy: Supplementary to that question, Mr. Speaker: If the minister has so much money in 1975-1976 for day care, can he explain why it has now taken more than a month for promises of funds for the Carleton Memorial Daycare Centre—

Mr. Speaker: Order please, that is not supplementary to the original question.

Mr. Cassidy: It's incompetence by the minister, Mr. Speaker.

WINDSOR HOSPITAL FACILITIES

Mr. Bounsall: A question of the Minister of Health, Mr. Speaker: In reference to the reorganization of the hospital situation in the Windsor area, will the minister now make a firm commitment to accept the decision of the Windsor and Essex County Hospital Planning Council—a decision which is expected very shortly, which appears to have a community consensus behind it, and will meet the minister's new criterion and ratios for all types of beds in the Windsor area, a criterion which the minister is requiring?

Hon. F. S. Miller: Mr. Speaker, I've persistently asked for a solution to the problem that was community-based and that had community support. Yesterday I was accused—or it was suggested that I had asked one hospital to change its role in Windsor and become chronic only. That was not the case. I didn't have a chance to answer that point of our discussion yesterday. That was a suggestion, I believe from the very group the member is talking about, that the role of a hospital be changed. It was not ministry inspired in any way at all. So, without saying that I can accept it, I would be very prone to accept any programme that saved the $4 million and had community support.

Mr. B. Newman: Supplementary: Will the minister assure us that if one of the recommendations is that the Riverview Hospital remain open, even though on a reduced basis, he will accept that recommendation?

Hon. F. S. Miller: Mr. Speaker, that was inherent in my original terms of reference to the community. Our solution was to close the hospital and that resulted in quite a violent reaction, as you know. We said to the community, "Find us another way to do it;" in other words, find us a way that saves the $4 million and doesn't involve the closure of the hospital. That is what I expect they're coming back with.

METRO POLICE COMPLAINTS

Mr. Singer: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Soliticor General. Since the police commission of Metropolitan Toronto seems something less than enthusiastic about accept-

ing and implementing the recommendations made by Arthur Maloney about the establishment of a new system of handling police complaints, does the Solicitor General intend to take any action to establish a system along the lines recommended by Maloney, both for Metropolitan Toronto and for other centres throughout the Province of Ontario?

Hon. Mr. MacBeth: Mr. Speaker, as you know and as the House knows, there is another investigation presently being carried out in regard to the police of Metropolitan Toronto and their conduct and I'm waiting for that investigation to be completed. I hope then that there'll be some combined recommendations arising out of Mr. Maloney's recommendations and those of the police in general.

Mr. Singer: Since the Solicitor General must be aware that the investigation being ducted presently into activities of the metropolitan police department relates only to allegations about police brutality and has nothing to do with handling complaints, can the minister explain why he is not prepared to implement the plan put forward by Maloney which was so widely hailed outside the House and inside the House?

Hon. Mr. MacBeth: I didn't say I wasn't prepared to implement it. I suggested I was considering the whole matter at one time.

It may be, if this other matter is delayed, that the other will be implemented earlier.

Mr. Roy: Mr. Speaker, I have a supplementary to the minister's answers. In view of the Solicitor General's comment that the hold-back in the implementation of the Maloney recommendations is because there is an investigation in Toronto, how does that affect implementation in Hamilton, Ottawa and other centres? Why doesn't he move ahead there?

Hon. Mr. MacBeth: Mr. Speaker, I have given the reason. I wanted to look at them all at the same time but if the other report is too long delayed, it may be that implementation of this other one will be earlier.

Mr. Singer: The less done the better.

DUTIES OF ANDREW STUPARICK

Hon. Mrs. Scrivener: Mr. Speaker, I have the answer to a question raised yesterday by the Leader of the Opposition.

Mr. Andrew StuParick is manager of the media studio. His function is to supervise and arrange electronic facilities on request. There is a staff of three including Mr. StuParick. The media studio, established more than a decade ago, is available to all members of the Legislature, the ministries and members of the press gallery, as outlined on page 14 of the booklet, "A Guide to Allowances and Services for Members of the Ontario Legislature," distributed to all members last month. Members of all parties, especially those with ridings some distance from Queen's Park, use the facilities to send messages to constituents over local radio stations.

Policy statements are made available to the electronic media in a form radio stations can use. Radio station editors make the ultimate decision on airing such material and experience has shown local newsmen insist on non-political material, a policy strictly adhered to.

Mr. Sargent: You kept it under wraps for a long time.

Mr. Roy: How can you read that with a straight face?

Hon. Mrs. Scrivener: No member of the Legislature has ever been refused the opportunity to record messages and reports for use by their local radio stations. However members must take the initiative and reserve studio facilities on a first-come first-served basis.

Mr. Martel: Is it not a fact that Mr. StuParick's staff is out in front of the legislative assembly gathering material? Is it also not a fact that he has only taped Conservative cabinet ministers to date? Is it not a further fact that he signs off all his statements as though it were Andy StuParick reporting from Queen's Park, but which is nothing but propaganda for the Tory party?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Mr. Martel: It is a fact. Don't tell me "order."

Mr. Speaker: The question has been asked. Is there an answer?

Hon. Mrs. Scrivener: Mr. Speaker, Mr. StuParick's actions are perfectly in order. He is simply recording policy statements from ministers as they are made in this House.

Mr. Sargent: He is a good guy but you have done him a disservice.

Mr. Deans: Does the minister not think it might be more appropriate if the activities

of Mr. StuParick and his staff and the media studio fell under the direction of the Board of Internal Economy rather than under a ministry?

Hon. Mrs. Scrivener: I think it is not at all appropriate.

Mr. Cassidy: Will the minister instruct Mr. StuParick and his staff to await ministers or members requesting media space downstairs and to cease the recording of statements by members of the Legislature in the scrum outside this chamber because of the gross conflict of interest represented by that activity which is taking place now?

Hon. Mrs. Scrivener: I'm sorry, I see no conflict of interest. Mr. StuParick is simply recording policy statements made by ministers of this government.

[10:45]

Mr. Martel: He has never recorded anybody but a Tory; never.

Interjections.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. This is getting into a debate now. Order, please. The member for Brantford has the floor.

Mr. Makarchuk: Would the minister consider disbanding that particular operation in view of the new economy drive of the government and stop using public funds for private purposes?

Mr. Speaker: Is this a supplementary or a new question?

Mr. Sargent: The NDP wouldn't do that.

Hon. Mrs. Scrivener: Mr. Speaker, I would point out to the member that we are using public funds for public purposes since all members of this House have access to the studio and to its facilities.

Mr. Singer: All members who make policy statements.

Mr. Breithaupt: All members are equal but some are more equal than others.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I thought the last question was new, because we had closed the other question. I didn't realize it was a supplementary until it was asked. We'll get on to other questions.

PAPERWORKERS' STRIKE

Mr. Ferrier: I have a question that I'd like to ask of the Minister of Labour. Is the minister able to report any negotiations now taking place in the pulp and paper industry of this province? What role are her officials playing in seeking to get negotiations going on a widespread scale in the pulp and paper industry in the province?

Hon. B. Stephenson: I had hoped that I might announce to this House that there was a meeting being held today in Thorold between the union and the management in that specific strike. I cannot announce that because, as far as I know, that meeting is not being held today. I would hope that it will be held early next week.

My ministry is in daily contact with both parties in this dispute and we are attempting at this time to bring them back to the negotiating table.

EGANVILLE CREAMERY

Mr. Conway: I have a question of the Minister of Industry and Tourism. What, if anything, is the minister prepared to do about the loss of 22 of 44 jobs at the Eganville creamery as the result of the takeover by Ault Foods?

Hon. Mr. Bennett: What is the minister prepared to do in the field of Industry and Tourism? I might say that we have worked with the communities up there to try to replace some of the lost employment that has resulted from the closing out of operations, not only in the creamery business but in others. Any assistance we can give to the municipalities will always be extended to them. Specifically, in the creamery business, I have not got a supplementary industry.

Mr. Conway: Supplementary: Does the minister share any concern for those loss in jobs to a community that certainly cannot afford that loss?

Hon. Mr. Bennett: I certainly do, as much as the local member.

Mr. Conway: What is the minister going to do about it?

Hon. Mr. Bennett: What is the member doing?

Mr. Conway: I am not the minister.

Hon. Mr. Bennett: Yes, I know.

Mr. Singer: Give StuParick a policy statement.

Interjections.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. We're wasting valuable time. The member for Lanark was trying to ask a question.

Mr. Roy: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, I asked you to make a ruling yesterday on questions asked by parliamentary assistants. There's a long-standing principle that until you make that ruling you should not accept them.

Mr. Speaker: I'm not prepared to make that ruling this morning. The ruling is not quite ready yet. We're digging into this more deeply than I had thought earlier.

Mr. Roy: Fine, but you shouldn't allow him to ask questions until you make a ruling.

Mr. Speaker: In the meantime, the hon. member for Lanark has the right to ask a question.

BOTTERILL REPORT

Mr. Wiseman: I have a question of the Minister of Agriculture and Food. Can the minister bring the House up to date as to whether he has received a report from Dr. Botterill in regard to large animal practice? If not, could he tell us when he might expect this report as the veterinarians and the farmers in my area are very concerned about it?

Hon. W. Newman: Mr. Speaker, that's a good question.

Mr. Singer: Did the member ask it the way the minister wanted him to? Is that the way the minister gave it to the member?

Mr. Breithaupt: Does Andy have the answer already?

Hon. W. Newman: Mr. Speaker, I know that Dr. Botterill is working on a report for the ministry. It is not in as yet and I can't really tell the member when it is coming in, but I'll try to find out for the member.

Mr. Singer: Soon?

GUIDELINES FOR AGRICULTURAL LAND

Mr. Godfrey: Mr. Speaker, I have another question of the Minister of Agriculture and Food. Will the minister announce when we can expect firm guidelines to be presented to prevent the use of prime agricultural land for non-agricultural purposes? When can we expect legislation to be introduced to that end?

Hon. W. Newman: In answer to that question, there will be no legislation coming in at this session to my knowledge and at this point in time. Members know my concern and my interest in preserving prime agricultural land. I'm very much concerned, as the member for Durham West well knows. I know a lot of people out there and the member also knows my concern about preserving agricultural land. I would like to assure him that in the North Pickering development alone we have 1,170 more acres of land under agricultural use now than we had when it was in private hands.

Mr. Makarchuk: Why doesn't the minister do something about it?

Mr. Godfrey: Supplementary. Sharing the minister's concern, would he please explain why he is letting 351 acres of prime agricultural land in the Westminster township garbage dump be taken over for garbage and taken out of agricultural production?

Mr. Roy: Tell him your concern.

Hon. W. Newman: Mr. Speaker, that question should be more appropriately addressed to the Minister of the Environment (Mr. Kerr)—

Mr. Moffatt: That is what you used to be.

An hon. member: Don't sound so concerned.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Hon. W. Newman: I am not aware of the situation. I don't know exactly what is happening in Westminster right now, but quite obviously our people have had their input into the actual situation.

Mr. Godfrey: Ineffectively.

Hon. W. Newman: However, that question should go to the Minister of the Environment.

CRIMES OF VIOLENCE

Mr. Ruston: I have a question of the Attorney General. Does the minister intend to advise Crown prosecutors to press charges for stiffer sentences on conviction of crimes of violence by using the Crown's right to guide the court with suggestions and legal precedents since this procedure has been very effective in the Province of Quebec?

Hon. Mr. McMurtry: I have communicated my concern to the Crown attorneys with respect to crimes of violence and have urged

them to make aggressive representation in this respect. I assume my friend is not suggesting that the Crown attorneys are not making appropriate representations where the case desires or demands such representations.

NAPPAN ISLAND DEVELOPMENT

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: The member for Waterloo North (Mr. Good)—and I am sorry he is not here, but I do want to put this on the record for him—inquired about the position that I was taking as a result of the review of background material relating to Nappan Island. He asked in part in his question whether I was now prepared to put forward to the Ontario Municipal Board the right to look at the environmental considerations dealing with Nappan Island when they hear the zoning change application being held next Monday.

I want the hon. member to know that the Ontario Municipal Board hearing is not only for the zoning change application; they are also determining the modification to the official plan that has been requested by the municipality. They wish to change the designation from rural to seasonal resort. We have looked into this matter and the Ontario Municipal Board, as a result, will examine the principle of development. The environmental reports will be dealt with and taken into account at that time.

Should the OMB refuse the redesignation in the official plan from rural to seasonal residential, the zoning bylaw cannot be approved since it would not conform to the official plan designation; and since the conditions of the draft approval of the subdivision require OMB approval of the zoning bylaw, the refusal of the bylaw would effectively stop the subdivision plan.

I want to assure the hon. member that the Ontario Municipal Board will indeed be taking into consideration the environmental considerations during that hearing on Monday.

COURT CASE BACKLOG

Mr. Makarchuk: I have a question of the Attorney General. In view of the fact that there is a backlog of court cases in the provincial court in Brantford, now running at about four or five months and increasing gradually, what is the minister prepared to do in order to shorten the waiting period before the cases come to trial?

Hon. Mr. McMurtry: I was not aware specifically of the problem in Brantford. I know that it is a matter that is a problem in many areas of the province. I will certainly undertake to speak to the Crown office in Brantford in order to see what can be accomplished with respect to speeding up the trial process, because I certainly share his concern in this regard as delays in the trial process have a very debilitating effect in every respect of the administration of justice.

Mr. Makarchuk: Supplementary: Could the minister indicate at this time when he would have some definitive answer as to what he will do or may not do?

Hon. Mr. McMurtry: I can't give a specific time frame, but I will endeavour to discuss the matter with my agent in Brantford and get back to the member, if not to the House, within the next week.

Mr. Singer: Supplementary: Since the Attorney General commented that there are delays in several parts of the province, is he doing anything to arrange for the speedy trial of charges against certain food suppliers in North York who are alleged to have improperly refrigerated their meat—if the newspaper reports are correct, these people are not going to be tried until January?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. That's some distance removed from the original question.

Mr. Singer: No, it was supplementary, Mr. Speaker. If you had listened to the Attorney General's answer, he said he was worried about slow trial processes in several parts of Ontario and North York is part of Ontario.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member knows that's stretching it. It was a very good new question.

JURORS' FEES

Mr. B. Newman: I have a question of the Provincial Secretary for Justice and the Solicitor General: Is the Solicitor General aware of the financial hardship imposed in many instances on individuals called for jury duty and does he plan to raise substantially jurors' fees?

Hon. Mr. MacBeth: Although that might come under the policy field, I think the question should more properly be directed to the Attorney General who is responsible for jurors' fees.

Mr. Roy: On a point of order, my colleague is talking about coroners' juries and that is under this ministry.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Hon. Mr. MacBeth: Coroners' juries? I am sorry.

Mr. Roy: Yes.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. minister may change his answer.

Hon. Mr. MacBeth: It is sometimes a little noisy in the House, Mr. Speaker, I didn't hear the word coroners' juries.

Mr. Grande: Sometimes?

Mr. Singer: It is a supplementary answer.

Hon. Mr. MacBeth: We realize that coroners' jury fees are, like other fees, not as much as we would like them to be.

Mr. Roy: They are taking a beating.

Hon. Mr. MacBeth: We have also heard a little bit about budget constraints recently and all I can say is that the matter is under active consideration. It is one of those places where, if we have additional money, some of that money should go.

Mr. B. Newman: A supplementary: Is the hon. minister aware that answer has been given in this House for well over five years and it certainly can't be under serious consideration if it has been on for that length of time?

Mr. Roy: I have a supplementary.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Welland—we are just about out of time. There are still many questions.

Mr. Roy: I have just one supplementary.

Mr. Speaker: Your turn may come on a new question.

Mr. Cassidy: He is running very hard, Mr. Speaker.

SPECIAL OCCASION PERMITS

Mr. Swart: A question to the Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations: Is the minister aware that the Liquor Licence Board is now in the process of refusing special permits or notifying volunteer community organizations that they will not be able to get special permits for events in public institutions, particularly the colleges of applied arts and technology? Is he aware of the serious detrimental effect that has on these volunteer organizations and is he prepared to recommend to the Liquor Licence Board that it reconsider its decision to refuse these special event permits?

Mr. Shore: Is that a speech or a question?

An hon. member: Sounds more like a wind bag, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: That's about five questions and this is what is taking up a lot of the time of the question period.

Interjections.

Mr. Speaker: We will let the minister answer what he can.

Hon. Mr. Handleman: There are something like 170,000 special occasion permits issued in this province every year. If the hon. member would like to give me details of the two or three which, presumably, have been turned down I would be glad to look at them. I would like to remind him that the post-secondary institutions are able to apply for a licence on their own and this is the course we would recommend in most cases. However, I am prepared to look at any specific instances.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Ottawa East, I believe, has a very urgent question.

JURORS' FEES

Mr. Roy: Yes, if I can direct a question to the Solicitor General again. Knowing the importance of the coroner's process in this province, how can he possibly say, when juries are being paid $6 a day to be on a coroner's inquest, that it is under review? What is he waiting for to bring this into the 20th century?

Mr. Shore: It is under the anti-inflation docket, isn't it?

Hon. Mr. Handleman: Minimum wage.

Hon. Mr. MacBeth: We realize that $6 a day is not enough for jurymen. At the same time people who have served on juries over the years have done it partly as a public service.

Mr. Sargent: That's a lot of hogwash.

Hon. Mr. MacBeth: One can stretch that too far, I realize, but—

Mr. Sargent: Come on.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: Do you need the money, Eddie?

Hon. Mr. MacBeth: —at no time has an attempt been made to pay jurors in full for the time they may lose through the public service they are doing.

Interjections.

Mr. Sargent: What are you doing?

Hon. Mr. MacBeth: I spoke earlier of financial constraints. All of the work we do in this government is important work and it is often difficult to get the proper priorities on all of the services rendered.

Coroners' juries and other juries are some of those matters which I think must be reviewed and should be upgraded as far as their fees are concerned. When this will happen, sir, I cannot say.

Mr. Roy: Could I ask one quick supplementary on this? Would the minister not at least review the situation of juries who are—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. That's not really a supplementary question. That's debating the issue.

Mr. Philip: Supplementary, Mr. Speaker: If the minister is content with that kind of pay per hour for jurors, I am wondering if he would consider changing the name "juror" to "farmer"?

[11:00]

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

GOULD STRIKE

Mr. Haggerty: Mr. Speaker, a question of the Minister of Labour: Can the minister indicate to the Legislature as to what progress, if any, has taken place to end the strike at Gould Manufacturing in Fort Erie?

Hon. B. Stephenson: The strike at the Gould plant in Fort Erie is, unfortunately, still going on. There was a meeting this week with a mediator from the ministry. I can't tell you that any progress was made, nor can I tell you that progress was not made.

Mr. Ruston: Very good.

Mr. Roy: Real definitive answer.

Hon. B. Stephenson: Their negotiations are still functioning and I am hoping that they will continue.

Mr. Cassidy: She is a very informative minister.

Mr. Speaker: The oral question period has expired.

Mr. Deans: The minister is glad the question period has expired.

Mr. Speaker: Presenting reports.

Motions.

Hon. Mr. Welch moved that Mr. McCague be substituted for Mr. Williams on the select committee on Hydro rates.

Motion agreed to.

Hon. Mr. Welch moved that the select committees to which bills have been referred may publish such notices as they deem necessary.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. Stong: I would ask the House to welcome with me a group of students in the east gallery, 25 grade 10 students from Bayview Secondary School, under the direction of Mr. Charles, from Richmond Hill in the super riding of York Centre.

Hon. Mr. MacBeth: Mr. Speaker, may I likewise ask the House to recognize a group who have just joined us from Our Lady of Sorrows School, some 30 grade 8 students under the leadership of Mr. T. Lynch.

Mr. Speaker: Introduction of bills.

HEALTH INSURANCE AMENDMENT ACT

Mr. Roy moved first reading of bill intituled, An Act to amend the Health Insurance Act, 1972.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Mr. Roy: Mr. Speaker, in view of the increasing number of physicians who are opting out of OHIP, the purpose of this bill is to prevent physicians and practitioners who bill patients directly from charging persons over 65 years of age or persons receiving public assistance amounts greater than that paid for the insured service under the Act.

Hon. Mr. Welch: Mr. Speaker, before the orders of the day I thought that perhaps before people went to committee work, and other assignments, I should indicate that the Honourable the Lieutenant Governor would attend in the House about 12:50 to give royal assent to those bills standing on the order

paper. There may be some, particularly the new members, who would like to see this process. That will be at about 12:50 p.m.

Mr. Speaker: Orders of the day.

Clerk of the House: The first order, resuming the adjourned debate on the amendment to the motion for an address in reply to speech of the Honourable the Lieutenant Governor at the opening of the session.

THRONE SPEECH DEBATE
(continued)

Mr. Speaker: Was someone just starting his speech last day? Was it the member for Kitchener-Wilmot?

Mr. Sweeney: Mr. Speaker, I did not have a chance to begin the last day, so I will start today. It is an honour for me to rise for this purpose and to share some of my thoughts and concerns with respect to the Speech from the Throne.

That document is a statement of what the government intends to do. It is, therefore, a statement of what the government feels are its priorities and what the needs and concerns are of the people of this province. Likewise, by the issues that are not contained in that document, we have some indication of what the government feels lacks priority.

I feel that it is my responsibility in responding to the Throne speech to indicate areas where I think changes should occur, to be as constructive as I possibly can. It is surely our job as members of this Legislature to be cognizant of, to remember the things that we heard and the things that we saw during the past election campaign.

I would refer the Speaker's attention to the fact that from time to time over the last three or four weeks, members of the government benches have been somewhat critical of members of the opposition benches when they referred, once again, to issues that were raised in the election. I find this somewhat surprising, because surely the reason why those of us who are here are here is because we were able to speak to the voters in our various ridings. Surely it is because they approved of and concurred with the points that we made. Surely it is because the issues that were raised were considered sufficiently important that they wanted their representative to come to this House and speak on their behalf.

It is not, however, the task of a member of this Legislature just to follow. It is also his or her task to lead, to provide some leadership, some motivation, some initiative. It is a task of members of this Legislature to indicate to the people of this province those areas where we think changes are required and then to move out among our constituents and indicate why we think these things should be done and to solicit their support.

The riding that I represent is a new one. Kitchener-Wilmot was carved from the two previous ridings represented by the member for Waterloo North (Mr. Good) and the member for Kitchener (Mr. Breithaupt). The riding I represent is particularly important, or should be particularly important to this Legislature, because it is in many ways a microcosm, if you will, of the entire Province of Ontario. It has approximately 80 per cent urban development and approximately 20 per cent rural and small town and village development. I would suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, that is the approximate proportion across this province.

It is a riding that is diversified in many ways. It has a mixture of industrial growth, commercial growth, agricultural growth and cultural growth. It's industry, for example, includes such things as electronics, meat packing, furniture making, and car part manufacturing. Many more could be included in a list. The point that I would make here is that it is by this very kind of diversity that the strength of my riding exists.

My riding is also one that is fortunate in the various cultural attainments that are presented to its people. We have a fine symphony orchestra, a good art gallery, many drama production groups and things of this nature. The people of my riding are well aware that culture plays an important part in their life.

My riding has a broad ethnic mix. It was founded originally by Mennonite and German people and to that original stock have come Polish people, Portuguese people, Italian people and a broad sprinkling of Anglo-Saxon people. In my riding we respect and we encourage the diversity, the strength and the heritage which these various ethnic groups bring to our community.

My riding is blessed with good media coverage. We have in our daily Kitchener-Waterloo Record, one of the finest small newspapers in North America, and I can say that because this newspaper has won more awards across all of North America for its various sections—it editorial pages, its news pages and its photo pages—

Hon. Mr. Bernier: It must have supported you.

Mr. Sweeney: —it has been indicated to it across the entire North American continent, this paper has had and will continue to have standards of high excellence.

Hon. J. R. Smith: I guess it's Liberal.

Mr. Sweeney: We have four radio stations in our community, and we have a good television station confined not just to my community but which also has over the last few years established satellite stations to the north, centred on Wingham, and to the west, centred on the Sarnia area. The riding that I come from is represented and is inhabited by people who are hard-working, who are independent of spirit, who are not looking for a handout from anyone, who want government only to support their natural aspirations to grow to the fullness of their own potential. The people of my riding expect government to be there when they need it. They do not expect nor do they want government to be constantly interfering in their affairs.

In my riding we have one of the lowest unemployment rates of this province and we have one of the lowest welfare rates in this province. I am not suggesting that there are no needy people in my riding; there are. But the people of my riding are of the type that strive constantly to be their own master, to share with their fellow man and to consider their government to be one of support. It is in this area that I would make some comments on this document.

As I go through it, I notice that it begins with some references to the Anti-Inflation Board and certainly I and my colleagues in this party support the stand of the government which in turn is supporting the position of the federal government with respect to anti-inflation. We do regret, however, and we have so stated, the fact that this provincial government will not take initiatives on its own to make some of its own decisions with respect to the anti-inflation procedures. I read in this report a statement that this government has led the way in restraining its own expenditures over the past year.

I have to read that statement with amazement, with wonderment, and certainly with utter disbelief. If there is anything that is patently obvious in the financial affairs of this province it is surely the fact that this government has not only not led the way in exercising restraint, not only has not given leadership in exercising restraint, but has been unable to exercise restraint within its own ranks.

We can conclude only one of two things when a statement like this is printed in this document, and that is that either the government is trying to deceive or the government it totally unaware of its own deficiencies. In either case, Mr. Speaker, I would have to suggest that the government of this province is in trouble.

[11:15]

This government, this province, is not in a fiscally responsible situation. Only recently the credit rating of this government was seriously challenged. Credit raters outside of this provincial jurisdiction have drawn to the attention of this government that its deficit position in the current fiscal year approaches 10 per cent of its total budget. They have been advised that that is a precarious position to be in.

We only need to look at the experience of New York City, which went through some of the same kind of fiscal policy. We only need to look at our mother country of England to see what has happened there when it practised some of the same kinds of fiscal policies.

Fortunately, in this land of abundance and of great resources we have not yet reached the financial and the fiscal break already reached by the two examples I just mentioned. It is time for us to pull back before we do encounter financial disaster. It certainly was with pleasure that I saw introduced into this House yesterday a programme review which recommended that this government reduce its expenditures by at least $1 billion—and in areas which have frequently been brought to the attention of this government by colleagues in my own party and in the other opposition party.

Surely, Mr. Speaker, now is the time when this government will (a) recognize the deficiencies in its fiscal policies: (b) will begin to appreciate the dangerous fiscal position that we are in; and (c) will certainly begin immediately to take steps to recommend that changes be made. Surely no longer can this government say that we do not have a fiscal problem in this province or that nothing can be done about it.

The fiscal health of this province, Mr. Speaker, will determine many of the other services which we are able to provide. It has been brought to our attention on more than one occasion during the last two or three weeks that what the government is able to do in providing social services to its people

depends largely upon the fiscal resources that are available to it.

As we move on in the Throne Speech we note a reference to rent review legislation to be brought before this House. As you well know, this has already been done and we applaud that move. We spoke during the election campaign of the need for some form of review system to protect the tenants, the renters, in this province.

However, at this time I would repeat a comment that I made earlier in this House, and that is that we are talking in this legislation of review, we are not talking of control. It has been shown time and time again in other jurisdictions, both in North America and in Europe, that rigid, binding, arbitrary controls are self-defeating. They do not produce what the whole intention of housing legislation in this province is intended to produce, and that is good accommodation at prices people can afford to pay. Let us never forget, Mr. Speaker, that the whole purpose of any housing legislation—whether we are talking of new house construction, purchased house construction or rental accommodation —is to provide shelter and accommodation for our people.

With respect to rental accommodation, let us also appreciate that the kind of legislation that has been brought in has a universality to it that is dangerous in some ways. It suggests to us in this Legislature, and to the people of this province, that the kinds of needs and the kinds of conditions that exist in one part of the province, namely our largest urban areas, are also the same conditions and the same needs that exist in other areas. That is just not so, and the evidence exists to show that it is not so.

For example, in my own area it has been demonstrated that while wages over the past 10 years have increased in excess of 100 per cent, the cost of rental accommodation has increased only 37 per cent. It has been amply demonstrated in my own riding that roughly 60 per cent of the renters are living in duplexes, triplexes and fourplexes owned by small individual landlords who also live in that same building and who, over the last number of years, have taken great pains to keep their buildings in good repair and to charge their tenants the lowest possible rates so as to bring in at least a fair return. These people have not demonstrated that they are out to gouge their tenants or to be unfair to their tenants. As a matter of fact, their vacancy rate is so low as to suggest strongly that the people who live there approve of what is happening.

There is also evidence in my riding that owners of some smaller apartment buildings, with 12, 13 or 14 units, have been facing some precarious financial situations over the last couple of years. Only a few days ago, I was reviewing a building owned by an owner in my area who, over the last two years, has incurred annual expenses of approximately $34,000 and had an annual income of approximately $28,000. In other words, that owner is losing money at the rate of approximately $6,000 a year. Those kinds of situations need also to be brought to the attention of this Legislature, just as we have accepted so openly the examples where in fact tenants have been gouged and where landlords have in fact been unfair. I guess all I'm trying to suggest is, let's bring a little balance into the picture; let's appreciate that justice needs to be done on both sides of the coin.

When we talk of the rental accommodation in this province we must keep in mind that the prime cause of the present problem is the lack of purchased accommodation in this province. It is a known fact, and I am sure it can be documented by every member in this House as they walked around their ridings during the last election, that there is family after family after family living in rental accommodation who would dearly desire to live in purchased accommodation if they could.

If we can find the imagination and the initiative to provide it, to the families of this province who want to own accommodation of their own, whether it be in a single-family dwelling, in a condominium dwelling or in multiple housing—I don't think that particular fact is as important as the fact that they simply want to own something of their own—if we can do that, then by that very fact we will solve the rental accommodation problem almost overnight.

Why do we have a purchased accommodation problem in this province?

I would suggest that the reasons are threefold, the first and most serious being the lack of low-cost serviced land; secondly, the financial plight of our municipalities and their unwillingness to accept more housing into their municipal areas because of the cost of hard and soft services, both before and following construction, and finally, the high interest rates on mortgages which exist in this province. All we have to do to understand that these three can be remedied is to go from this very spot, this city of Toronto, directly across the lake to the American city of Rochester and find that accommodation which is almost identical in every way—the same size lot, the same size home, basically

the same construction, in very similar residential areas—selling at half the price of the same accommodation in this city of Toronto.

There is something drastically wrong, and what can we do about it? What can we do, for example, about the shortage of low-cost serviced land?

Let us use some initiative. Let us recognize in the whole housing area that we do, in fact, face a housing accommodation crisis in this province. Let's accept the fact that it is, in fact, a priority. Let us remember that during wartime we found ways through wartime housing to meet our needs. Wartime houses, which were supposed to be a short-term temporary affair but which, again, many members of this House can bring to your attention, Mr. Speaker, are still standing in many of communities in a good state of repair and well used. We do face a crisis and we have to solve it on a crisis basis. In terms of serviced land, for one thing, this provincial government has under its direct control upwards of 100,000 acres of land in land banks. In this fiscal year budget, there is I believe another $72 million to purchase more land. Surely the time has come to service and put on the market that land which is owned by the government, at cost—not at market value, which simply increases that vicious circle, but rather at cost.

Mr. Speaker, I would draw to your attention that in the Malvern project, under the jurisdiction of this government, raw, unserviced land was purchased at $800 an acre. Assuming that we can get approximately four good-sized building lots out of an acre of land, plus all the other services, we're looking at the original cost of that land, unserviced raw land, at $200 per lot. Yet that land is selling today at $36,000 a building lot.

How in the name of any kind of describable justice can the government of this province condone that kind of action? Surely the government of this province does not want to stand accused of being the most gross land speculator in the province? Yet this kind of action brings forward no other possible description.

Someone, somehow, someday—and let it be today—has got to break the cost of serviced land cycle. I don't know who else can do it except this government, making a beginning at least with the land under its own control. I think another possible solution is to encourage and to permit in some of our municipalities a skip- or a hop-over kind of development with respect to land servicing. It is unfortunate that many of our private developers completely control all the developmental land around our larger centres. They control it; they control the price; they control when it's going to come on the market because they know the pattern of development has been in a consistent circle outward from existing developments.

[11:30]

As far as I can see, the only way we're going to break that kind of stranglehold is to skip right over the top of them and move to other land—I'm not talking about good class 1 or class 2 farming land but lower class land—and provide servicing there as quickly as possible. When we talk of servicing let us also appreciate the fact that one of the high costs of serviced land is the degree of sophistication and complexity which our municipalities, supported by the provincial government, demand of serviced land in this province in most areas.

Why is it necessary to have road widths of 60 ft in small subdivisions? Why is it necessary that we have curbs and gutters; that we have sidewalks? In many areas where there is good natural drainage, why is it necessary for us to have storm sewers, extremely costly storm sewers? Why is it necessary to have underground wiring? The list is almost endless.

What we have said to the people of this province through our planning procedures, both at the local municipal level and at the provincial level, is that we will provide Cadillac-style development or we will provide nothing. It surely is an ideal worth looking toward to provide the very best for our people that we possibly can but surely we're talking about all of our people not just a small percentage of them? If we demand servicing requirements which are so costly that we force out of the market upwards of 60 per cent of our population, that is a wrong decision and it has no justification.

At the present time in this Province of Ontario, from the government's own statistics, 60 per cent of our families do not earn enough income to go out into the market today and buy housing. To give some example of these fantastic increases in the price of housing, may I quote one only from my own municipality:

In 1973, only two years ago, the price of a low-cost, no-frill house supported by the municipal government was $21,000. Low cost, no frills. That same house today, only two years later, now sells for $43,000, an increase in excess of 100 per cent. There is something drastically wrong when we cannot get serviced land on the market in this province to prevent that kind of scandal because

almost $20,000 of that $43,000 is the price of the lot. That's where our problem lies.

I've also alluded to the fact that part of our problem exists because municipalities are faced with financing restrictions and, because of that, they quite naturally try to prevent further development in their areas. We must come up with imaginative, innovative ways of helping our municipalities.

For example, it has been suggested that we allocate to our municipalities two or three percentage points of the provincial income tax to be used for these kinds of purposes. It has been suggested that in the provision of the major services—for example, sewage treatment and water supplies — the provincial government should share the cost with municipal governments to a much larger extent than it does now.

It has been suggested that we take a whole new look at the assessment procedures in this province and see whether or not we cannot come up with more income levied in a more equitable way, with suggestions, for example, that would place the bulk of assessment on land rather than on buildings and suggestions that would allow us to take a look at the total services provided and allocate them on a per-family basis rather than necessarily on the value of that particular home.

There are imaginative, innovative ideas around. Let us listen to them, let us examine them, let us try them out in some test cases and see if they can work, but let us not continue to go on doing the same things in the same way that have patently been proved not to be effective.

In terms of mortgage financing there is no doubt that housing mortgages of 12 per cent are crippling. Housing mortgages of 12 per cent cannot be afforded by the majority of our people, no matter what their income level is. Those have to be modified. There has been criticism from the government benches in this House that the fault lies solely with the federal government. I do not deny that part of the fault surely lies with our federal government, but part of the fault also lies with this provincial government, and perhaps it is time in this area, as in so many others, that we stand up and start solving some of our own problems in the best way we can without constantly pointing fingers at others and excusing our way out of our dilemmas and our difficulties. For example, we know that the $2 billion deficit of this province which hopefully will be eradicated over the next two or three years, is partially financed by $1.2 billion of pension funds from both the Canada Pension Plan and from the teachers' superannuation plan. Many low-cost mortgages, say, at eight or nine per cent, could be made available to the people of this province, if that $1.2 billion of pension funds directly under the jurisdiction and control of this provincial government were allocated to the low-cost mortgage field.

If that step were taken, I predict, I prophesy, that holders and managers of other kinds of pension funds could be persuaded to follow suit. Those holders and managers of private pension funds and union pension funds could also be persuaded, I am convinced, to direct those funds in the eight, nine or even 10 per cent area into low-cost housing financing and mortgages.

How many hundreds of thousands of homes could be built, and could be financed in this province? Let us appreciate that if we can have a tremendous upsurge in home-building in this province, it would be the greatest shot in the arm to our entire economy. We would make work for many skilled and unskilled people. We would provide production for the various facilities that are needed in the building of homes. So much would flow from it—the manufacture of furniture and other goods that are required in homes and the various servicing that is required in homes. If we can have that tremendous upsurge in home construction, not only will we be meeting a primary need for accommodation of our people, but we will also be meeting many secondary needs, including the upsurge in the economic health of this province.

As we go on through this document, we notice that there is no mention whatsoever of the consolidating tendencies of this government which have caused so much havoc in this province, consolidating tendencies that began in 1969 with the county school boards, which caused so much alienation between teachers and trustees, between schools and parents, and which caused such high increases in costs to be generated by this provincial government as well as by local municipal governments.

We had the pattern; we had the model—and we didn't learn from it. Because only a short while later this government followed up with another form of consolidation which has proved to be even more disastrous—and that is regional governments.

In my own area, in the regional municipality of Waterloo, within 15 months after regional government having been set up, the municipal employee increase was 990 per-

sons—from approximately 1,700 to in excess of 2,600.

Every regional municipality in this province is subsidized by the province to the tune of approximately $2.5 million a year, because despite the high increases in local municipal tax to support it, the local funds simply are not sufficient to float these disastrous regional government setups.

Just to indicate how unwise, how unthinking this government has been, the regional municipality of Waterloo was patterned almost directly after that of Niagara. At the very time that Waterloo was being created—being set up against the opposition of almost 100 per cent of the population—almost at that very time, Niagara was generating all kinds of its own internal problems and was saying to the provincial government: "What have you done to us?"

How can one area of this province be set up as a regional municipality, generate insoluble problems, and then the government come along and set up another model in another part of the province without having solved those problems first?

What I would allude to is that in the last quarter of the 20th century we do need some changes, some modification of our municipal government setup. I do not think anyone will deny that—but surely let us use one, two, maybe even three different forms of government. Let's try them out. Let's find out what works and what doesn't work. Let's examine whether or not the decisions which are made in terms of the sharing of responsibility are the right ones or not. Let's find out whether or not they are financially defensible. Let's find out whether or not the improvements we predict in services do occur.

What has happened in this province is that the government has got it into its mind that the one and only way of modifying, of improving municipal government in this province is that of regional government. I predict that they are going to have to change.

In my own regional municipality of Waterloo, the township of Woolwich has presented a documented statement to the Treasurer (Mr. McKeough) of the province asking for a review right now. The township of Wellesley has gone so far as to vote within its own local council to secede from regional government.

The township of North Dumfries had almost a minor revolution, if you will, within its own council to get out of regional government. It was only because of the pressure exerted by their mayor that they didn't follow through with it.

Only three days ago the city of Cambridge had the issue on its local council table. The vote was an even split, seven to seven either to review or to secede from regional government. It was only the deciding vote of the mayor, in that case as well, that prevented the vote from carrying.

[11:45]

What I am suggesting is that wherever regional government exists in this province it is costing too much money, it is not improving services, it is alienating the people from the political system, they are fed up with it and they want at least a review. In other parts of this province they want no more regional government until we know what works and what doesn't.

If further proof were needed, Mr. Speaker, I would draw your attention to the fact that in the latest government financial review, which was presented to this House yesterday, one of the major recommendations was that we cannot afford on economic grounds alone any more regional governments in this province. During the election, we said that time and time again and we were ridiculed for that statement, and now it has been borne out by the government's own commission, as so often happens, if further proof were needed.

I would also draw to your attention the fact that in this document there is not one mention made of the agricultural community, the agricultural problems, the agricultural concerns of the Province of Ontario. Every one of us in this House knows, if any part of our riding is rural, that there are problems, there are concerns, there are needs, and yet the government did not see fit to include even one sentence in this document.

The averge net income of the farmers of this province in 1973 was $8,000 after paying their expenses. That is less than the average industrial worker in this province earns. That's bad enough, but in 1974, one year later, that declined by 23 per cent.

Mr. Gaunt: It will be even worse this year.

Mr. Sweeney: In 1975, the Ministry of Agriculture and Food of this government has already predicted that it will further decline by at least another eight per cent. When we look at the agricultural situation in this province we see nothing but reversals in every direction. We see fewer people on the land; we see fewer family farms; we see a reduc-

tion in the production of every form of grown produce and livestock—every single one without exception; we see more and more land being taken out of agricultural production.

The agricultural situation of this province is in dire straits and yet, in the Throne Speech, not even one sentence appeared.

Mr. Kennedy: There is higher productivity than we have ever had.

Mr. Warner: You can't understand it.

Mr. Sweeney: Let us appreciate that at the present time it would take a young farmer a minimum of $100,000 to start up a farming operation that could in any way be economically viable. That's a minimum—in many cases it would probably approach $200,000. Let's just look at the investment alone. How can we expect farmers who are already in the business to stay in it when the return on their investment is less than 10 per cent? That's less than what they could get if they took that same money and put it into any kind of savings account. How can we expect that?

Mr. Warner: That's part of Farm Start programme.

Mr. Sweeney: How can we expect our farmers not to accept the lavish financial offers of the land developers who come to them? How can we possibly expect them not to accept when we put them in such intolerable financial straits? I am not suggesting that there are not some farm developments in this province that are making good money, but I am talking about the average; I am talking of more than half.

If this process continues it will not be very long before Ontario, which has vast and rich agricultural resources, will in fact become the net importer of its own food. That will be a tragedy, and that day is not very far away. When we reach the point where people who are desirous of working the land, of growing our food, of raising our livestock, are driven off the land in the province by frustration, by desperation, by fiscal restraints, and finally by anger, that day will be a disaster for this province and it is surely coming.

Mr. Warner: It's their fault—it's their fault.

Mr. Grossman: Isn't everything?

Mr. Sweeney: An item mentioned in this document refers to gun control. Last spring in this province we had a tragic occurrence in one of our high schools. For years prior to that, this government was asked to do something about gun control, but it waffled, it wavered, it whiffled and whatever else. At that time they declared, "Something shall be done." Approximately one month ago another tragic accident occurred at one of our high schools in this province, and once again our government waffled and wavered. Once again, it said: "We can't do anything about it. It will have to be the federal government. But, of course, if they don't do something eventually, then we will."

I do not know, and I do not believe that anyone in this House could predict that even if we had gun control in this province whether those two tragic accidents could have been prevented. I don't know that, but I do know that if we don't do something now, there will be more of those accidents and the blood of those people will be on the heads of the members of this Legislature. We shall not be able to deny that responsibility.

I have to ask, why do the citizens of our province need to have dangerous weapons in their homes? Why is it necessary? I will not deny the right of the hunter to take his gun into the woods. It is something which is abhorrent to me personally but I will not deny that right to others. I will not deny that right to the sport clubs that use their guns for target practice. But are we such a lawless people, are we such a barbaric people, that we have to have within our homes weapons that have no other use than destruction? They serve no other purpose.

Perhaps the time has come for us to say to our people: "No more guns in our homes. We don't need it and we can't afford the tragic consequences." Barring that, we must come forward as soon as possible with legislation which will be enforceable and which will somehow prevent these tragedies.

As I walked around my riding, I found people who were frustrated and angered by social and economic forces which they could not understand and which they did not know how to control. I say that is wrong. I found people living in inadequate housing, which breeds most of the social problems that we face today: the breakup of families, the alienation of parent and child. I say that is wrong.

I found people who were burdened by the spiralling of costs which constantly put them behind; which created much of the labour unrest we see in this province and which is endangering one of our economic lifelines—that is our export market. That is wrong.

Surely, the time has come in this province for all of the people, particularly the mem-

bers of this Legislature, to re-examine and restructure the priorities of this government. Surely, the time has come once again to allow the inherent, potential dynamism of our people to blossom forth? We are a proud province, rich in human resources, rich in natural resources, even rich in financial resources. Surely the time has come for imagination, innovation and statesmanship rather than politics to harness those resources?

As only one member of this Legislature, I personally pledge, with the help of my God and with the support of my colleagues, to do what I can to bring that about so that some day in the future we can all look back and say this 30th Parliament recognized what needed to be done, did what needed to be done and we were all pround to be part of it.

Mr. Gregory: Mr. Speaker, it is both an honour and a privilege to join in this debate today. I would like to congratulate the Speaker on his election to the position. I think it represents a recognition of both his legislative abilities and his contribution to this assembly. I think I can speak for all the hon. members today, in particular those newly elected to this House, when I express my deep appreciation for the guidance and valuable assistance he has given us over the past few weeks.

It is with very considerable pride that I come before this House today representing the constituents of the great riding of Mississauga East. I would be remiss, indeed, if I did not pay tribute to some of my predecessors who represented Mississauga East before redistribution when it was the great riding of Peel South.

The hon. Thomas L. Kennedy, a former Premier of this province, represented this area and, in fact, lived in what is now Mississauga East. My immediate predecessor, the hon. member for Mississauga South, has given me much inspiration through the fine representation he has given to the citizens of Mississauga.

I should also like to pay tribute to my successor on the council of the city of Mississauga, Mr. Charles M. Murray, who was successful in a by-election on Monday last. His closest opponent, Mr. Frank Bean, has shown a commendable interest in community affairs and I congratulate him for his splendid efforts.

I am doing this, sir, because of my respect for the people who are so interested and so concerned about the politics in Mississauga today. They've worked very hard in order to do something to correct it.

Mr. Reed: Don't forget Bonnie Roberts.

Mr. Gregory: Thank you very much. I am getting to that. There were three other candidates—Mrs. Bonnie Roberts, Mrs. Della Saunders, and Mr. Bill Eadie, whose fine efforts made this election very interesting. I certainly hope that in the year remaining in that term, the interest will remain and we will have five very interested candidates of the same calibre at that time.

[12:00]

Although ours is not a metropolitan riding, we do border on one and, therefore, our problems are partially rural and partially urban. Toronto International Airport in Malton presents a mixed blessing in Mississauga as a whole and in Mississauga East in particular. There was a great celebration when it was announced that Pickering Airport would not go ahead. The celebration in Mississauga was not so pronounced. Certainly the position of the airport has attracted considerable industry to the Malton and north Dixie area. Many large hotels owe their existence to the presence of the airport and many secondary industries are located there. These industries have contributed heavily to the tax revenue of Mississauga.

Another example of the growth of our community is the new postal terminal which is the largest in Canada. During this time of postal unrest we have the somewhat dubious honour of housing over 830,000 sq ft of vacant space. Some serious thought has been given to the idea of converting this 19-acre echo chamber into a convention floor. Perhaps the Liberal Party of Ontario might be interested in being the first customer.

Mr. Sweeney: After you.

Mr. Gregory: I don't think they'd fill it. Maybe they believe that their counterparts in Ottawa will be able to settle the postal strike by that time. I would hope so.

Mr. Sweeney: Still fighting that?

Mr. Gregory: Although the international airport has brought substantial growth and progress to our area, the other side of the coin is the extreme noise factor that is imposed on the residents of our community. It it understandable that the citizens of Mississauga are concerned about any attempt to expand this facility. I was very pleased to hear the statement of our Premier (Mr. Davis) that left no doubt about his determination to prevent any runway expansion in Malton. This has been very good news indeed to the constituents of Mississauga East.

People of our community are also concerned about the preservation of our creek beds. The government's parkway belt system for the most part will accomplish the desired effect. I would hope that consideration can still be given to extending this system to include the Etobicoke Creek which separates us and protects us from the urban sprawl of Metropolitan Toronto. The Credit River, almost certainly one of the most beautiful of the river beds in southern Ontario, should be protected through inclusion in the parkway belt system. I would hope some consideration can be given to this.

Another area of concern to us is the proposed Highway 403 which is sorely needed in Mississauga. It would provide traffic lanes to relieve the heavy congestion that is developing as a result of the home-building programmes that have been in existence for the past 10 to 15 years. The Queen Elizabeth Way is becoming jammed to the point where we are now experimenting with computerized access on the Mississauga ramps. Burnhamthorpe Rd. is rapidly approaching capacity.

The population of Mississauga has grown from 50,000 to 250,000 in about 15 years and is expected to be at about 650,000 in approximately another 20 to 25 years. It is a fact that more than 60 per cent of the work force commutes from Mississauga to Toronto each day. As a result of this, Mississauga East becomes a throughway for commuters travelling to Toronto from Hamilton, Oakville, Burlington, Milton and Mississauga itself.

Mr. Gaunt: And even Wingham.

Mr. Gregory: And even Wingham, on occasion.

Mr. Kennedy: Could the member for Huron-Bruce take another route?

Mr. Gregory: Where's Wingham anyway? In a recent traffic study that was commissioned by the city of Mississauga and completed by the firm Kates, Peat, Marwick, it was pointed out that to provide for expected traffic in an east-west direction an additional 10 traffic lanes would require to be constructed in each direction in the Burnhamthorpe corridor—20 additional lanes of traffic for commuters. Highway 403 is needed very badly and needed now. I sincerely hope that this project will be given a high priority.

Approximately 45 to 50 per cent of my riding is composed of rental accommodation. In the Speech from the Throne our government declared its intention to implement a programme of rent review. The subsequent legislation is welcome. I believe that the rent review programme should be considered as a temporary measure, to be in place as long as the federal wage and price guidelines are in effect. The real problem is the need to expedite construction. Along with other measures, more incentive must be given to municipalities so that they may accept large rental projects in their areas.

My colleague from Kitchener-Wilmot (Mr. Sweeney) has mentioned some of the problems that we have with the municipalities and the reasons that they don't welcome additional construction. There is one that was neglected, and so often is neglected by the members on the opposite side of the House; that is, the negative aspect of many of the citizen groups in opposition to building of any type of accommodation in their area. This is something that I think can only be corrected and helped by an extreme and important educational process headed by this government.

I said the other day in my remarks that people today seem to have a "Pull up the ladder, Jack, I'm all right" attitude. I think people are going to have to be educated in the important things in life, that everyone is entitled to a place to live; and sometimes it is going to have to be done over the objections of potential neighbours.

During the recent election campaign the opposition and third party candidates spoke loudly in Peel region about how regional government was not working. Facts were twisted, half-truths were told and exaggeration was the order of the day. They said it was brought in against the wishes of the municipalities.

Mr. McNeil: Never.

Mr. Gregory: They said that the people did not want to be a part of the regional municipality. They said that regional government slowed down the legislative process and would take away some of the responsibilities of municipal councils.

Mr. Gaunt: That's right. That's what the people say.

Mr. Kennedy: Not in Mississauga, they don't.

Mr. Gregory: The fact of the matter is that the council of the county of Peel requested the Province of Ontario to form a region and to change the structure so that instead of having 10 municipalities, there would be three.

Mr. Gaunt: Who voted for it?

Mr. Davidson: Did you have a referendum?

Mr. Gregory: Yes, we had a referendum just a little while ago. I will tell my friend about it in a minute.

In 1973 the report on restructuring was presented to the regions of Hamilton-Wentworth, Halton and Peel. This report was virtually unanimously accepted and endorsed by the council of the county of Peel. During the provincial election there were five ridings in the region of Peel as a result of redistribution. I am delighted to say that all five ridings elected a Progressive Conservative, three for the first time.

Mr. Gaunt: Not by much.

Mr. Gregory: Five members of the government party that brought in regional government received the confidence of the people who we were told were against regional government. It would seem to me that if the local politicians are still fighting regional government, then they are apparently not aware of what their constituents really want.

Mr. Warner: You are right.

Mr. Cunningham: They probably know better than you.

Mr. Grossman: What else is new?

Mr. Deans: Do you think there could have been other factors?

An hon. member: You'd better look at the region of Waterloo.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The hon. member for Mississauga East has the floor.

Mr. Gregory: I think when you get a reaction, Mr. Speaker, generally you have said something that has hit home.

Mr. Deans: There could have been other factors too.

Mr. Gregory: I would like to express my complete support of the initiatives of the Attorney General (Mr. McMurtry) in the field of law enforcement. In particular, his actions in the area of hockey violence are to be commended. When fighting is accepted as part of the game, and when there is a glorification and emulation of players such as Dave Schultz, we place in jeopardy the entire concept of the sport as a source of fun and recreation.

Mr. Moffatt: Which riding is Dave Schultz in?

Mr. Grossman: Durham East.

Mr. Gregory: I think the people of this province are tired of hearing the Clarence Campbells of the game stating that they can and do police themselves. I think the people of this province are tired of hearing sports broadcasters say that violence in hockey is an integral and acceptable part of the game.

The issue of violence in general has been of grave concern to our society for many months now. There is a strong wave of support for tightening bail laws, lengthening prison sentences and establishing gun control. This being the case, there cannot and must not be exception to the rule. Violence should not be accepted and even praised in one area of life and disdained in all others.

Mr. Grossman: Let alone the question period.

Mr. Gregory: The Criminal Code prohibits assault with intent to injure. Putting on skates should make no difference to the application of the law. The hockey rink is a place where professional athletes go to work and it is as much a part of society as a factory or an office. To permit exceptions in an arena is to invite dangerous disrespect for the rule of the law and the rights of others.

I further support the Attorney General's emphasis on the need for federal government clarification of the capital punishment issue. We must not have a law which says one thing and a cabinet which is prepared to rescind that law. So called cabinet discretion has made a complete mockery of the law and those who are responsible for enforcing it.

Another matter which is of great concern to me is that of gun control. As the hon. members well know, and as has been mentioned just previously by my colleague from Kitchener-Wilmot, in May of this year a student at Brampton Centennial Secondary School went on a shooting spree which resulted in the deaths of three people and the wounding of 13 others. Less than five months later there was a similar occurrence at a high school in Ottawa. Surely, these two tragic incidents underline the absolute necessity for gun control law?

Firearms control is primarily a matter of federal jurisdiction and can best be dealt with through the Criminal Code. I am pleased that Ottawa intends to take action in this area and I hope the anticipated legislation will be brought forth in the very near future. We must ensure that there is no repetition of the senseless tragedies which have occurred in two of our schools.

The Speech from the Throne clearly emphasizes the need for our province to work on whatever national team can be put together to find effective remedies for our current economic problems. This, surely, can be the only avenue open to a responsive and responsible government. There are those opposite who have spoken eloquently on the need for a provincial anti-inflation board to run its own anti-inflation programme. There are those opposite who believe that this government should act on its own without federal consultation and without interprovincial consensus.

Mr. Sweeney: We never said that.

Mr. Gregory: There are those opposite who believe that the only way our province can be effective in an anti-inflation thrust is by creating yet another set of guidelines, yet another set of rules and yet another bureaucracy. They advocate a complete balkanization of the federal programme—

Mr. Sweeney: You were not listening.

Mr. Gregory: —the results of which can only be the distruction of any efforts aimed at dealing with the economic pressures attacking the country as a whole.

If they believe that is the only way Ontario can be helpful, let them say so openly to the people of this province and they will decide.

Mr. Sweeney: We have never said it.

Mr. Grossman: Oh, yes.

Mr. Gregory: The voters will choose between the politics of negative cynical criticism—

Hon. Mr. Davis: Yes, you have.

Mr. Sweeney: Not the way he says it.

Mr. Gregory: —and the politics of responsible government, government which is prepared to join in a co-operative effort to the national good.

I strongly believe that the posture of this government has been a responsible one. We have pledged maximum co-operation in economic action with the federal government.

The provinces have been asked to undertake a programme of rent control consistent with national standards. Ontario has moved quickly in this area. Our rent review legislation ensures that at a time when wages are limited and prices are subject to review accommodation costs will also be held to a realistic level.

Our province has suggested to the federal government ways in which the national programme can be improved and upgraded. For example, we felt that the $600 annual maximum pay increase for low wage groups should be raised and we have voiced this belief in Ottawa. The maximum was subsequently raised to $700. I still feel that this should be increased even more.

In the area of government spending control, we have stressed the need for leadership from Ottawa. The Ontario government has shown restraint in the past and will continue to do so in the future.

An hon. member: You didn't read that report yet.

Mr. Gregory: Between 1971 and 1974, our province reduced its share of the gross provincial product, dropping from 11.3 per cent to 10.7 per cent.

[12:15]

Mr. Grossman: Not like Ottawa.

Mr. Gregory: During this fiscal year a number of measures have been implemented to ensure continuous cutback on spending growth. This restraint programme should and must be continued and expanded in the next year. The planned extension of the civil service complement freeze and the freeze of salaries for all senior civil servants in 1976 are good examples of this government's desire to control spending.

We must stress the need for similar fiscal leadership from Ottawa. The Ontario government is acting now in support of the national programme and the national interest. We must not succumb to the fragmented interest of any single group or individual. Achieving success through this programme will require the support and unity of all members of society, led by government.

The atmosphere of economic turmoil in which we meet today should not and must not become a forum for partisan politics and partisan disruption. The people need and want effective leadership. They gave this Legislature a mandate to remedy the economic ills and it is up to all elected members, regardless of political affiliation, to see that the goals are achieved.

I am proud to have received the confidence of the electorate in my riding. I hope, with your assistance and with the assistance of this assembly, that I will be able to carry out the

mandate they have given me to the best of my ability.

Mr. Warner: Mr. Speaker, in the Speech from the Throne, the Lieutenant Governor of our province said, and I quote: "The government will deal primarily with the following critical issues: Inflation, rents, mortgage interest rates and tenant security." There is no argument that the above mentioned issues are important; in particular, the problems of inflation and rents being most critical.

Let's examine the government's response to the seemingly formidable task, and while we examine, let's keep the concept of imagination and leadership clearly in view. I'll be coming back to both of those concepts. I would ask the members to keep them in mind.

Inflation: In the face of serious inflation and the clamour for action by the citizens of this province, the hon. Treasurer of Ontario (Mr. McKeough) announced that Ontario would opt into the federal anti-inflation programme. The greater national interest must be served by blindly accepting Ottawa's leadership.

But the acceptance is not really as blind as it first appears, I would submit. The true Tory dogma is revealed in the Treasurer's rhetoric, and I quote from Oct. 30: "If this wage-price spiral is to be broken," etc. Wage-price spiral—the suggestion clearly being that wages lead prices.

The attendant psychology to that is devastating to workers. Your wages, speaking to the workers, must be controlled so that prices can level out. If you say that often enough, you over there might actually believe it yourselves.

The truth, of the matter, and I think most of us here fully realize it, is that in a time of inflation prices lead and wages make desperate attempts to catch up. Nonetheless, this government is willing to buy the federal anti-inflation programme and all the inherent inequities. What is so curious at this point is that the government was so willing to jump into the anti-inflation programme that the federal government was offering, and yet we have heard nothing from them with regard to the inequities which we know exist. They are silent on that matter.

To be on the safe side, however, this government tossed in some of its own home-grown anti-inflation fighters. I quote from pages 10 and 11 of the report to the Legislature by the Hon. Darcy McKeough, Treasurer of Ontario, on Ontario's anti-inflation programme, Oct. 30:

> Mr. Speaker, it is our intention to make this programme work in Ontario with only a small dose of bureaucracy but with a large dose of effectiveness. The Premier has established a special cabinet committee, chaired by myself, with the ministers of Education, Health, Labour, Housing and Energy, the Attorney General and the Chairman of Management Board. This committee will monitor the progress of the programme and make recommendations to the cabinet. As its chairman, I expect to be reporting to the members from time to time concerning the results of our work.

Here we get to the important section, the responsibilities of the provincial co-ordinator. This is the so-called nuts and bolts of the situation. These are the little anti-inflation fighters who are going to help "monitor the overall anti-inflation programme with regard to how it's operating in Ontario." They will be the "main contact for all Ontario government ministries concerning the application of guidelines in their specific areas of responsibility." The co-ordinator is to be the "chief liaison officer between the province and the federal government." He will "offer liaison between Ontario and the private sector with respect to the operation programme." It means, to this point anyway, absolutely nothing.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Oh, that's not right.

Mr. Warner: If this government were truly concerned—

Hon. Mr. Davis: His colleagues should tell him that's not true.

Mr. Warner: —about inflation, and if they were truly concerned about augmenting the federal programme, why on earth would they consent to having the sales tax increased as of Jan. 1, 1976? It is my firm belief that if we had not been given a minority government situation, we would have seen a sales tax increase of greater than seven per cent; in fact, possibly either eight per cent or 10 per cent.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Where does the member have this crystal ball of his?

Mr. Warner: But, nonetheless, we haven't heard a guarantee that it's not going beyond seven per cent—

Hon. Mr. Davis: Is the member going to be like Mackenzie King, communing with the spirit world?

Mr. Warner: The crystal ball I borrowed is from the hon. Treasurer, which he alluded to earlier.

Hon. Mr. Davis: No, no.

Mr. Warner: The immediate conclusion from all of—

Mr. Gaunt: Mackenzie King took his with him though.

Hon. Mr. Davis: I think he has borrowed it.

Mr. Warner: The immediate conclusion that one might jump to in the face of what we have seen from the government is that there's a lack of concern. That's not true. This government has managed to retain its concern for the multi-national oil corporations, and multi-national mining corporations, the car insurance corporations, Bell Canada, and many other corporate citizens too numerous to list.

Mr. Grossman: Same old speech.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Please say you're going to nationalize—is he going to say that?

Mr. Deans: I think so.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Is the member for Wentworth getting uncomfortable?

Mr. Deans: Yes, yes.

Mr. Warner: It is at this juncture that government supporters claim, "Ah, but we brought in rent controls and security of tenure." It was done kicking and screaming—at the insistence of the tenants of this province and their 38 representatives here. The government brought in rent control, but not within a framework of leadership.

There is still no comprehensive housing policy. There is still no stated philosophy that says shelter is a basic right for every human being. When we turn to security of tenure — again a necessary social right so long denied and possible now through a minority government, although still not fashioned with the framework of empathy with tenants — we find once more it is the result of pressure, not of leadership.

Otherwise, if we had leadership from this government, we would not be faced with the loophole that is provided by section 103d, subsections b and c, in Bill 26:

> Where a landlord requires possession of residential premises for the purposes of conversion to use for a purpose other than rental residential premises, or repairs or renovations so extensive as to require vacant possession of the premises, the landlord may, at any time during the currency of the tenancy agreement, give notice of termination of the tenancy agreement, provided that the length of notice shall not be less than 120 days.

And that loophole means that those citizens of apartments No. 1 and 23 Oriole Rd., of whom the Premier (Mr. Davis) is well aware, are faced with eviction, total eviction, from both of those buildings because the owner has indicated he wishes to clear the building so that he can double or triple the rents and rent those apartment-hotel-like accommodations to the corporations which are located along St. Clair Ave.

The frustration of those tenants came to the surface. Repeated media coverage, letters to the mayor and to the Premier himself —in fact a petition to the Premier's office to do something—have been to no avail. It would appear that unless this bill can be cleaned up somewhat those tenants are faced with eviction from two entire buildings so that the owner can use them to appease the needs of the corporate citizens along St. Clair Ave.

Again, there was absolutely no leadership in the framework of empathy toward those who must rent and are unable to purchase. Those are barriers which should never exist in an enlightened society. Those are barriers which most of us are faced with from time to time.

Few comments can be passed at this time regarding the mortgage interest rates, I think in all fairness, because we haven't seen the legislation. However, I would anticipate, and I am sure that the government would go on record shortly as saying, they are quite interested in allowing the credit unions of this province to participate in passing along mortgage money to those people who are in a position to try to purchase homes; that is that the government will follow up the pleas that have been made by the credit unions to be allowed into the money market to provide a service.

I realize that that really jars the whole basic concept of banking in this country, that the handling of money must be for the purpose of profit. What the credit unions have suggested is, give them the opportunity to pass along mortgage money and they will do it at bookkeeping charges only. They anticipate an increase of one-half to three-quarters per cent only on top of the money which is available through that very treasured triple-A rating this government has.

I am hopeful the government will take that into consideration when it comes forward with its proposals about mortgage interest rates and take all of that money-lending business, or at least a good portion of it,

out of the hands of those who now operate it and put it more into the hands of the credit unions. You have precedents in other provinces, in particular the Province of British Columbia where the credit unions operate quite successfully and get the support of their government.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Does the member want their problems too?

Mr. Warner: We might also consider amending the Act so that a provincial bank is established on the same basis as the provincial Bank of British Columbia, but I'm sure all of that will be revealed as the legislation comes forward.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Does the member want the same economic problems as British Columbia too?

Mr. Warner: Already early in the life of this Parliament, and I think we come to a point of some division here, we see a pattern emerging; namely, act only in response to pressure from the public or combined opposition forces. Ottawa is just too convenient a scapegoat. It has been a scapegoat in the situation of the teachers' strike; it certainly is in the anti-inflation programme.

The challenge to this government is pretty clear. It's one of leadership, and I put that again not in personal terms but in one of economic leadership and social leadership, and we just haven't seen it.

The government could start off—and I offer here a comprehensive set of guidelines—with a very simple, straightforward form of leadership, and then work its way up to more difficult types. Then as it goes on its examples will become bench-marks and I am sure that it will increase the pride it has in its work.

For example, they could start by keeping promises they made to the farmers. That would be an interesting place to begin. I was extremely interested in the comments made by the hon. member for Kitchener-Wilmot (Mr. Sweeney) who I thought pinpointed the plea and the absolute emergency nature of the agricultural situation in this province. I applaud him for bringing to the attention of the House the very serious nature of the agricultural situation.

[12:30]

This government, of course, a long time ago talked in vague terms—but it was quite understood by the farmers—about a farm income stabilization programme which would come about, all in due course—all in due time, the world evolving as it should, it would come. All they had to do was wait; and they waited and waited, and we still do not see a farm income stabilization programme.

The agricultural organizations in this province clamour for it. They have read, digested and understood the programme from the Province of British Columbia and they want it. They have asked this government—pleaded, demanded—and it still does not come forth.

The member for Kitchener-Wilmot pointed out the problem the young farmer faces. Members may find it quite curious that a city member—I represent an urban riding in Scarborough — is talking about agricultural problems, but why on earth should it be divorced? All of us have to purchase food and the less that is done about the agricultural problem, the more we pay for our food. I am extremely concerned about the agricultural problem.

I submit that the member—if he will excuse the expression — was being somewhat conservative in his estimate as to the cost involved for the young farmer. I submit it is closer to $0.25 million if he wishes to be involved in farming as a profession.

We don't see a Farm Start programme in this province yet; and one wonders why, since there is precedence in so many other provinces for it. Again it is a lack of leadership. I think that's the general theme running through all of this legislation which we are seeing and it must be repeated over and over again and perhaps eventually this government will face up to it.

Mr. Kennedy: Collective farms?

Mr. Warner: For example, if the government is really serious about fighting inflation it will not increase the sales tax. I have mentioned it before and I bring it back again and I ask the government to consider it very seriously. Perhaps it will. That legislation runs out at the end of December and the government still has some time to rectify it. It still has some time to ease the pressure and ease the burden for the citizens of this province.

If the Tories are really serious about leadership, they would stop giving groups the impression that size determines the level of their importance.

I would imagine the hon. member for Scarborough East (Mrs. Birch) has had a presentation from the mother-led union with regard to the payments they receive. The kind of response they got back from the

government was an impression—not in definite words, not in concrete terms but an impression—that they are important in terms of the size of their group. I submit that's a totally wrong kind of impression for any government to give.

Their case was extremely legitimate. What they pointed out was that although the amount paid to a single mother to support a four-year-old child was $62.50 a month, a foster parent would receive, for the same child, $152.93 per month. The natural mother is being denied $90 a month.

But their pleas fell on deaf ears it would seem. Their pleas were put in the context of "You are only 350 people." Do the Tories know what they are doing to them? They are forcing them to go out into this province and organize the 90,000 mothers who are in a similar situation; organize them and bring them down here to demonstrate in front of Queen's Park and apply pressure through the media and so on. Why must this government continue not to react? Why must this government continue to say one is only important in terms of numbers? There is no leadership.

Hon. Mr. Davis: That's not what the OSSTF said.

Mr. Warner: No social conscience. That's a pretty damaging—

Hon. Mr. Welch: Who, me?

Mr. Warner: No, not you.

Mr. Eakins: Did the Premier hear what he said?

Mr. Mancini: Bring the Premier back. This is good stuff.

Mr. Cunningham: Why do you think he is leaving?

Mr. Eakins: This is the best part.

Mr. Warner: Now that the Premier has taken the easy ones and can depart, I will move to what are comparatively more difficult issues for the Premier to handle. Once he has mastered those easy ones, he can now move on.

Experience is available from other provinces. The government knows now by the definitive studies that have been done, including a substantial review by the Toronto Daily Star, that we in Ontario pay more for our car insurance in this province than anyone else in Canada and we get substantially less coverage.

How long must we wait for no-fault insurance and for non-discriminatory rates for drivers under the age of 25? In short, how long must we wait for leadership to bring about public car insurance?

Mr. Grossman: Dec. 11.

Mr. Warner: Tomorrow perhaps, or at least in the new year.

Mr. Dukszta: Never for the Conservatives.

Mr. Warner: We'll wait. The miracles of minority government will unveil themselves, I'm sure.

Other provinces are making denticare a reality while Ontario waits, coddling and protecting its dentists against denticare.

Mr. Grossman: What about BC?

Mr. Dukszta: Like father, like son; no action.

Mr. Warner: How long will we wait? There is no action and no leadership.

Finally, if we want to get into the more difficult things, we reach the real heart of the matter, the issues which require real courage and leadership ability; the admission that our property tax as a base for paying for education is regressive and antiquated. What is really needed is an application of progressive income tax without the myriad of deductions —deducting the car washes and all of those other things—a really progressive income tax scale applied fairly and equitably and universally across the board.

A tax on profits from industry is needed to pay for education. I'm not suggesting taxes on the business, I'm talking about a tax on profits. The companies which don't make a profit don't pay the additional tax. I'm not talking about anything grandiose; I'm talking about one per cent, if you want particulars.

It has been shown in this country and other countries that a very small percentage of the gross national product is actually spent on education. In fact in the country of Canada, in total approximately two per cent of total gross national product is spent on education.

I'm asking for one per cent of the profits of industry to augment that portion of the tax which is taken from the income tax source to pay for education. Let's get away from the property tax base. In the case of senior citizens or those on fixed incomes, it's driving them out of their houses. It's unfair, it's regressive and it must be abolished. I'm wondering when we're going to see leadership in that regard.

Then we get right down to the real crunch of the matter, and that is the redistribution of wealth in this province and indeed in this country. As all of us know, it's that wealth system that helps to sustain the class society. No matter what other terms one wishes to couch it in, or no matter how one wishes to hide is, we do have a class society. There are inequities that are rampant in our society and they are not being stopped. The gap widens further.

We've seen in that regard almost gross indecency is this wage and price control. As all of us know, it's really a misnomer. It's wage control, that's for sure; but it's wage control mostly at the organized level and the unorganized level.

There are no minimums. The employer doesn't have to give a raise; and the unorganized worker, I submit, isn't going to get a raise—or at the most a paltry sum. And at the upper levels, where are the controls?

We heard a story the other day of a director of education receiving a $5,000 increase in salary. That comes under the guidelines? It comes under the guidelines because the package applied to the total board and not to the individuals within that board. The worker at the bottom got his small sum so that the one at the top, who was already earning in excess of $30,000 a year, is able to receive an additional $5,000. He obviously needed it to keep up his standard of living.

When I prepared my notes I had not anticipated speaking with regard to the Special Programme Review Committee, whose report was tabled by the hon. Treasurer (Mr. McKeough) Nov. 20. This voluminous document found its way to my desk only yesterday. However, I perused it last night and I found some very interesting reading and I wish now to make some cursory remarks on the contents.

I turn to the last page of the statement by the hon. Treasurer, to the second last paragraph on page 5, because I find it a very curious kind of statement:

> For those who have dreams and pretensions toward ambitious new schemes of large-scale income redistribution, I would advise them to consult with Canadian taxpayers first. I see no great thirst on the part of taxpayers to undergo a forcible reduction in their standard of living to finance new income redistribution programmes. These are tough times and restraint has to be applied in the public sector, both as an example and a necessity.

That's an absolutely incredible statement for anyone in this age of enlightenment to make.

We're coming back to the old business again, that in order to redistribute our wealth, somehow all of us must undergo a decrease in our standard of living. Upon what basis that is founded I have absolutely no idea, and I'm sure the hon. Treasurer doesn't either. That's an incredible statement to make.

I would submit that it may cause some concern to the average medical specialist in this province who's receiving an average annual income of $100,000. A redistribution of part of his income may cause him some difficulties. He may have to fly economy instead of first-class on his trips to the south, and that will be a hardship.

But let's get down to the heart of this matter. When we're talking about redistributing income, there is never a suggestion that it causes any depreciation in the standard of living of those who are in the middle income bracket, which consists of the vast majority in this country. To say there is no thirst on the part of taxpayers to see a change is not consulting with the Canadian Labour Congress, which represents a substantial portion of the workers of this country. It's an unfounded, undocumented statement. I resent it.

I move on, because my particular interest in this Legislature is with regard to colleges and universities. I move on to what has to be construed as one of the most devastating statements I have ever heard. I say at the outset that this government has made some moves in the right direction in bringing about some changes that were long needed long overdue in the system of fees and tuitions for students. It had made progress but this damaging document flies in the face of all of that progress. I am sure the government itself must feel very badly to see some of this printed material. I sympathize with the government. I am sure they are truly sorry that some of these statements have been made.

[12:45]

I quote from page 130 of the document where it says, "We propose the following guidelines be adopted:—and I jump into the middle of that section—"An increase in tuition fees of about 65 per cent." It goes on to state that the average fees for universities would increase from $588 to $970.

Mr. Dukszta: Disgusting.

Mr. Warner: Almost $1,000 a year of tuition fee. If that isn't enough, if enough harm hasn't come to those students who can't afford to go to university now, I turn—

Hon. Mr. Welch: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the hon. member would allow a brief interruption. The Lieutenant Governor is due to come in and I wonder, if I left to get her now, whether the hon. member, if he has something further to say, would move now that the debate be adjourned not later than 12:50 p.m. and then we will arrive with Her Honour. I am sure that he has more to say; so if we could have that motion that this debate be adjourned not later than 12:50 p.m. I will excuse myself now to get the Lieutenant Governor.

Mr. Warner: Certainly, Mr. Speaker. I was keeping an eye on the clock, and I will be cognizant of the time.

As I was saying, as if the increase by 65 per cent isn't sufficient, we turn to page 133 and we notice that the suggestion here, with regard to loans and grants, is that as a first step the maximum provincial grant would be decreased from $3,200 to $2,200 and the loan portion would be increased from $800 to $1,800. Absolutely astounding.

Not only does the government take the student, who can't afford his university education in the first place, and slap him with an additional several hundred dollars for his tuition, but it makes sure he is going to be in debt, substantially in debt after he has finished university. I find it astounding.

Since I am sure we will get involved in this document in one form or another, I would appreciate statements as to how this government is going to eradicate those suggestions from the document. They are extremely destructive.

We come back to the whole business about leadership. It really doesn't matter what subject matter we turn to; whether we talk about hospital care—we got into what I thought was an extremely important debate yesterday; I was pleased that the member for Grey-Bruce (Mr. Sargent) raised the issue, because it brought to light a very serious problem about delivery of health care services throughout this province to the small communities. Again I mention that, coming from an urban riding, our health services are met by hospitals, and actually an over-abundance of medical personnel; but in the smaller communities that isn't the case. In the smaller communities the health care seems to be deteriorating; the service is not there.

We have pleaded with this government to do two things: One, to institute community health care services in the communities; and secondly, to make sure that something is put into place, something more than adequate, before this government starts closing down hospitals. The closing down of those hospitals without any community health service being put into place is absolutely irresponsible. I commend the member for Grey-Bruce for introducing the debate yesterday.

Mr. Sargent: Thank you.

Mr. Warner: It comes down to a matter of leadership, and that particular issue brought to light the lack of leadership in health care.

In education, again we have seen—

Mr. Speaker: Order. If the member is moving onto a new topic, perhaps he might move the adjournment of the debate.

Mr. Warner moved the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to.

The Honourable the Lieutenant Governor of Ontario entered the chamber of the legislative assembly and took her seat upon the throne.

ROYAL ASSENT

Hon. P. M. McGibbon (Lieutenant Governor): Pray be seated.

Mr. Speaker: May it please Your Honour, the legislative assembly of the province has, at its present sittings thereof, passed certain bills to which, in the name of and on behalf of the said legislative assembly, I respectfully request Your Honour's assent.

The Clerk Assistant: The following are the titles of the bills to which Your Honour's assent is prayed:

Bill 1, An Act to amend the Judicature Act.

Bill 8, An act to amend the Assessment Act.

Bill 9, An Act to amend the Bills of Sale and Chattel Mortgages Act.

Bill 10, An Act to amend the Assignment of Book Debts Act.

Bill 11, An Act to amend the Conditional Sales Act.

Clerk of the House: In Her Majesty's name, the Honourable the Lieutenant Governor doth assent to these bills.

The Honourable the Lieutenant Governor was pleased to retire from the chamber.

Hon. Mr. Welch: Mr. Speaker, before moving the adjournment of the House, may I

indicate what our programme will be next week.

On Monday, until 5 o'clock we will resume the consideration of the estimates of the policy field of Social Development to be followed by the Ministry of Natural Resources. At 5, of course, is the private members' hour.

On Tuesday we will proceed with second reading of Bill 26 and then Bill 27; then, if time permits, we will do legislation in committee of the whole House, doing Bills 2, 3, 4, 6, 7 and 27, if, in fact, that work has been completed. Wednesday of course, is committee day, Thursday, we will go back to committee of supply estimates, the Ministry of Natural Resources followed by the policy field of Resources Development. On Friday of next week, a week from today, we will continue with the Throne debate.

Are there any questions?

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to take this opportunity to congratulate the House leader on the very fine way he runs the business of the House this year.

Mr. Deans: Mr. Speaker, I do have a question for the record: I recall there was a commitment made to table the papers related to the Ontario position on the federal guidelines and that some appropriate time would be set aside for debate on that matter. I wonder if the House leader would bring that back to mind at the beginning of the week and perhaps have an answer for us at that time?

Hon. Mr. Welch: Mr. Speaker, I would be glad to. It was my intention to discuss that early next week with my colleagues.

I appreciate very much the kind remarks made by the member for Grey-Bruce. I would want to point out that it is only possible because of the co-operation which I am receiving from the House leaders of the other two parties. Together we are doing our best and together we appreciate having the members' compliments.

Mr. Deans: It's like the Bermuda triangle; certain things get lost.

Hon. Mr. Welch moved the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to.

The House adjourned at 1 p.m.

CONTENTS

Friday, November 21, 1975

Credit card payments, statement by Mr. Handleman 821

Distribution of GAINS cheques, statement by Mr. Meen 821

Rent controls, point of privilege by Mr. Rhodes 822

St. Thomas hockey coach, statement by Mr. McMurtry 822

Distribution of GAINS cheques, question of Mr. Meen: Mr. Deans 823

Toronto teachers' negotiations, questions of Mr. Wells: Mr. Deans, Mrs. Bryden, Mr. Renwick 823

Special programme review, questions of Mr. McKeough: Mr. Breithaupt, Mr. Sargent, Mr. Roy, Mr. Shore 825

Hospital review, questions of Mr. F. S. Miller: Mr. Breithaupt, Mr. Roy 826

Ontario Council on University Affairs, question of Mr. Parrott: Mr. Breithaupt 827

Daycare budget, question of Mr. Taylor: Mr. McClellan 827

Windsor hospital facilities, questions of Mr. F. S. Miller: Mr. Bounsall, Mr. B. Newman 828

Metro police complaints, questions of Mr. MacBeth: Mr. Singer, Mr. Roy 828

Duties of Andrew StuParick, question of Mrs. Scrivener: Mr. Deans, Mr. Cassidy, Mr. Makarchuk 829

Paperworkers' strike, question of B. Stephenson: Mr. Ferrier 830

Eganville creamey, question of Mr. Bennett: Mr. Conway 830

Botterill report, question of Mr. W. Newman: Mr. Wiseman 831

Guidelines for agricultural land, question of Mr. W. Newman: Mr. Godfrey 831

Crimes of violence, question of Mr. McMurtry: Mr. Ruston 831

Nappan Island development, question of Mr. Rhodes: Mr. Good 832

Court case backlog, questions of Mr. McMurtry: Mr. Makarchuk, Mr. Singer 832

Jurors' fees, question of Mr. MacBeth: Mr. B. Newman 832

Special occasion permits, question of Mr. Handleman: Mr. Swart 833

Jurors' fees, questions of Mr. MacBeth: Mr. Roy, Mr. Philip 833

Gould strike, question of B. Stephenson: Mr. Haggerty 834

Health Insurance Amendment Act, Mr. Roy, first reading 834

Resumption of the debate on the Speech from the Throne, Mr. Sweeney, Mr. Gregory, Mr. Warner 834

Motion to adjourn debate, Mr. Warner, agreed to 851

Royal assent to certain bills, the Honourable the Lieutenant Governor 851

Motion to adjourn, Mr. Welch, agreed to 852

SPEAKERS IN THIS ISSUE

Bennett, Hon. C. Industry and Tourism (Ottawa South PC)
Bernier, Hon. L. Natural Resources (Kenora PC)
Bounsall, E. J. (Windsor-Sandwich NDP)
Breithaupt, J. R. (Kitchener L)
Bryden, M. (Beaches-Woodbine NDP)
Cassidy, M. (Ottawa Centre NDP)
Conway, S. (Renfrew North L)
Cunningham, E. (Wentworth North L)
Davidson, M. (Cambridge NDP)
Davis, Hon. W. G. Premier (Brampton PC)
Deans, I. (Wentworth NDP)
Dukszta, J. (Parkdale NDP)
Eakins, J. (Victoria-Haliburton L)
Ferrier, W. (Cochrane South NDP)
Gaunt, M. (Huron-Bruce L)
Godfrey, C. (Durham West NDP)
Grande, A. (Oakwood NDP)
Gregory, M. E. C. (Mississauga East PC)
Grossman, L. (St. Andrew-St. Patrick PC)
Haggerty, R. (Erie L)
Handleman, Hon. S. B. Consumer and Commercial Relations (Carleton PC)
Kennedy, R. D. (Mississauga South PC)
MacBeth, Hon. J. P. Provincial Secretary for Justice and Solicitor General (Humber PC)
MacDonald, D. C. (York South NDP)
Makarchuk, M. (Brantford NDP)
Mancini, R. (Essex South L)
McClellan, R. (Bellwoods NDP)
McKeough, Hon. W. D. Treasurer, Minister of Economics and Intergovernmental Affairs (Chatham-Kent PC)
McMurtry, Hon. R. Attorney General (Eglinton PC)
McNeil, R. K. (Elgin PC)
Meen, Hon. A. K. Revenue (York East PC)
Miller, Hon. F. S. Health (Muskoka PC)
Moffatt, D. (Durham East NDP)
Newman, B. (Windsor-Walkerville L)
Newman, Hon. W. Agriculture and Food (Durham North PC)
Parrott, Hon. H. C. Colleges and Universities (Oxford PC)
Philip, E. (Etobicoke NDP)
Reed, J. (Halton-Burlington L)
Renwick, J. A. (Riverdale NDP)
Rhodes, Hon. J. R. Housing (Sault Ste. Marie PC)
Roy, A. J. (Ottawa East L)
Ruston, R. F. (Essex North L)
Sargent, E. (Grey-Bruce L)
Scrivener, Hon. M. Government Services (St. David PC)
Shore, M. (London North L)
Singer, V. M. (Wilson Heights L)
Smith, Hon. J. R. Correctional Services (Hamilton Mountain PC)
Smith, S. (Hamilton West L)
Stephenson, Hon. B. Labour (York Mills PC)
Stong, A. (York Centre L)
Swart, M. (Welland NDP)
Sweeney, J. (Kitchener-Wilmot L)
Taylor, Hon. J. A. Minister of Community and Social Services (Prince Edward-Lennox PC)
Warner, D. (Scarborough-Ellesmere NDP)
Welch, Hon. R. Culture and Recreation (Brock PC)
Wells, Hon. T. L. Education (Scarborough North PC)
Wiseman, D. J. (Lanark PC)
Young, F. (Yorkview NDP)

No. 22



Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT — DAILY EDITION

First Session of the Thirtieth Legislature

Monday, November 24, 1975

Speaker: Honourable Russell Daniel Rowe
Clerk: Roderick Lewis, QC

THE QUEEN'S PRINTER
PARLIAMENT BUILDINGS, TORONTO
1975



CONTENTS

A list of the speakers taking part in the debates in this issue of Hansard appears, in alphabetical order, at the back of this issue.

Daily contents of proceedings also appears at the back of this issue. Reference to a cumulative index of previous issues can be obtained by calling the Hansard Reporting Service indexing staff. Phone 965-2159.

Hansard subscription price is $15.00 per session, from: Sessional Subscription Service, MGS, 9th Floor, Ferguson Block, Parliament Bldgs., Toronto, M7A 1N3. Phone 965-2238.

LEGISLATURE OF ONTARIO

MONDAY, NOVEMBER 24, 1975

The House met at 2 p.m.

Prayers.

Mr. Leluk: I would ask the members of this House to join with me in welcoming 30 grade 8 students from John G. Althouse Public School and six grade 9 students from Silverthorn Collegiate Institute in York West riding. They are seated in the west gallery.

Mr. Stong: Seated in the east gallery are 51 grade 8 students from James Robinson Public School in Markham under the direction of Mrs. Marylou Hunt and Mr. Colin McLennan. I would ask the House to join with me in welcoming them.

Mr. Philip: Sitting in the east gallery are grade 7 students from St. Andrew's Roman Catholic Separate School. I ask the members to welcome them.

Mr. Speaker: Statements by the ministry.

ROLE OF PARLIAMENTARY ASSISTANTS

Mr. Speaker: Just before I call for oral questions—

Mr. Lewis: Take all the time you want.

Mr. Speaker: —the member for Ottawa East (Mr. Roy) has twice raised the question of whether parliamentary assistants should be permitted to ask questions of the ministry during the oral question period. I thank the hon. member for raising the question because of its great importance.

I must confess to a feeling of ambivalence in this matter as I can see good arguments on both sides. On the one hand, is the fact that such assistants are still private members, not members of the cabinet, and are not privy to cabinet discussions. There is some merit in the suggestion that they should be allowed to seek information on matters of particular interest to their constituents as long as such questions are directed to ministers other than those to whom they have been appointed assistants. I think it is obvious that they should not direct questions to their own ministers.

On the other side of the question, it has been pointed out that they do swear the oath of secrecy. They assist in carrying out policy by sitting on regulations committees of cabinet. They do pilot legislation through the House on behalf of the ministers whose assistants they are. In at least one case, special permission was granted by the House for a parliamentary assistant to answer questions on behalf of his minister during the latter's prolonged absence. In at least some other jurisdictions, such assistants are prohibited from asking questions.

In view of the special status of these members and of the fact that a committee of the House is at the present time considering the fourth and fifth Reports of the commission on the Legislature, including the references in those reports to the question period, I am requesting that this whole matter of participation by parliamentary assistants in the question period be considered by that committee, including the question of whether or not they should be permitted to answer questions on behalf of their ministers either in the absence of such ministers or on reference by the ministers.

I am sending a copy of this request to the chairman of that committee on the assumption that the House will agree that my request may be treated as a reference of this matter to the committee. I request that a report on this question may come from the committee very promptly.

Mr. Nixon: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, could we assume then, that until the committee acts on your suggestion, the parliamentary assistants will not have the right of question?

Mr. Speaker: I would think otherwise because at the moment they do have the right. I think it would be unwise to change it until the final decision.

Mr. Nixon: We won't appeal that.

Mr. Speaker: Oral questions.

TORONTO TEACHERS' NEGOTIATIONS

Mr. Lewis: A question, if I may, to the Minister of Education: With the latest transfusion of confusion and ill will which exists between teachers and board in Metropolitan Toronto, what is the minister's next move, pray tell?

Hon. Mr. Wells: I am planning on having some further talks later today with the parties. I understand one of the parties to the dispute is in Ottawa today making a presentation, which it indicated it was going to be doing. Upon its return we shall see where things go.

Mr. Lewis: By way of supplementary, understanding how all of us collectively voted the right to strike, and granting them the inalienable right to do so, but assuming that the minister would like to settle the strike, as others would, would he like to join with me or may I join with him in an effort to bring the parties to the bargaining table in an attempt at some prolonged and persistent bargaining to end the dispute? Might the minister try that?

Hon. Mr. Wells: I would be happy to sit down with my friend and hear just exactly what he has in mind.

Mr. Lewis: It will be a pleasure.

Mr. Renwick: That could be prolonged.

Mr. Nixon: It's not going to settle the strike by the two of you sitting down together.

Mr. Lewis: It has as good a chance as anything else.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Hon. Mr. Wells: I have to say, I think the way this strike will be settled is for both parties to get to the bargaining table. They are going to have to use a mediator and, with great respect, the Leader of the Opposition or myself are not the mediators that are needed in this particular situation.

Mr. Lewis: Fine.

Hon. Mr. Wells: But I do think before that can happen, some of the matters that have now come to the fore will have to be settled —and there are two, as my friend knows. One is the charge of bad faith bargaining by the teachers and the other is the insistence by the board it have some determination from the Anti-Inflation Board before it continues with bargaining.

Mr. MacDonald: There are more roadblocks being erected here than on the western front.

Mr. Foulds: In his response to the first question by the Leader of the Opposition, did the minister say he was meeting with both sides? Is he meeting with them later today together or individually, or is he simply contacting them by telephone?

Hon. Mr. Wells: I said I would be in contact with both sides—I am not meeting with both sides—as indeed I have been every day in the last week or so.

Mr. Lewis: Can I ask a supplementary or a new question? Is the minister not concerned with the challenge on the bad faith side of it, apart from the right of the teachers to place the challenge? Is that likely to prolong things another week or 10 days until there is a ruling from the Education Relations Commission, and isn't that absurd in the context of the pressure of negotiations? Couldn't we bring them together before we await that outcome?

Hon. Mr. Wells: My friend knows the legislation allowed the Education Relations Commission to hear charges by either party at any time if either felt that the other was not negotiating in good faith. I understand the commission has received a copy of a letter from the board to the teachers to this effect at the present time, and the commission will now have to hear this matter.

Mr. Speaker: Any further questions? We are prolonging this quite lengthily I believe, and there are many other people who wish to ask questions. This is a final supplementary question. The member for Riverdale.

Mr. Renwick: A supplementary question to the Minister of Education: Has the special cabinet committee on the anti-inflation guidelines—of which his colleague, the Treasurer (Mr. McKeough), is the chairman—met with the chairman of the Metropolitan Toronto School Board and the chairman of the other constituent school boards to discuss the guidelines and their application?

Hon. Mr. Wells: The answer to that is no; but I have met with those parties to discuss the guidelines.

SERVICES TO MENTALLY RETARDED

Mr. Lewis: May I ask the provincial Treasurer: If, under the Canada Assistance Plan, money flows into the provincial Treasury

—as in the case of cost-sharing over the provision of services to the mentally retarded —in an amount significantly in excess of government programmes in that field—in this case, an amount in excess of about $50 million—what happens to that money in the process of the consolidated revenues of the province? Is it earmarked; is it disbursed to alternative programmes; can it ever be identified.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: I think I would have to take a look at the answer to that, in order to be precise about it. As a general answer—I am not sure of the specifics here—the money wouldn't flow until it had been spent on our part, so the accounting wouldn't be necessary. I would want to take a look at my answer in terms of the specifics that the member has asked about and I will get back to him.

Mr. MacDonald: Will they get it before they spend that?

Mr. Lewis: My colleagues are prompting me to the obvious question: Do we receive the money from the federal government before we have programmes in place to utilize it?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Not normally.

Mr. Lewis: Not normally, and yet the Ministry of Community and Social Services says in writing it has received $30 million last year and $18 million so far this year and has only planned for a marginal amount. Could the Treasurer try to give us a specific reply? I would be interested.

HOSPITAL APPEAL BOARD

Mr. Lewis: A question of the Minister of Health: Did he notice that Mr. Justice Grange has joined with a number of senior counsel in Ontario, and apparently with the Ontario Medical Association itself, to call into question the usefulness and appropriateness of the present Ontario Hospital Appeal Board, and might the minister consider reconstituting that board in the light of this almost universal criticism?

Hon. F. S. Miller: Mr. Speaker, I noticed very briefly the comments in the Globe and Mail today, and I guess those are the ones to which the member is alluding.

Mr. Lewis: Yes.

Hon. F. S. Miller: I have asked my staff to give me opinions upon those comments. I am certainly not going to take the comments of a person as eminent as he lightly, and I am quite pleased to look at them and see if, in fact, there is good reason to follow them or not.

Mr. Lewis: Was the minister aware of the profound legal and medical, and now judicial, questioning of the fairness of the present board and the appointments to it, or does this come as news to him?

Hon. F. S. Miller: I was certainly aware of the criticisms of the constitution of the board in the beginning. I recall two or three editorials, almost three years ago I would think, on this topic, and yet looking through those editorials at that time—I wasn't minister, as you recall, but I was interested as parliamentary assistant—it seemed that some of the assumptions or conclusions drawn were not necessarily fair. Certainly there are people on there who had previously been on boards of hospitals. The chairman at one time had been on the board of a hospital and yet he was not at the time of his appointment. I would hope that he was chosen because of his competence—he is from my riding.

Mr. Nixon: Yes, right; a very competent fellow.

Hon. F. S. Miller: That was also a coincidence; he was chosen before I was even the parliamentary assistant to that ministry. I think that time has proven that he was a very competent lawyer and a very dedicated person. As yet, I haven't seen substance to the rumour that the composition of the board had alienated or affected its decisions. I am, however, quite willing to look seriously at the comments made today.

[2:15]

Mr. Nixon: Supplementary: Since the minister has indicated a great respect for the opinions of Mr. Justice Grange, and it is Mr. Justice Grange's opinion that four of the five members would have perhaps a somewhat pre-established opinion of appeals over decisions made by hospital boards, there is quite clear conflict, resulting in the comment of Julian Porter—another very able associate of the minister—about "sending a doctor through a long tunnel of slander."

Mr. Speaker: Order, please—the question.

Mr. Nixon: It should be remade—shouldn't it?

ST. JOSEPH'S HOSPITAL STAFF REDUCTION

Mr. Lewis: One other question of the Minister of Health: Did the minister know in advance of St. Joseph's Hospital's intention to reduce its budget deficit by an arbitrary laying off without pay of all its employees for two days?

Hon. F. S. Miller: No. I did not, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Lewis: How does the minister feel abont that approach without consultation with the work force involved?

Hon. F. S. Miller: I understand that there was consultation. However, the member may or may not agree with the adequacy of the consultation with the various staff involved. In fact, I was told that was the very reason that this route was followed; in fact, they chose the two-day lay-off for everybody following a discussion with staff where they proposed the alternatives.

I am trying to go by memory, but it seemed to me the alternative was that 60 or 70 people would have to be dropped on an almost permanent basis if they didn't follow this route. I understand that most of the professional and semi-professional staff agreed with this. I also understand that there was no complaint lodged by either the president of the local union or the person on the property representing CUPE.

TORONTO TEACHERS' NEGOTIATIONS

Mr. Nixon: I would like to ask the Minister of Education if the report in the Globe and Mail of last Friday concerns him, which indicates that the Ontario Education Relations Commission was unable to meet to decide "when a school strike has gone on too long"? The minister is aware that the legislation requires that commission to advise the government when a strike has gone on too long, in which case the minister would then consider action taken by this Legislature. Has he followed up on this report that the commission, which is a part-time commission, has not come to grips with a decision that is theirs as to when a strike has gone on too long?

Hon. Mr. Wells: Yes, I have followed up on that, Mr. Speaker, and I am convinced that the commission is doing everything possible to fulfil their responsibilities. I am sure my friend knows there are still only three members of that five-member commission, and the three members are doing a yeoman job. I think that they can fulfil all their responsibilities.

Mr. Nixon: Supplementary: Can the minister report to the House what guidelines the commissioners will be using as to "when a strike has gone on too long"? That it would interfere with the possible successful completion of a course of study?

Hon. Mr. Wells: I can't tell my friend what guidelines the commission will be using. This, as he knows, will be the first time that the commission has carried out their duties under this particular section. They are presently deciding what the guidelines will be. I understand they intend to hold hearings with interested parties and they then will offer a decision which will be transmitted to the government.

Mr. Lewis: Just a supplementary: The commission will hold public hearings, I take it, on the interpretation of the guidelines? Does that not suggest to the minister yet further urgency for bringing the parties together today, since every place we turn around there is another prolongation?

Hon. Mr. Wells: I am sorry. My hon. friend says "on the interpretation of the guidelines." I was talking about the commission developing the guidelines—

Mr. Lewis: Yes, that is right.

Hon. Mr. Wells: —for carrying out these duties. No, they are not going to hold public hearings on the guidelines. They are going to hold public hearings on whether the stoppage constitutes—

Mr. Lewis: Constitutes "too long."

Hon. Mr. Wells: —a situation that is interfering with the students' progress.

Mr. Nixon: Mr. Speaker, if I may ask a supplementary question based on the minister's answer: Surely the commission has been selected with the approval of all members here. We are fortunate in the quality of the commissioners to make that determination, so that it is not left to the government or politicians to say the strike should go on—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. Is there a question?

Mr. Nixon: Would the minister not consider it the duty of that commission to make a decision on the basis of the responsibility

this House has given them and when the time comes, if it does, to make a recommendation to the government that the future of the pupils is in jeopardy?

Hon. Mr. Wells: Yes; that's quite right, Mr. Speaker. That commission, if they wish to, without any hearings or without any further considerations, can make a recommendation to the government—that's their prerogative.

Mr. Nixon: Are you taking a referendum on it?

Hon. Mr. Wells: It's also their prerogative, if they decide they want to, to set up a procedure to hear people who may have some complaints about the situation that's going on and who would be urging the commission to make some determination to us about the strike. That's also their prerogative. I might tell my friend that the commission at this point in time, of its own volition, is not ready to make any recommendations to the government in this regard.

Mr. Speaker: This will be the final supplementary.

Mr. Foulds: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Is the minister aware that the matter is of some extreme urgency to those pupils on the semester system who would be completing their grade 12 or grade 13 year as of January?

Hon. Mr. Wells: Certainly there is some urgency and I think we all recognize this urgency. We might perhaps have a little more clarity in the whole situation around here if my friends would all state that what they're really asking for is that this House legislate the teachers back to work.

Mr. Lewis: No. We just want to bring them to the bargaining table. We would like to try.

Hon. Mr. Wells: I presume you know that the teachers asked me if we wouldn't legislate them back last Friday?

Mr. Lewis: No, I didn't know that.

Hon. Mr. Wells: Well, they did.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I said this was the final supplementary.

Mr. Lewis: That's a most extraordinary revelation.

Mr. Nixon: Surely, Mr. Speaker, arising from the minister's last answer—

Mr. Speaker: This will be a new question, then.

Mr. Nixon: I put a new question to the minister. If the teachers are calling for a legislated return to the classroom, is the minister considering the sort of thing that the legislation does involve; that is, arbitration or final offer selection which is open to both the school boards and the teachers? Is he using his good offices to see if one of those alternatives is available?

Mr. Speaker: Is there any answer to the question?

Mr. Lewis: There must be an answer. It was a question.

Mrs. Campbell: Got to find out the answer first.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Hon. Mr. Wells: The teachers—and I have the statement here—asked me if I would consider legislating them back or having this Legislature legislate them back to work with the Hartt conciliation report imposed as the settlement.

Mr. Nixon: Oh, great. No further questions on that one.

Interjections.

Mr. Foulds: Supplementary: Was there not also a rider that they felt Bill 100 had been shot anyway? Was that not the basis?

Hon. Mr. Wells: I don't think they felt it had been shot. As I explained to them Bill 100 is going to be here for many more years to come.

An hon. member: It may or may not.

TOBACCO AUCTION

Mr. Nixon: I put a question to the Minister of Agriculture and Food. Can the minister report to the House the situation pertaining to the tobacco marketing in the province because the auction barns have now been closed for a week?

Hon. W. Newman: There was a meeting last Friday between the Farm Products Marketing Board, the tobacco board and the manufacturers. As a result of the meeting held last Friday there is a further meeting being held this morning.

Mr. Nixon: Progress?

Hon. W. Newman: There was a meeting this morning with the tobacco board and the committee to discuss the matter and I am very optimistic—I haven't heard the results of their meeting yet; maybe they're still in session—that we'll get the tobacco auctions open again, hopefully, this week.

Mr. Nixon: Supplementary: Since this is a matter of grave concern to the farmers involved, does the minister consider the agreement between the buyers and the tobacco producers to sell their crop at an average price of 94 cents a pound to be a legally binding agreement? If he does consider it this way, is he considering some legislative steps so to constitute it?

Hon. W. Newman: I am convinced the manufacturers in this country are bound by it. I am a little concerned about the offshore buyers of tobacco at this point in time. I don't want to comment in detail on it until I get the results of the meeting today. The 94 cents per pound the member is talking about is a commitment by the manufacturers in this province.

ARNPRIOR HYDRO PROJECT

Mr. Yakabuski: Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the Minister of Energy. Is the minister aware that Acres and Co., on the Hydro project in Arnprior, is requesting workers from the International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers, Unit 586 in Ottawa, when it should be actually requesting workers from Unit 586-2 in Pembroke, Ont. which is supposed to serve all of Renfrew county?

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: No, Mr. Speaker, I wasn't, but I will look into the matter on behalf of the member.

PORT ARTHUR CLINIC STRIKE

Mr. Foulds: A question of the Minister of Labour: Now that the negotiators for the doctors at the Port Arthur clinic have rejected the recommendations of the ministry mediator for a settlement of the four-month strike at the Port Arthur clinic, is she satisfied that their negotiators have bargained in good faith over the last four months and, if not, is she willing to take action under section 14 of the Act?

Hon. B. Stephenson: To my knowledge there has only been negotiation within the last two weeks. In fact, there was very little in the way of negotiation in the previous period of time, although there may have been some. I am certainly satisfied that the recent negotiation has been in good faith.

Mr. Foulds: Supplementary: Has the minister not been made aware of the memorandum of agreement preceding the last two-week period and has she not been made aware that the union is willing to go to voluntary binding arbitration? Would she be willing to use her own ministerial authority and her considerable prestige with the medical doctors to urge them to do the same?

Hon. B. Stephenson: I was not aware that the union had expressed that willingness, but I shall certainly investigate that possibility.

REGIONAL GOVERNMENT

Mr. Reed: I have a question for the Treasurer. Is he prepared to apologize to the constituents of Halton-Burlington for accusing the rural population of having an easy tax ride, when he knows full well that before the imposition of regional government the townships of Esquesing and Nassagaweya had no debentures and no personal debt?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Mr. Speaker, I'm not sure—

Mr. Nixon: Just say you're sorry.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: —of the sequitur in that question or whether it is a bit of a non sequitur.

What I certainly indicated to the Halton regional council with very little disagreement, I think, from nearly all of the regional councillors who were there, was that one had to appreciate that for a long time—and this isn't true of just Halton; it's true in other parts of the province as well—there have been people, whom the previous Minister of Agriculture and Food referred to as rurbanites. I don't know what the present minister refers to them as. These are people who have moved out into the country on a quarter of an acre or an acre, who essentially have had full municipal services and have enjoyed very low tax rates.

I'm not now talking about the farmer, be he in Kent county or be he in Halton Hills or wherever. There are a great number of people who have—

Mr. Yakabuski: The truth is bitter.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: —I don't say they did it by choice—enjoyed very low tax rates or

lower tax rates—there's no such thing as a low tax rate—because they have moved out to a concession, frankly through inadequacies, I suppose, in both local and provincial planning permissions that have allowed them to do so.

They have really in many ways had the best of all worlds. They've often enjoyed provincial policing, the full benefits of an enlightened school system, perhaps fire protection and a library system. They haven't wanted nor need a water and sewer system—

Mr. Shore: What about the apology? That is what he is asking for?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: —and they have paid substantially less taxes than the people living in some cases across the border in the urban municipality. I include myself in that category.

Mr. Reed: Supplementary: How does the Treasurer then relate that to the fact that the people in the rural areas assumed a share of the personal debt of the other areas? He's accusing the rural people of free-loading but with—

Mr. Yakabuski: No, now, don't twist it.

Mr. Reed: —the imposition of regional government the rural areas took on that financial burden.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Interjections.

Mr. Speaker: Is there an answer to the first part, which was a question, I believe?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Yes, the first part was a question. The question is am I accusing someone of free-loading. No, but I am accusing the member's party of being bankrupt and dishonest in that kind of talk.

Mr. Nixon: Under those circumstances, Mr. Speaker, a supplementary.

Interjections.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. This is the sort of question and answer which get us into a debate.

Interjections.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Interjections.

[2:30]

Mr. Nixon: Well, they talk about a bankrupt province. They talk about the man who put us behind $2 billion this year—the bankrupt Treasury.

Interjections.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Mr. Nixon: Supplementary, sir.

Mr. Speaker: This is developing into a debate, and I suggest we go on to the next question. The Minister of Education has a correcting answer to a previous question.

Mr. Nixon: You are always against the questioners from rural Ontario.

Hon. Mr. Bernier: Don't steal his line.

Hon. Mr. Wells: It appears that I might have left the wrong impression. My friend from Port Arthur (Mr. Foulds) asked about Bill 100 and whether the teachers had said that had it not been "shot"—were those his words? Well, actually the words that were used to me were that Bill 100 had been "smothered under the pillow of Bill C-73."

ESSEX PACKERS

Mr. Mackenzie: Does the Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations have any plans to protect the savings of employees of Essex Packers in Hamilton, who are now being asked to invest their savings in the company, in view of the statements in this House that the minister has reason to believe that the principals in the company do have the money to bail the company out, and he is not prepared to go ahead with provincial assistance?

Hon. Mr. Handleman: Mr. Speaker, I find it difficult to relate the question to my responsibilities as Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations. We have nothing to do with the personal savings of the employees of Essex Packers, nor with the relationships between the company and its employees—so I simply cannot answer the question.

Mr. Mackenzie: Possibly this should have gone to the Minister of Industry and Tourism—if I could ask to redirect that question.

Mr. Speaker: Does this come under the authority of the Minister of Industry and Tourism?

Hon. Mr. Bennett: Mr. Speaker, this is similar to the Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations, in that it certainly has no relationship to Industry and Tourism.

Mr. Nixon: Ask the Minister of Correctional Services (Mr. J. R. Smith).

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I think perhaps you might give it some thought and—have you got the right minister this time?

Interjections.

Mr. Speaker: Order.

Mr. Mackenzie: In view of the new developments, where the employees are being asked to invest their savings, is the Minister of Industry and Tourism prepared to make available to the employees at Essex Packers the results of his investigation that led to the comment in this House that they did not need provincial assistance, in that there was money available with the principals of the firm?

Hon. Mr. Bennett: Mr. Speaker, as far as the member is concerned, I think I indicated very clearly at the time that I reported to this House on some of the facts that were made available to us on a confidential basis—that it was a confidential report made through the financial houses to us as to the company's position and the position of the individuals who own the company at this present time. I am in no position to release to the members or to the employees of the company the facts and figures that we happen to have. If the employees are intending to invest in Essex Packers under some type of loaning arrangement, that would be between them and their lawyers and the people who are advising them on their financial investments.

Mr. Mackenzie: If the government was not prepared, after representations by the company to invest in it, on the basis of the answer we got in this House, surely we have some obligation to the other employees to protect their savings.

Mr. Speaker: Order please. You're debating the answer.

Mr. MacDonald: I have a supplementary. Does the minister not feel that he has an obligation to reveal at least something to this House to justify an action in which the principals won't invest their money, and yet they are seeking to have the employees do it instead?

Hon. Mr. Bennett: Mr. Speaker, my responsibility would relate to the individuals of the company who wish to secure financing through the development corporation of the Province of Ontario. That's where my responsibility happens to come and that's why we were investigating as to what position we might be in. As I indicated to this House at this time, we do have an export loan outstanding with Essex Packers at the moment, which has supported them in the exporting of their pork products to Japan and various other countries of the world. That's where our concern happens to be, and it was not in the area of concern as to who may or may not invest in Essex Packers at this time.

SPECIAL PROGRAMME REVIEW

Mr. Peterson: Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the Treasurer, through you, sir, if he can enlighten this House as to how, in view of the tabling of the Henderson report last week, if he has asked Hydro to cut down its proposed spending over the next few years? I think it would be illuminating to us as well as to the committee on Hydro.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: I'm afraid I don't follow the question.

An hon. member: The minister wasn't listening.

Mr. Speaker: Does the hon. member wish to repeat the question?

Mr. Peterson: In the Henderson report—

Mr. Nixon: That's Max.

Mr. Peterson: —which the minister tabled last week, he suggested that he would be asking Hydro to cut back on its proposed capital spending over the next few years. Can he inform this House how much he has asked Hydro to cut back and what the programme for the cutback is?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: No, we have not specified an amount or specifics at this point in time.

Mr. Peterson: For the benefit of the House and for the benefit of the Hydro committee, this is absolutely fundamental information. I would ask the minister when he is going to inform the House.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Mr. Speaker, I indicated that to the committee two weeks ago Wednesday. When I met with the committee, I made it clear that there were ongoing discussions between Hydro, the Ministry of Energy and my own ministry. I thought that it would be several weeks before those discussions are completed.

COMMENTS BY OPSEU PRESIDENT

Mr. Williams: Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the Premier.

[Applause.]

Mr. Reid: On to the big boys now. Paul Yakabuski tried and it didn't work.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please; we'd like to hear the question. Order.

Mr. Williams: Mr. Speaker, last Saturday I was disturbed to read in the press where Charles Darrow, president of the Ontario Public Service Employees' Union had threatened to shut down the province if proposals by the Ontario government committee on spending were adopted. My question of the Premier is whether it is not now time for the leaders of all three parties to join together and speak out strongly, and in unison, condemning any of those persons in our society who would advocate and preach civil disobedience in this country.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I cannot speak for the leaders of the two parties opposite as it relates to the question of civil disobedience or the right to strike in our own public service. My views are well known; I'm opposed to it.

Mr. Nixon: You people missed your cue to pound your desk there.

CEASE AND DESIST ORDER

Mr. Moffatt: I have a question of the Minister of Labour. Is the minister aware of the cease and desist order which was placed by the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Relations against the firm known variously as New Standard Readers Service, as the National Readers Service, Universal Reference Books of Canada, General Reading Service and Federated Publishers Service? This cease and desist order—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The member asked if she was aware of the order, that's all we need to know.

Mr. Moffatt: The question has some relevance to that particular ministry, Mr. Speaker. May I continue?

Mr. Speaker: The member has asked the question.

Hon. B. Stephenson: I'll answer the question, Mr. Speaker. No.

Mr. Moffatt: Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: Does the member have a supplementary?

Mr. Moffatt: Mr. Speaker, I would ask a supplementary of the minister then. Would it be possible if the minister would investigate all of the ramifications of that particular cease and desist order as it affects that particular company and its dealings with its employees? The company has been under investigation by the Ministry of Labour and it is important to the employees.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please, the question has been asked. Is there an answer to that?

Hon. B. Stephenson: I'll certainly investigate it. I wasn't aware of it.

Mr. Moffatt: Mr. Speaker, I'll send the material to the minister.

MINISTER'S SPEECH AT CONESTOGA COLLEGE

Mr. Sweeney: I have a question of the Minister of Colleges and Universities. In the light of a statement which he made at Conestoga College approximately a week ago, in which he played down the need for a college or university education for job admission, and in the light of the recent document presented to us by the Treasurer, is there any intention by his ministry to discourage students in this province from going to university?

Hon. Mr. Parrott: To the contrary. In my statement on that occasion, I tried to emphasize—and I stand firmly in this position—that there are three separate and distinct opportunities for education. One is the university, one is the community college and one is the training that we receive in business and industry. It is not always necessary for a person to have a degree or a piece of paper in order to fulfil a very useful role in society. I stand very firm on that position.

Mr. Lewis: I would support that.

AIR POLLUTION IN TORONTO

Mrs. Bryden: I have a question of the Minister of the Environment. On Thursday last the air pollution index for Metro Toronto reached the alarming height of 62. Since 32 is considered the acceptable level for health, I would like to ask the minister why he did not use his powers to require an overall 50 per cent cutback, which I understand can be put in effect when it looks like the index will

reach 50; it had already reach 58 by 9:15 in the morning.

Hon. Mr. Kerr: Mr. Speaker, we did order some of the companies to cut back 50 per cent. I believe that was on Thursday or Friday morning, when the index reached around 50 as the hon. member indicated. We asked the incinerators to close down entirely, 100 per cent, and there were about 10 industries as well as Hydro which were asked to cut back to 50 per cent. That's when the reading was between 50 and 60. It is only when we reach 100 that they close down entirely.

Mrs. Bryden: Supplementary: What measures is the ministry taking to try to anticipate the kind of conditions which occurred in Toronto so that we can get the reduction faster? I think the reduction did occur, but only down to about 45.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please, it's a supplementary question. The hon. minister.

Hon. Mr. Kerr: There was a miscalculation. On Thursday, if the hon. member recalls, Hamilton was a little higher than Burlington and it was expected that there would be a change; they expected a wind that particular evening and some rain but that didn't develop. The condition stayed the same; the inversion continued and overnight the index started to go up. We had hoped for a change in the weather which didn't come. During the evening we informed some of the industries, the ones on night shifts, that they were to cut back. We did that by telephone and in the morning, Friday morning, they were all served with orders.

CONSTRUCTION ON BATHURST ST.

Mr. Givens: A question of the Minister of Transportation and Communications: When does he intend to commence construction of the grade separation at the foot of Bathurst St., in order that he can commence the development of the great GO transportation system which was so glowingly and extravagantly announced by the government—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I think the question has been asked without the need for any editorial comment, thank you.

Mr. Givens: Editorial comment?

Mr. Good: Answer the question; never mind the editorial comment.

Mr. Givens: When is the minister going to start commencement of the grade separation at the foot of Bathurst St.?

Hon. Mr. Snow: Mr. Speaker, that project is one of the projects of TATOA. It is under consideration and will depend upon budgetary constraints and certain other matters which have to be settled before construction could start. We do not have a definite starting date at this moment.

HYDRO TRANSFORMER STATION

Mr. Grossman: A question of the Minister of Energy. Would the minister acknowledge that the transformer switching station on the books for the corner of McCaul and Orde Sts. in my riding, is a matter for which the final decision rests with Toronto Hydro and neither the Ministry of Energy nor Ontario Hydro is pushing the project?

Mr. R. S. Smith: Why don't you ask Toronto Hydro?

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: The project to which the hon. member refers, at this point as I understand it, is pretty well entirely in the hands of Toronto Hydro and city council. The Ministry of Energy has not been involved in the project at all. Ontario Hydro, again as I understand it, has been involved as consultants to Toronto Hydro in dealing with the whole question of systems security for downtown Toronto.

Mr. Peterson: Supplementary, Mr. Speaker: Would the minister consider referring that matter to the Porter commission on a priority basis, because there has been no independent review?

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: No. What we are talking about here is the efforts of a municipal hydro utility to advise its council on what it thinks is necessary to maintain systems security in a municipality. I would not refer it to the Porter commission.

[2:45]

Mr. Speaker: The member for Wentworth.

Mr. Peterson: Supplementary: Is the minister saying he has no control or influence in this matter?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I believe the question was asked. Thank you very much.

ESSEX PACKERS

Mr. Deans: I have a question of the Minister of Consumer Commercial Relations. Will the minister take whatever steps are necessary to ensure that a prospectus is filed and that all of the requirements of the Securities Act are complied with in regard to the proposed sale of shares by Essex Packers' principals to their employees? Will he further ensure that the prospectus that is filed is made available to each employee and that it contains whatever information it was that brought the government to conclude that it ought not to invest in Essex Packers?

Hon. Mr. Handleman: I will certainly undertake to ensure that the provisions of the Securities Act are complied with in any share distribution.

SALES TAX ON MOBILE HOMES

Mr. Edighoffer: I have a question for the Treasurer. Does the Treasurer recall the statement made in this House by the Minister of Housing (Mr. Rhodes) in which he stated the government wants to ensure that mobile home owners enjoy substantially the same privileges and responsibilities as the owners of conventional homes? Because of this, does the Treasurer anticipate that there will be immediate changes in the Retail Sales Tax Act or regulations so that the inequities will be eliminated between sales tax on regular homes and mobile homes?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: That is a matter which is under review and I will be glad to get back to the member.

PAPERWORKERS' STRIKE

Mr. Samis: I have a question of the Minister of Labour. In view of Mr. Munro's statement in the House of Commons Friday, saying that the federal anti-inflation guidelines need not be the basis for a settlement in the pulp and paper strike in Ontario, is the minister now prepared to urge publicy that the companies get back to the bargaining table?

Hon. B. Stephenson: We have been so urging. We have been bending every effort in that direction and will continue to do so.

Mr. Samis: Supplementary: Has the minister or her ministry contacted, within the last two weeks, officials of Domtar, Great Lakes Paper or the Eddy company, with a view to getting them back to the table?

Hon. B. Stephenson: At least one of those companies, yes.

Mr. Samis: Which one?

Mr. Swart: A supplementary question: Can the Minister of Labour tell us whether she has had the meeting with the Minister of Natural Resources (Mr. Bernier) to discuss any pressure that could be brought to bear in that respect with regard to the negotiations between the Canadian Paperworkers' Union and the paper mills?

Hon. B. Stephenson: I would agree that the Minister of Natural Resources can bring much more weight to bear than I can upon this subject—

Mr. Stokes: Do you mean cancel the licence?

Hon. B. Stephenson: —but we have had no formal discussion of that specific action.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Huron-Bruce.

Interjections.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. Was that supplementary to the original question? I'm sorry, I missed the first question.

Mr. Swart: Supplementary: Is the minister aware that she informed the House that she would have a meeting with the Minister of Natural Resources to discuss this matter?

Mr. Speaker: The answer can be either yes or no.

Hon. B. Stephenson: Yes. It has not been formal.

BONDING FOR FOOD PROCESSING PLANTS

Mr. Gaunt: I have a question of the Minister of Agriculture and Food. In view of the recent Essex Packers' experience, is the minister considering instituting a requirement for bonding, particularly as it applies to direct shipments from producers to the plant?

Hon. W. Newman: That has been a concern of mine since I came into the ministry. As the hon. member knows, all commissioned salesmen are bonded, so the farmers are protected; but on a direct sales basis they are not. Certainly we are looking into it

with the legal branch and the economics branch on the aspects of bonding where there are direct sales, to protect them where they are not covered by a recognized agency.

Mr. Gaunt: Supplementary: In view of the fact that there may be high bonding requirements, particularly as they apply to the smaller plants, has the minister taken a look at that aspect of it and if so, what would he recommend in that event?

Hon. W. Newman: That is why I said we are looking at it, because bonding can be very high in some of our small community plants that serve the farmers in the various areas of this province. We are having a look at the total situation because many times they sell directly there too.

WATER POLLUTION

Mr. Angus: I would like to direct my question to the Minister of the Environment. Would the minister advise this House when he plans on providing us with the complete detailed information on all the downstream portions of pulp and paper mills which he did promise or did say was available? Could he also provide us with the true figures for the Great Lakes Paper mill in Thunder Bay and not an average figure over a length of one mile?

Hon. Mr. Kerr: The answer to the second part of the hon. member's question is yes. As for the first part, the hon. member asked me this question, about a week or 10 days ago I think, that information is being compiled. It is substantial. He is talking, I believe, about every pulp mill in the province and I expect to have that information for him very shortly.

Mr. Speaker: We will hear a question from the member for St. Andrew—no, for St. George. I get my saints mixed up.

ENFORCEMENT OF MAINTENANCE ORDERS

Mrs. Campbell: My question is of the Attorney General: Surely the Attorney General is aware of the fact that the Deserted Wives' and Children's Maintenance Act comes within his purview; would he not advise this House at this point in time as to whether he believes the enforcement of orders in that court should be confinement to jail for contempt, or has he some other alternatives? During the period this is in effect, might he be inclined to advise the Law Society of Upper Canada that if a lawyer is found guilty of contempt it would, in his opinion, constitute unprofessional conduct?

Hon. Mr. McMurtry: Our hon. friend from St. George has obviously had considerable experience in the field of our family courts and I certainly welcome her advice on any occasion in relation to that area. The whole matter of committing people to jail for non-payment of support, as she understands, is a very complex matter and not something which can be approached sort of in a very simplistic fashion. I don't have any statement to make at this time but I would be very happy to discuss the matter with the member for St. George and to enlist her opinion as I am seeking the views of others who have something to offer in this very important field.

Mrs. Campbell: A supplementary, if I may.

Mr. Speaker: We will allow it if it is just a short one.

Mrs. Campbell: Does the Attorney General not understand that an order in that court may not be just an order for maintenance; it might also be an order for access?

Hon. Mr. McMurtry: Yes, I am well aware of that fact.

Mr. Speaker: The oral question period has expired.

Petitions.

Presenting reports.

Motions.

Hon. Mr. Welch moved that Mr. Belanger be substituted for Mr. Morrow on the select committee to consider Bill 20.

Mr. Lewis: Mr. Speaker, just before it is carried, sir, what is Bill 20—is that the rent bill?

Some hon. members: Yes.

Mr. Lewis: Am I to understand that simply because Donald Morrow—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Mr. Lewis: No, I am speaking to the motion, sir. Thank you. Because the member for Ottawa West (Mr. Morrow) made a most courageous, appropriate, insightful and useful presentation to this Legislature on second reading—

Hon. Mr. Kerr: He was reading one of your speeches.

Mr. Lewis: —that he is now being dispatched to Coventry, removed in disgrace from the select committee where he was reposited and sent off elsewhere to be substituted by the world of enlightenment that Mr. Belanger represents?

May I say, Mr. Speaker, we will not challenge the confidence of the government on this motion but it is with great regret that we find the member for Ottawa West so occupied on other committees that he can not participate on this one.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Ottawa West.

Mr. Morrow: Mr. Speaker, speaking to the motion, I would like to thank the hon. Leader of the Opposition for his very fine remarks on my behalf. I want him to know that I asked the House leader to substitute me this morning after our first meeting of the rent control committee.

I happen to be chairman of the select committee for the Camp commission; I am on the committee of internal economy. They decided this morning to sit on Tuesdays, Wednesdays and Thursdays. Last week, as chairman of my committee, we decided to sit on Tuesdays, Wednesdays and Thursdays. I can't be in both places at once, so I ask the whip and the Leader of the Opposition for a substitute on this committee.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. Speaker: Introduction of bills.

HIGHWAY TRAFFIC AMENDMENT ACT

Mr. Young moved first reading of bill intituled, An Act to amend the Highway Traffic Act.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Mr. Young: Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this bill is to provide a semi-annual inspection for motor vehicles in the Province of Ontario with a view to mechanical safety and fitness.

OCCUPATIONAL HEALTH ACT

Mr. Martel moved first reading of bill intituled, An Act for the Promotion and Protection of the Health and Safety of Persons engaged in Occupations.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Mr. Martel: Mr. Speaker, the purpose of the bill is to consolidate matters dealing with the health and safety of workers and place them under the jurisdiction of the Ministry of Labour. The bill also establishes a department to be part of the Ministry of Labour, which is responsible for research and the setting and enforcing of standards to protect workers.

Mr. Hall: Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to introduce to the House 64 students from Camden Public School in metropolitan Camden in the riding of Lincoln. They are seated in the east gallery, together with teachers and parents, and I would ask the House to welcome them.

Mr. Speaker: Orders of the day.

Clerk of the House: The eighth order, House in committee of supply.

ESTIMATES, SOCIAL DEVELOPMENT POLICY FIELD
(concluded)

Mr. Chairman: When we were last discussing these estimates on Thursday evening, I believe the member for Peterborough had the floor.

On vote 2401:

Mrs. Sandeman: When we broke on Thursday evening, I was attempting to present to the minister some of the inconsistencies and discrimination and cruelties that seem to be inherent in the province's present treatment of disabled and handicapped persons. I had given one example, and I would like to give a couple more of the kind of things that can happen under the present policy of the Social Development Policy Field.

[3:00]

I would like to bring to the minister's attention the case, for instance, of a 49-year-old widow who is seriously ill, but able to live at home as long as she may have the services of a full-time homemaker. Unfortunately, this lady has made the serious mistake, it seems, of saving enough money to buy a $3,000-bond after her husband's death. This bond represents to her the last vestige of her independence and she is also saving it to pay for her funeral expenses. However, until she has succeeded in liquidating all but $1,500 of this bond, she must pay for the homemaker at the rate of $25 a day or $125 a week.

I have here a letter form her doctor, which I think presents even more clearly

than I could the anomaly inherent in this situation. Her doctor was hopeful that some change could be made in her situation. He writes, explaining her medical condition:

> She is a severe diabetic who has much difficulty with regulation of her blood sugar. Her wide swings of blood sugar often put her into an insulin reaction without warning. For this reason, she requires the presence of a homemaker during the daytime. Her husband recently died in December, 1974, so she has no one else. Other medical problems include a stroke, a pulmonary embolism and bouts of coronary insufficiency. The problem arises that the homemaker cannot stay because of a regulation stating that Mrs. Morrissey cannot have money in the bank. It would seem to me that if we could keep Mrs. Morrissey in her home, rather than an institution, we would be saving the taxpayers considerable money.

That seems to me to be a very striking point. It costs $25 a day for the full-time homemaker. The minister surely knows how much it would take to keep that woman in the unpleasant situation of a chronic ward in a hospital. She is only 49 years old and we are requiring her, in effect, to move back to a chronic ward.

I think the ministry does a little better when it looks at slightly retarded young people in this province. The kind of young person I'm thinking of struggles through the two-year vocational programme at a high school and discovers when he or she leaves that he is fitted for no vocation but is able to get a disability pension and quite often able to go to a sheltered workshop. Therefore, he or she is guaranteed some support, some help and a feeling of being independent and of learning to do something useful and not being a financial burden on his parents.

But I ask you to compare this with what happens to a 60-year-old man. I think I can best illustrate the extreme anomalies in the kind of situation we have where we will support an 18-year-old without asking what his parents' income is, we will give him a disability pension and we will send him to a sheltered workshop, by comparing that situation with a case documented here in a letter from a wife who writes, as she says, "in desperation and frustration." She describes the situation of her husband and says that her problem is:

> ". . . the difficulties experienced in efforts to obtain a disability pension for Ted [her husband] who has multiple sclerosis and arthritis of the spine. He is wheelchair-bound and has an electrically-operated bed. He has been unable to work for the last couple of years. Prior to that, he had a little mimeographing business at home which gave him a sense of independence. But his condition was deteriorating and I finally had to do his work at night until I could no longer manage two jobs, and my own position was the obvious priority.
>
> After consideration of his condition, prognosis and frequent periods of hospitalization, together with my state of health and mind, the doctor recommended placement in an institution where he would receive adequate care. Following a year's wait, he was admitted to the nursing care wing of a home for senior citizens."
>
> This is a lovely home but, as you are probably aware, the nursing care wing is for senior citizens who are ill and in some cases just waiting to die. This is not an atmosphere conducive to a cheerful, healthy outlook for a disabled person who just requires some care and assistance. Rules and regulations of this wing are not flexible and even the appointments are not as pleasant as the remainder of the house. This is understandable when you consider the primary function of the nursing care wing but where then does one find suitable accommodation that one can afford.
>
> After three months in this extremely depressing environment, he signed himself out and had everything moved home while I was on a brief holiday with relatives. He discharged himself July 23, 1975. At the present time, his recreational and social activities are nil.

Of course, the minister is aware that his income will be nil because his wife is working. She is attempting through the means of this letter to explain to people how he feels about being totally dependent on her. She goes on to document what happened to her husband in September.

> By some error, Ted received a disability cheque on Sept. 19, dated Sept. 30, covering the month of October, 1975. No explanation enclosed; just the cheque with attached drug card. He was absolutely elated and immediately thought that finally his needs had been recognized. His words when he phoned me at work were, "Now I can pay my board, buy my own tobacco and help you."
>
> His elation was short-lived, however. On inquiry about his November cheque—not

received, he thought, because of the mail strike—he was informed by the social worker at the local office of the Ministry of Community and Social Services that everything was on hold as he was not entitled to it. However, the social worker stated that a hearing in the home could be requested by completing form 1.

[She goes on to say] The Ministry of Community and Social Services seems to be obsessed with the procurement of a statement of my financial status. My sole income is that received from the society [she works for the Rehabilitation Council for the Disabled] and I will not be subjected to an inquisition by a social worker or by anyone else. This may sound uncooperative to you and to other officials but it represents my last vestige of integrity and personal privacy and I must remain adamant. This is an invasion of my privacy and these people who represent the ministry should be qualified to make an assessment of need when presented with facts.

All information relevant to Ted's situation was submitted to the proper officials over a year ago and should have been sufficient to render a favourable decision. The ministry keeps stating that pension is disallowed because Ted is my dependant. Actually, I started out in 1964 to help him when we learned his diagnosis of multiple sclerosis and the present situation evolved as a result of his gradual deterioration.

Why does a 60-year-old man, who has contributed to his community both in service and taxes, not have as much right to financial independence as an 18- or 19-year-old? The discrimination is very evident.

She goes on to say that she would be happy to be classed as a single person and pay considerably more tax if they will recognize his right to independence.

It is very degrading and humiliating for a man to have to ask his wife for his smallest needs. I have managed to date, but rising costs in all areas of living and the fact that I am exhausted make it increasingly difficult.

She also sent to me her husband's statement for the form 1, in which he is requesting a review of his situation. I would like to read to the minister the reasons this man gives for requesting a small pension to make him independent. He says he is asking for the review "for restoration to the status of human being." It's the policies of this ministry, I submit, which have made this man feel he is no longer a human being. He is asking, he says:

For financial independence in obtaining the necessities of life and a few of the amenities; to be able to contribute to costs of necessary repairs, renovations and upkeep of my home; to relieve the burden placed on my wife who has assumed full responsibility for all treatment and living costs and who is now very tired and requires assistance; for treatment costs not covered by OHIP or Blue Cross but found to be beneficial.

He also makes the point that there is gross and blatant discrimination in the granting of disability pensions—discrimination on the grounds of marital status and age. Eighteen-year-olds and up are granted a pension regardless of parents' income. In many instances both parents are working.

It would appear to me that a man who has contributed to society during his working years—this man is now 60 years old, incidentally—and to the government through income tax, and to the funding of such pensions, surely would be entitled to the same consideration as the 18-year-old.

As for marital status, it is both degrading and disgusting to be advised legally to get a legal separation or a divorce and shack up later. Yet this advice has been given in some instances.

He goes on to explain the time he spent in the nursing care wing of the senior citizens' home. He says:

Living or existing in this environment was depressing to the degree that self-destruction was among the solutions sought for release. After careful consideration and discussion with the minister of my church, I resolved the situation by signing myself out.

What he is saying, in effect, is that we will support him financially in a situation where he is made literally suicidal. We will pay the total cost of keeping him in the nursing care wing of a senior citizens' home. But when he considered suicide, discussed it with his minister and decided against it, and decided the only solution for him was to sign himself out, without discussion with his wife, and go home, we deny to him even the smallest of pensions so that, as he says, he may feel that he is a human being.

He goes on to document what has happened since then. He had everything moved home while his wife was away on a brief

holiday with relatives and was unaware of events at home. Municipal authorities were kind enough to provide a homemaker on a five day week, eight hour daily basis. He said:

> If not in time for me, perhaps this hearing will help to eliminate some of the social and economic injustices so evident today in the granting of assistance for the disabled adult in my age group. We are in a forgotten age and disability group where facilities are almost non-existent for the disabled adult who requires some care.

I think his letters and his brief to the review board speak for themselves.

But as the minister is aware, when developing policy for the disabled and handicapped it's obviously not enough to look at the financial needs of people who are disabled or handicapped. Certainly, we must have in this province a system of pensions which really meets the needs of disabled persons without inconsistencies, without discrimination, without providing more hardship than it prevents. We must also realize that to bring true independence and self-respect to the handicapped and disabled there are other areas which must form part of the policy of the ministry. These areas are transportation, accessibility and housing. I don't intend to speak at any length about these, but just to mention each one very briefly.

Many disabled people feel themselves shut-out from normal life by the sheer lack of proper transportation. That can range from the provision of an electric wheelchair to various modifications to normal automobiles to vans equipped with hoists. This province is woefully short of proper means of transportation for disabled people.

Not only is it woefully short of proper means of transportation but if a disabled person, or a handicapped person, manages to get somewhere, if he does have transportation available, it is very likely that the building to which he is going will not be accessible to him.

Now that we have an Ontario Building Code we must also have written into the regulations for the Building Code a set of mandatory conditions that will ensure accessibility for everyone—accessibility to libraries, to public buildings, to apartment buildings, to city halls. It is a sad comment on the situation that in my own riding the city hall is not accessible to disabled persons. It is going to become so, because sadly, one of our alderwomen has recently been confined to a wheelchair and it suddenly became apparent to anyone that persons in wheelchairs could not get into the Peterborough City Hall.

[3:15]

With that kind of first-hand experience from an alderwoman, things are happening there. But it is not enough to rely on people in public office becoming handicapped in order to make buildings accessible. What we must do, I think, is to implement mandatory standards. Supplement No. 5 of the National Building Code could easily become part of the Ontario Building Code—and that would ensure accessibility to all new buildings for disabled people.

The building to which a disabled person does not have proper accessibility is quite often his or her own home. I believe many people are in chronic wards of hospitals and nursing homes because their own homes are not suitable for them to live in. I believe that we must develop a policy in this province which will look at more initiatives in altering, where necessary, the homes of handicapped people.

Again, we come back to the two basic points of my argument. One is dignity and self-respect for disabled persons, which he is more able to find in his home than in a hospital. Secondly, there is the cost benefit. Everyone knows it is very much cheaper for a person to live in his or her own home than in an institution, even with the home-care person coming in daily and even with some alterations to the home.

The vicious circle, which at the moment traps the disabled and handicapped outside the world in which most of us so freely move, is made up of these four problems which I have touched on—the problems of income, of transportation, of accessibility and of housing. Action in all these areas must form part of the social development policy of this province.

Mrs. Campbell: Mr. Chairman, I regret that I have not been able to follow the discussion of other problems, so I hope you will forgive me if I cover some matters that have already been covered.

Following what has been said here this afternoon, I would like again to draw to the attention of this ministry, whose responsibility it is to set policy, the fact that we still have no real policy in this province as it relates to the disabled, as opposed to those unemployable by reason of disability.

I would like now to place on the record of this House the experience which I had. It is a very sad one—a case where I was trying desperately to get through to the ministry the fact that, in my opinion and in the opinion of the physicians involved, a woman was disabled. I think it is interesting that no

matter what we did, we couldn't get through the ridiculous definitions that we have.

What happened was that during the course of my campaign I did receive word that this woman had been accepted as being eligible. I stated that I was very pleased to note that she had been accepted as eligible for a disability pension; because when she had died a week or so before I had believed that she had died of unemployability. I think this is one of the things that we simply cannot tolerate in this province If we have a reason for having policy secretariats, then surely this is one of the areas to which the policy minister should be addressing her attention.

I do not know the present policy of this ministry insofar as day care is concerned; and I would like to know what the position is. I would like to point out that under the recommendations of the advisory council, one of them was that there should be an immediate increase in the number of child development councillors, "with at least one councillor on staff in each district office." I am quoting from page 2 of that report.

I would like to have an answer as to whether or not it is a fact that while a supervisor has been appointed for northwestern Ontario, she will not be starting work until January, 1976. And whether or not it is a fact that there are many areas, many district offices, without the child development councillors. Are we still seeing a dichotomy between the policy secretariat and the ministry involved in carrying out the programme? It is time, it seems to me, that we should clarify that position.

What are we doing about these regulations? Is it a fact that some are now functioning under the aegis—if one may call it that—of the philosophy of this ministry and they are operating, therefore, under lower standards than those which Metropolitan Toronto, for example, wishes to accept or which this caucus is willing to accept? Is there a hiatus? Is there an interregnum and what are we going to do about it?

I want to ask the minister if she has had any thrust at all into the whole question of prevention. Questions have been asked here of the operating minister. Things are under advisement but what, in fact, is the policy of this government in dealing with the matter of prevention in the social welfare field and, of course, in the health field as well? What is being done about it? What is the philosophy? Why are we not hearing of any real policy developments in this area?

The minister is aware, I am sure, that as a result of the combined opposition to the lack of policy there was a meeting called some time in the spring—the date escapes me—to deal with at least prevention in the social welfare field. Notwithstanding everything we tried to do, we could not get a commitment to a further meeting and nothing has transpired to the best of my knowledge, information and belief. I would like to know what the policy of this government is in this area.

I would like to point out, too, that apparently the government was prepared to listen to the opposition—that is the combined opposition—in its desire to assist people to get out of the welfare syndrome and back into productive society. As a result of that, we had a provision—albeit not very meaningful but a provision—whereby a person seeking to get off the welfare roll would receive $100 for the first month and $50 for each of the next two months.

I believed that was a fait accompli. I would like to give you a picture of what happened to a woman in the city of Toronto—a mother of seven children who tried and did get employment. When she received employment she was able to earn $100 a month less than she received on the welfare rolls. Although she had notified the ministry of her position, someone undertook to advise the ministry that they thought she was guilty of fraud. So nobody did anything about the $100 or indeed the next two $50. There she was, trying to work, trying to stay out of the welfare field. And on top of that, when she went to Ontario Housing where she lived, they reduced her rent by $10 a month.

I recognize the fact that the Ministry of Housing in this government is not regarded as a part of Social Development. And I think it is significant and deeply significant that indeed it is not. But surely, the policy secretary should have some opportunity to discuss with the housing ministry the problems which arise in such circumstances. I would certainly ask the policy minister, the policy secretary, wherein the policy is.

Are we indeed interested in creating incentives or are we only interested in creating roadblocks? Is the secretary aware of the fact that many people, many of the poor, in the city of Toronto, particularly those mothers who are single heads of families, are deeply convinced that there is a deliberate policy of this government to keep them in the welfare mould and to ensure that their children are to become useful for what they call the "joe jobs" in the community which nobody else will do.

I don't for one moment believe that it is a deliberate policy. Don't misunderstand me. But I think we have to make it clear by what we do by way of incentives that, indeed, our policy is quite otherwise. At this point in time we have not made it clear, and in fact it does become a very serious question for any mother who wants to get off welfare, who wants to be self-supporting. I would ask the secretary too, if she would be kind enough, to at least hold some conversation with the Housing minister and with those involved with Ontario Housing.

On another matter, what is happening in this city is this: If a mother in Ontario Housing has trouble with one of her teenage sons; and you know it isn't just people in Ontario Housing who have trouble with teenage sons in our society today—and daughters, you are quite right, and daughters; nothing chauvinistic over here. However to continue, if they are in Ontario Housing, what happens is that those mothers are told: "Either you get rid of this kid or you all have to get out of public housing."

I wonder if there is any real thought, any real philosophy, any real policy or any real human mercy in such cases? Surely we have to bring to a mother in that kind of a plight all the assistance possible in the community, rather than telling her get rid of him or her; or get out; or we will get an order prohibiting this child to be in the complex. Is that not totally destructive in our society? This is our kind of humanity in the province today. I believe if we were in the government, housing would be a part of social development. I would like the minister to comment on that.

[3:30]

There are many other areas to do with health and the health problems of the people in my riding. There are problems with the educational system. The new Canadian children, as well as children living in some of the housing in the lower end of the riding, and I'm sure it prevails in other parts, seem to be caught up with the middle class concept of what they should be achieving. I wonder if the minister has any input into the Ministry of Education. They should consider what it does to children to be written off as summarily as they are today.

Has anyone done any kind of a survey to find out what percentage of those children are sent to the slow learning institutions in the city of Toronto, and why they are sent there? Is it because they have been written off? Is it because nobody really cares? What are the answers? What is the concern of government for those children?

With the new thrust to save money, are we still going to have the mother with one child trying to cope with income of $1.86 per day each, for food, clothing and entertainment? What is the philosophy of the government bearing in mind the statements the Treasurer (Mr. McKeough) has made?

Mr. Chairman, I could go on ad nauseam with the problems of inconsistencies, inequities and what seems an hiatus or a vacuum in any kind of policy development at this time. I'm not going to pursue the matter further, Mr. Chairman. I have to say, and again most reluctantly to this minister, that I have not seen the development of any policy which would really merit the expenditures for this ministry. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. McClellan: Mr. Chairman, I want to continue where the hon. member for St. George left off. I think I share the gist of her remarks.

I probably feel somewhat more strongly that this ministry is redundant. Its record is dismal. When you look at its record of accomplishment over the last year you look in vain for anything of significance to point to. I don't think it is accidental that there is no annual report for this ministry. There is nothing to report except perhaps bad news.

The ministry is supposed to be responsible for the development and co-ordination of policy recommendations within the social development field. Let's just look at the community and social services field and try to look for a few policy initiatives. You look in vain, as I said, Mr. Chairman. Where are the policy initiatives in the field of prevention? Where is the suggestion for the array of preventive services which could prevent family breakdown before it happens? It simply does not exist. It has not been developed.

We are left with a Children's Aid Society budget of $250,000 for prevention. We are left with a Child Welfare Act, the prevention provisions of which have not been implemented in the last 10 years. Where are the policy initiatives in the field of work activity? Where are the re-employment strategies to rescue people from the plight of welfare? They do not exist.

We do not have programmes or policies which will encourage people to move to productive employment. Instead, we have disincentive piled upon disincentive right across the board—in day care and in the provisions of the Family Benefit Act the whole weight of programmes, the whole weight of legisla-

tion, the whole weight of the regulations are against a move from welfare to productive employment. Yet, if we listen to the ideology of the government, we would expect from a Conservative government some moves at least to encourage people who want to return to the work force to do so. But the facts are the opposite.

When we look at the income maintenance field we look again in vain for policy initiatives. We have the same old hodgepodge of inequity we have had for the last 10 years. We have the tragic irony that a child in the care of a foster parent receives a higher budget than a child in the care of its own mother. What a—words fail one in contemplating that kind of situation. What can you be thinking of?

When we look at the organization of social service delivery we look in vain for policy initiatives. We look in vain at a time when in other jurisdictions—in Quebec, in British Columbia—major initiatives have been undertaken around social service delivery. Here in Ontario, after a brief glimmer of optimism under Mr. Eberlee, the deputy, the department seems to have fallen back into its historic disarray.

The decentralization programme which was initiated with dispatch—I suppose that is the only word to describe it—has now been replaced by a policy, apparently, of recentralization. It is becoming somewhat clear that after I don't know how many years—four years—of the minister's stewardship, the department is in something of an administrative shambles. Morale is even lower, if that is possible, than it has been in a number of years.

We look at the advisory councils this secretary is responsible for and we look in vain for recommendations which have been translated into programmes. I'll come back to that in a minute.

However, I think there is one area where this secretary has made a major policy initiative and I want to dwell for the remainder of my remarks on that and that is in the field of day care. There clearly has been a new policy thrust in the field of day care and we all know what it was. Very simply the thrust was to reprivatize day care in this province, to turn the provision of day care in this province over to the corporate sector, to the Great-West Life Assurance Co., to Mini-Skool—the minister shakes her head in denial.

Mr. Martel: It is true.

Mr. McClellan: It is a simple fact that the only justification for the attempt to destroy quality day care in this province in June, 1974, was to make it possible for corporate day care to make a profit out of providing care to the children of this province.

Mr. Martel: Right on.

Mr. McClellan: It was a monstrous proposal. It was a proposal which inspired something that was akin to revulsion throughout the social service community of this province and it led to a massive campaign of opposition. Thank God that campaign succeeded because if it hadn't succeeded I shudder to think what might have happened. I think that the record of Mini-Skool is very clear. In July, 1974 Mr. Woloshyan, who was Mini-Skool's vice-president in charge of finance, admitted that more children are enrolled in the company's daycare centres than Ontario's regulations allow. In other words, Mini-Skool, as a matter of deliberate corporate policy, deliberately overenrolled children in their daycare centres in order to increase their profit margin.

The annual report of the Great-West Life Assurance Co. said in 1973: "This unusual acquisition meets the prime objective—a good return of an insurance company's investment programme." The prime objective was a good return.

That man was talking about the care of children. Yet this minister was prepared to allow the destruction of quality day care in this province for the sake of the corporate sector.

As well, by permitting corporate day care to move into this province, this minister has permitted the public subsidization of corporate profits. I am aware that at least in Metro Toronto the municipality has entered into a contractual arrangement with the Mini-Skool's corporation which includes in the contract a provision for the subsidization of a profit margin.

The minister's proposals appear to have been shot down, and I will come to that in a moment. Because it is clear that this government is not prepared to begin to deal with the real existing need for day care in this province now, it is clear that the only alternative that will be available to people in this province is going to remain corporate day care. There is clearly no alternative being provided.

The daycare expansion programme that was announced with so much fanfare in June, 1974, I must confess, has me somewhat baffled. I would hope that when the minister replies she could give a clear and concise

statement about how much of the $15 million has actually been spent; how it is intended to stage the spending of the money and how many daycare spaces the programme will create. Nevertheless, I think it is clear that the $15 million was not, as originally had been described, going to be spent in one fiscal year. It seems clear now that it is going to be extended over three fiscal years and it is unclear what happens when the moneys run out.

[3:45]

At any rate, the expansion programme is less than a drop in the bucket. My understanding is that it will create some 3,000 spaces in total, and yet we know from the Women's Bureau of the Ontario Ministry of Labour that there were 300,000 women in this province in 1970 who needed some kind of child care arrangements for their children. Something in the order of 150,000 to 160,000 of those mothers had children under six years old. And that was five years ago, Mr. Chairman.

There is clearly no capital available for the kind of daycare expansion programme that would meet the needs of the children of this province. I say very simply that in the absence of capital to expand the public, non-profit day care sector, the only source of capital that remains available is in the private corporate sector. By refusing to create sufficient day care capital expansion funds, you are really saying the same thing that you said in June of 1974, that if people want day care in this province let the private sector provide it. That remains, Mr. Chairman, as vicious a policy today as it was in 1974.

There are some simple things that could be done. At the Ontario welfare conference in Hamilton this weekend, a representative of the CCSD outlined a way of using existing space in Ontario schools to meet the immediate daycare needs.

I am aware that in 1971 a $10 million winter works programme was established to undertake a rapid day care capital expansion programme. In a period of obviously inincreasing unemployment, this makes sense again. I don't think this ministry is interested in sense. I don't think this ministry is interested in publicly meeting the day care need. I think that your commitment remains to the Great-West Life Assurance Co. and to the corporate sector.

Let me deal finally, at least on day care, with the recent report of the advisory council on day care. I doubt if any ministry has ever received such a slap in the face from one of its advisory bodies. The advisory council report is a complete and total repudiation of the June, 1974, proposed amendments to the Day Nurseries Act. I want to deal with it just a little bit.

The advisory council has said, in response to the minister's attempts to raise child-staff ratios to dangerous levels:

> There is no evidence that a reduction in the number of programme staff would be equally effective in producing quality day care for children.

The only evidence suggests that she listens to the representatives of the Great-West Life Assurance Co. The advisory committee says as well that it repudiates the minister's proposals to reduce the qualifications of staff, and it comes out decisively in favour of trained and qualified child-care workers.

The advisory council also recommends strengthening the kind of support that's provided to the day care movement in this province by increasing the number of child-development counsellors and the number of qualified staff in the central office as support of the development of quality day care across the province. And it finally deals with the question of bringing private-home day care firmly under government control to assure quality.

I think the nature of the repudiation that the minister has been given from this council is, as I have said, complete and total. The minister ought to consider resigning. I'm sure you won't. I am one who believes, and believes very strongly, that we ought to move to reduce your salary. I gather that would be taken as a motion of non-confidence, so we probably won't do it for that reason. But you deserve it, let me say that to you, you deserve it.

Let me turn very briefly to something I alluded to a few moments ago. That is the general use of advisory committees. Perhaps before I do that I would like to ask the minister to give this House some assurance that she intends to adopt the recommendations of the advisory council on day care, and to advise this House what kinds of structures, what kind of study process, what kind of a review process or what kind of decision-making process the report of the advisory council on day care will be going into, and to give us some idea of the timetable for what we all hope is a speedy reversal of government policy in this area.

Let me raise one other matter with respect to advisory councils. I am not sure what the

advisory council on the disabled is called. I think the minister knows the one I am referring to—there is an advisory committee that consists in the main of people from that part of the social service sector that serves the disabled and physically handicapped, as well as people who are themselves handicapped. I think that perhaps identifies the committee without naming it.

I am aware that the government introduced, last winter, an excellent programme called the care package proposals. I am advised that this programme was recommended by your advisory committee, that you approved it, that the previous Minister of Community and Social Services (Mr. Brunelle) approved it, that it went to cabinet, that it was awaiting cabinet approval; and that the present incumbent of the Ministry of Community and Social Services (Mr. Taylor) snatched it away for further study, despite the fact that it had been approved by yourself and by the hon. member for Cochrane North. I would like your comment on that.

The present Minister of Community and Social Services indicated in this House that my description of the course of events was essentially wrong. I believe that my description of the course of events is essentially right. I would like you to comment on it. I would like to know what you intend to do with the care package proposals. There is a project which happens to be in my riding—it's just an accident that it is in the riding—the project of the Clarendon Foundation at Bathurst and St. Clair, and I understand the minister will be going there to visit.

There are a number of young people who are paraplegics in that project, who are confined to wheelchairs, by virtue of accidents, who are able to live fully productive, fully useful lives but their future it totally dependent on the enactment of the care package proposals. There is a young man, a musician, who was injured in a car accident and is confined to a wheelchair. If he does not live in a project like that of the Clarendon Foundation, which provides a residence with in-service care on a 24-hour-a-day basis, his only alternative is to go to a chronic care hospital, which is a nightmarish kind of prospect. This young man is now able to continue his studies at the University of Toronto by virtue of the excellence of the care group home programme undertaken by the Clarendon Foundation. It represents a model that could be used by all severely disabled people, like this young man.

There is another young girl there who is equally disabled and confined to a wheelchair, who is able to continue her studies at Ryerson in drafting. There are other young people there who are able to continue to work, but if you proceed as you seem to be proceeding to kill the care package proposals you are condemning these young people—

An hon. member: Saving money.

Mr. McClellan: You are condemning these young people, for the sake of your much-vaunted cost saving—

An hon. member: Holding the line, is how the minister described it.

Mr. McClellan: —to chronic care hospitalization. Nothing could be more soul-destroying. Nothing could be more tragic to the lives of these young people.

I hope I am wrong in my description of the events. I hope the care package proposals have not been sabotaged by the incumbent. I hope, in fact, that you are looking at them positively. I plead with you to do that. I think it is an excellent programme. I think it would be a great tragedy if you allowed your rhetoric about cost saving to destroy this excellent programme.

I will conclude. My remarks have been somewhat vicious, I suppose somewhat vituperative. I don't usually address myself in that general vein. I think the record of this particular ministry has been a major scandal in this province in relation to day care. I think the minister's only opportunity to repudiate her former regressive policies, particularly in day care, is by adopting forthrightly the recommendations of the advisory committee on day care.

Mr. R. S. Smith: Is the minister going to reply to all the questions at the end or is this —not—

Mr. Chairman: I think that was the intention of the minister.

Mr. R. S. Smith: Well then we are not having a debate here, we're just having a dialogue.

Mr. Lewis: Even a dialogue requires two.

Mr. R. S. Smith: But it comes in large doses.

I have a couple of other things I would like to bring up. It's very difficult in the social development field not to talk mainly about community and social services, and I guess that's what most of the debate has been since it started, except for the period of time we

spent questioning the usefulness of this ministry itself. I think from our point of view and from the point of view of the other party, the Leader of the Opposition's party, it has been well demonstrated that the usefulness of the ministry is very little if any.

We might as well just talk about specific things, because that seems to be the only thing there is left to talk about. I haven't mentioned day care to any great extent nor have I asked any questions. In order to discuss this with the minister, I would hope that she would answer some of my questions as I went along because that's the norm in this Legislature and that's the usual way that the estimates are carried out. Whether some previous arrangement has been made or not, of which our party was not made aware, I don't know. Perhaps you could explain that to me now.

Mr. Chairman: The hon. member for Rainy River—I think he's left—wanted to comment on this.

Mr. R. S. Smith: Well I am asking a question. I am asking if I can ask a question and get an answer.

Mr. Lewis: Of course you can.

Mr. R. S. Smith: That's the way we carry out the estimates in this House. We've always done it that way and why should it be different now? Do we have different rules for different ministers?

[4:00]

Mr. Chairman: I was just following the comments of the previous chairman. I understood this had been agreed upon by the committee. It is the normal procedure to have dialogue, I agree with the hon. member. I was just repeating the instructions or the understanding—I wouldn't say understanding, the comments, I guess I should say—of the previous chairman that the minister was going to respond after the members for Nipissing and Rainy River had asked their questions.

Mr. R. S. Smith: Am I to have an opportunity to ask further questions?

Mr. Chairman: I would assume so. There is no closure or anything like that after the minister responds.

Mr. R. S. Smith: Okay. After she answers the questions of the last five or six speakers—

Mr. Chairman: The minister indicates it's agreeable with her.

Hon. Mrs. Birch: Mr. Chairman, I have no objections to answering questions as we go along. It was my understanding that I was to receive the comments of individual members of the opposition and then conclude with my answers to all of those comments. But I am quite prepared to answer questions at any time.

Mr. Chairman: I think there had been some understanding on this but the Chair will be guided by the wishes of the hon. members.

Mr. R. S. Smith: If there was an understanding, at least I wasn't made aware of it. I'm sorry.

I have very few questions because I realize we're going past the time at which there was an understanding to stop.

Hon. Mrs. Birch: Mr. Chairman, rather than have the member for Nipissing upset, I would much rather go along and answer questions. After I've finished answering the comments of those who have already preceded him, I'd be very happy to hear his comments and provide my answers at that time. If he would like me to begin to respond to his colleagues who have spoken that's just fine with me. I'm quite prepared to do that.

Mr. R. S. Smith: I don't care. I'll ask my questions now and get it over with then I won't have to listen to all the other things.

Hon. Mrs. Birch: There is a limited time and we're just wasting time by this kind of discussion. I'm quite prepared to answer.

Mr. R. S. Smith: I'm just pointing out to you that this is a different method being used. It has never been used before, to my knowledge, in the estimates.

Mr. Dukszta: I think she's saying she's going to answer.

Hon. Mrs. Birch: I don't want to establish a precedent; I'm quite prepared to answer.

Mr. R. S. Smith: That's fine, I'm satisfied with that.

Mr. Chairman: The hon. minister has indicated she will answer. Perhaps the hon. member might let her answer the questions which have been put to this point and then if there are any further questions there could be dialogue.

Mr. Dukszta: Exactly.

Mr. R. S. Smith: Now I've got to sit here for another hour and wait for that.

Mr. Chairman: Does the hon. minister wish to respond to the questions which have been asked?

Hon. Mrs. Birch: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Far be it for me to cause any concern about everyone's questions not given an answer. I understand we have several hours and I'm quite prepared to stay until everyone is completely satisfied with the answers from the social policy secretariat.

Unfortunately, the member for Peterborough (Mrs. Sandeman) is not in the House. She raised several issues regarding the handicapped people of this province. I wanted to point out to the hon. member that she and her party in the opposition hold no monopoly on concern for the handicapped people of this province. Many of us, long before we entered this political arena, chose to show our concern for the handicapped and those other segments of society which need our help on a voluntary basis and worked for many years helping those people. I would like to point out there are people on this side of the House as well who share your concern.

Mr. Martel: It's your legislation, though, which creates the discrimination, that stupid ruling.

Mr. Chairman: Order, please.

Mr. Riddell: Let her answer the question!

Hon. Mrs. Birch: Are you going to let me answer the question?

Mr. Martel: That stupid ruling on who is eligible or not; unemployable or disabled; that's your government.

Hon. Mrs. Birch: Of course, the hon member for Sudbury East is well aware that the cost-sharing arrangements with the federal government are based on needs tests on a family basis. We're locked into those and we have no alternative but to follow the tests they have prescribed as being necessary in order to share in those programmes. The hon. member is well aware of that.

Mr. Martel: The definition you too are well aware of.

Hon. Mrs. Birch: The hon. member for Peterborough went on to speak of some of the alternatives she could see for providing care for the handicapped people of this province. We're well aware of that. Our council for senior citizens and our council for the physically handicapped have come forward with recommendations to provide home care.

I spoke of this the other evening. On home care for handicapped people, convalescents and the chronically ill, we agree with the member for Sudbury East that we have become too institutionalized. Canada is one of the most highly institutionalized countries in the world. I don't think it's something we can be proud of, but for too long people felt if there was a problem anywhere in society, money and institutions could rectify that problem.

We know now that's not the answer. We're attempting to do something about it. We're attempting to provide care for people, to keep them in their own homes, regardless of the problem, regardless of physical disability, age or whatever. That is the direction this government is going to take and is taking now. Unfortunately those things don't happen overnight. It's very difficult to change attitudes and change direction. We have a commitment to change that direction and we have started down that pathway.

The hon. member for Peterborough also touched on some of the other areas we're very concerned with regarding the handicapped. We're very concerned about housing accommodation. Something is being done about that, as the member for Bellwoods (Mr. McClellan) pointed out, with the care package.

I would emphasize that the information you were given by the Ministry of Community and Social Services is correct. That care package has not yet been to the social policy field for discussion, it has not been to cabinet, it has not come out of Community and Social Services. It is due to come to the social policy field along with the same package on the transportation for the physically handicapped. That will be coming forward very shortly.

Mr. McClellan: But you already approved it yourself.

Hon. Mrs. Birch: Not officially.

Mr. McClellan: And so did Mr. Brunelle.

Hon. Mrs. Birch: Not officially. That's an area we're very concerned with; housing accommodation and transportation for the physically handicapped. We feel for too long the rest of us have taken all of these things for granted. Unfortunately, the handicapped people of this province have not had the same opportunities. We're intent on making sure they do receive the same kind of consideration.

Mr. McClellan: How are you going to stop Taylor from killing it? That's what I want to know.

Mr. Chairman: Order, please.

Hon. Mrs. Birch: She also pointed out the inaccessibility to public buildings. Again I would remind the hon. member, the building code makes it mandatory in all new buildings that accessibility be provided for the handicapped. We're attempting to do something about it in the area of older buildings. We're attempting to do it here in the Legislature. Were talking about making it easier for the handicapped people of this province to enter by the front doors of this Legislature, not through the back doors.

I think they have every right to expect it and we intend to do something about that. We intend to make every part of this building accessible to any handicapped person. The same will apply with all government buildings. We feel we should set an example for the private sector to follow. That's something we are certainly involved in and on which we expect results very shortly.

Unfortunately, the member for St. George (Mrs. Campbell) is not in the House, but I would like to reply to some of the concerns she expressed. She was puzzled as to why the housing ministry was not part of the social policy field. I suppose it's something that could be considered part of the social policy field. However, I expect almost every ministry within government has some social field and should be part of it.

When one considers that the social policy field already involves five ministries, with about two-thirds of the total provincial budget, I don't feel it would necessarily be helpful to have an additional ministry within our policy field.

The Ministry of Housing is always available for any consultation. Indeed they have met with representatives within our policy field on several occasions. The intent is that any policy field can meet with one of the ministers of the other policy field at any time. We don't see that as any particular problem.

The member from St. George also touched on the question of the unavailability of help for children who live in Ontario Housing units. She went on at great length to say that parents were intimidated. If they had a troubled child, they were told to get rid of the child or they would have to move out of the development.

Now I find that totally unacceptable, and very very difficult to believe, that any parent would be put in that kind of position. I can only say that Ontario Housing have attempted in many ways to help some of the troubled teenagers and other children within Ontario Housing developments. They have provided community workers. I know in my own area of Scarborough East, in most of the developments there are community workers and social service agencies involved in providing help for these families with troubled children.

We also have the council on emotionally disturbed children dealing with some of these children with learning difficulties, and hopefully we will be able to provide some answers to help the parents who have these tremendous problems.

The hon. member also spoke about the attempt of the government to encourage dependency on the part of single-parent mothers. Of course, I have to take grave exception to that. I think we have moved in many directions to encourage mothers to get out into the work force. We have done it again by attempting to provide day care within my area, and I am sure within many other areas, co-operative day care. We have encouraged them by providing an exemption of over $100 for the first month and $75 for the second and $50 for the third. She also receives her OHIP; her dental coverage for three months after she has taken a job.

I think that we have encouraged or have attempted to encourage many mothers who are single parents. I have had them come into my office and we have encouraged them in many ways to go out and look for work; this is happening. I think that when it comes to the area of day care I will just answer some of the comments that have been made.

Mr. Lewis: I don't even think you need to go further.

Hon. Mrs. Birch. No more day care?

Mr. Lewis: You need not refer to that. It is just hopeless. We are so many miles apart, there is no point. If you believe that the single-parent family in this province is encouraged to self respect—there's not even a point in discussing it.

Mr. Martel: Not even worth it—$100?

Mr. Lewis: Let the member for Nipissing (Mr. R. S. Smith) grit his teeth and have at it.

Mr. Chairman: Order, please. I don't think the hon. minister has answered the hon. member from Nipissing as yet on all his comments, has she?

Hon. Mrs. Birch: He hasn't asked the question.

Mr. R. S. Smith: I haven't ask the question yet.

[4:15]

Mr. Chairman: The hon. member for Nipissing.

Mr. R. S. Smith: She might have answered them, but I haven't asked them yet.

Anyway, I just have two or three and I do like to get the answers when I ask the questions. I indicated I would have a couple on day care. Most of my questions, I think have been covered by the dialogue that's gone on before, to some extent, and by the minister's own committee's report which answered most of the questions for all of us and pretty well ended that debate as far as I am concerned—except for the fact that there still hasn't been the movement within the ministry concerned itself to put into the force the recommendations of that report.

But there are some questions I would like to ask, because they directly affect some of the services that are in my own area. The first is that daycare centres are licensed under the day nurseries branch. I understand there are differentials between the types of licences that are granted and that in fact there are daycare centres in operation that are without what could be considered to be licences. So we have some with what are called clear licences and some that don't have clear licence—whatever that means, I don't know; I guess they have a blemish on the licence; I don't know whether it's the paper or what it is, it must be something. I would like to ask the minister if she could differentiate between those two types of licences that are issued.

Secondly, in regard to some of the recommendations in the report, people who are working in daycare centres must either have a degree or something comparable to it, or they must be in training for that type of licensing. Following on that, there are in my area, as I understand it anyway, daycare centres that do not have people with that type of training, and yet the colleges in the area are using these daycare centres as training areas for people to obtain that type of licensing. So here we have people without licences in the position of training people to obtain a licence. I find that very hard to follow just as I find it very hard to explain to the minister.

I would like her to answer, first of all, what the different types of licences are and then how they arrive at the granting of the privilege of training people to people who themselves have not had the same type of training, who do not hold any type of describable degree or diploma from any recognized course and who, in many cases, have been in the field for only a very short period of time.

Hon. Mrs. Birch: I have been placed in the position of having to answer for the daycare programme as a result of introducing into this Legislature a proposal for some changes in the regulations under the Day Nurseries Act. But, the hon. member is well aware, day care is the responsibility of the Minister of Community and Social Services; as the Provincial Secretary for Social Development, it is not my responsibility. I would respectfully suggest that any of these questions that the hon. member has should be referred to the Minister of Community and Social Services.

Mr. Good: He doesn't know either.

Mr. R. S. Smith: I'm not quite finished yet, Mr. Chairman. I would like to try a few more questions to see if I can get an answer.

The member for St. George (Mrs. Campbell) put forward a question in regard to the Children's Aid Societies in the section that has to do with preventive care. The member for Sudbury East (Mr. Martel) also put forward questions the other day regarding the one meeting that was held last year and the proposed meetings that didn't quite take place following that. If the minister has answered those, I am sorry but I did not hear the answer. Would she tell me what exactly is taking place in that area and if, in fact, the group that met last May or June is going to meet again and if the proposals that were put forward at that time have been studied within the purview of your ministry?

Hon. Mrs. Birch: No, the proposals were not submitted to the policy field but I do understand that the Minister of Community and Social Services has agreed to a further meeting and a date has been set.

Mr. R. S. Smith: Just how long is it going to be before those proposals might get to the policy field for discussion?

Hon. Mrs. Birch: I would respectfully suggest that it would be better to ask the Minister of Community and Social Services (Mr. Taylor). It's his decision when to bring it forward to the policy field.

Mr. R. S. Smith: Mr. Chairman, I would really like to ask questions about policy but every time I do it hasn't got there or it has escaped or something. It's rather a frustrating experience. So we'll ask specific questions because obviously the minister doesn't want to talk about policy. I would like to ask—

Mr. Riddell: It points out the redundancy of the minister.

Mr. R. S. Smith: —and I know it's going to be referred back to some other ministry again, and this is a matter that's been kicked around for about four years now. It has to do with the definitions within the Family Benefits Act. Of late, this has been changed a bit by the GAINS programme, but there still is that whole question of the differential between disability and unemployable. I was wondering if this ministry has dealt with that on a policy basis—as it must, I presume, at some time or other, if we are going to have some change. Is there any development towards doing away with the definition of unemployable within the Act and defining those people who are unemployable as being eligible under GAINS because of their disability?

Hon. Mrs. Birch: Again, to my knowledge that has been undergoing a great deal of consideration within the Ministry of Community and Social Services. We expect that to come to the policy field very shortly.

Mr. R. S. Smith: I will just point out to the minister that this is the fourth year running that we have asked this question and it is the fourth year running that it is going to move out of that one ministry up into the policy field. That's four years here; it'll be four years there and it'll be four years before it gets to Cabinet or wherever else it goes from there. Meanwhile a good number of the disabled people in this province are living on incomes that are just far below those which anyone can understand how anybody else can live on. I think it's a real social injustice. Perhaps somebody's going to rename these policy fields and these committees and these ministries the Ministry of Social Injustice rather than the Ministry of Community and Social Services.

The COGP report, No. 3—and this is a straight policy question—did recommend that Housing be placed within this secretariat. I realize that this question was asked a few minutes ago but you know this government, for two years at least, ran on the fact that "we are changing because of the COGP recommendations and that's why we can't do this or that, or why we can't answer that." One of the recommendations of that report was that Housing would fall under this secretariat. Would you explain to me why it was not placed under this secretariat, and has not been since its establishment?

Hon. Mrs. Birch: I have already answered that question. The member for St. George (Mrs. Campbell) asked why Housing was not in our policy field. I did point out to you probably many of us felt that it should have been, but then again that almost any ministry within government could be argued as having a social role in some aspect. I also pointed out to you that already we have five ministries within our policy field accounting for two-thirds of the total provincial budget. To make it much larger than that would not be too helpful.

We did point out that there's very good liaison between all of the policy fields; a great deal of discussion does go on within the policy fields of other ministries. We feel that this is the much better way to approach it, that the Ministry of Housing is now part of the resource policy field. Particularly, I suppose, the reasoning behind that is because of the land planning, transportation systems and all of those things within resources that have to be planned in planning for housing.

Mr. Warner: To the minister, I assume from the remarks she has made this afternoon that she views this area as one showing progress and development; that the ministry is moving ahead and it's getting a firm hold of all the social problems which beset us and is providing leadership.

Such being the case, I would like some remarks from the minister relating to the statement made by the hon. Treasurer of Ontario this Thursday past, Nov. 20, in his speech to the Junior Investment Dealers' Association here in Toronto:

> In the field of social services, the committee is equally hard-nosed. It calls for a general tightening up of social security programmes; for instance, by including incentives to work and by excluding more vigorously those recipients who really don't need help. In one of its most basically philosophical recommendations, the report suggests that we encourage individuals and institutions to accept responsibility for solving some of the social problems that are now left to government. Who among us can resist saying "amen" to that?

Could the minister enlighten us as to how those remarks fit into the philosophy of the

area she is responsible for? How will that be reflected in terms of the hard dollars which are needed to be spent in this province to help solve the social problems we are faced with?

Hon. Mrs. Birch: I would like to point out to my hon. colleague from Scarborough that we don't believe that dollars are always the answer to any social problem. I think that is an assumption too many of us have made in the past. Perhaps it is time we began to look very closely at people assuming more responsibility for themselves and their families rather than expecting government to do it.

I think we will be looking very carefully at many of these areas within the social policy field with a view to making that more possible. As a government, we feel a strong determination to help those who need our help but we have just as strong a determination to see that those who can look after themselves do so and not at the taxpayers' expense.

Mr. Lewis: Is there anything more simplistic than that?

Hon. Mrs. Birch: Oh, of course, of course.

Mr. Chairman: Do you have another question?

Hon. Mrs. Birch: You don't have to listen.

Mr. Warner: As a fellow-up to that, I understand fully what the minister is saying and I wonder with what, in those vague terms, are you going to replace the dollars? What is it that this government is going to do, which is so magical, to replace the help those dollars provide to solve these problems? Can we have some concrete examples of what this government intends to do now that it is going to start removing the dollars from social services?

Mr. McClellan: Spare us the nauseating rhetoric, too

Hon. Mrs. Birch: To the hon. member, I think that will be perfectly obvious after we have finished looking at the programmes within our policy fields and deciding just where those dollars can be saved. We will all be made aware of them at that point.

Mr. Spence: Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the minister in regard to drugs: Have you a policy in your ministry in regard to the use of drugs in this province? From time to time people bring it to my attention. The use of drugs, it seems to them, is on the increase and, of course, when the law apprehends a young man pushing drugs, his sentence in the courts is practically nil. It is becoming of great concern to many people and I wondered if you had a policy on drugs in your ministry so that I would be able to inform the people of the policy of your government. It is a real concern and it seems to many to be on the increase; the people would like something done about this concern.

[4:30]

Hon. Mrs. Birch: Of course, this government is concerned about the use of drugs, and that's why we fund the Addiction Research Foundation to the tune of about $16 million. There are laws that prohibit the use of drugs and there are penalties for those who break the law, but again the encouragement of many programmes throughout various communities to educate young people to drug dangers is something that is heavily encouraged and promoted by this government and paid for by this government. So, yes, we are concerned. But other than providing education, providing help for those who have become victims of drugs, our present programme is about the extent the government can go.

Mr. Spence: Is this programme used in our schools across the province?

Hon. Mrs. Birch: Yes, it is. The Addiction Research Foundation has many workers throughout the province who are available, but their going into the school depends on the local school board. Again, where the school board is agreeable, then there are workers from the Addiction Research Foundation to provide that information to students.

Mr. Spence: Mr. Chairman, I would ask the minister if there are many school boards against this programme you're carrying out across the province?

Hon. Mrs. Birch: I wouldn't be in a position to say. I don't know.

Mr. Chairman: The hon. member for Scarborough West.

Mr. Lewis: Mr. Chairman, very briefly, we would like to have—as my colleague for Bellwoods (Mr. McClellan), I think, pointed out while I was away—we would like to have made the traditional motion. But I must admit that in my years in the Legislature, I hadn't realized until now that what we were doing was reducing the ministry's salaries by an amount equivalent, rather than the minister's salary. There are some civil servants in the minister's ministry who are excellent and first-rate people. I would indeed hesitate to

savage their salaries as much as I would have that feeling about the minister's salary, for reasons purely of political opposition. So, it occurred to me over the weekend that it didn't make much point in pursuing that motion, lest it pass now.

Interjections.

Mr. Lewis: In addition, this morning the member for Wentworth (Mr. Deans) told me that the government would view it as non-confidence.

Mr. Reid: And a little more important.

Mr. Nixon: And very properly so, too.

Hon. Mr. Bernier: You are scared.

Mr. Lewis: I want to tell you it's a sorry day when the Provincial Secretary for Social Development is viewed as a matter of non-confidence, but I—

Mr. Nixon: I think she is excellent and able in her own right, too.

Mr. Lewis: I accept the fact that the government views it this way and therefore you can all relax. We're not moving a reduction in the minister's pay—

Mr. Reid: Neither are we going to move to increase it.

Mr. Lewis: —since we wouldn't get anywhere.

I think, however, it's been demonstrated by a number of speakers, both in the Liberal caucus and in the New Democratic caucus, that there is no confidence in the appropriateness of the ministry—of the ministry as a ministry; let me not reflect on personalities. And I think that says something about the ministry itself, because I don't get the impression that over on the opposition benches there is a kind of simple, mindless assumption that certain ministries should go regardless.

If there was a rationale for existence that came from the ministry, if there was a perception in the minds of the opposition that the ministry was really needed and useful and helpful and appropriate, we would acknowledge that. Some of us would concede an error in judgement and acknowledge it, but I don't think there's any basis for that acknowledgement.

I listened briefly to the member for St. George (Mrs. Campbell), I've listened to the member for Nipissing (Mr. R. S. Smith), I've listened to members in my own caucus on a number of occasions, but I have not heard the minister effectively respond to the great question mark which continues to hang over the head of this million-dollar expenditure. Why? What for?

So you sit and you co-ordinate a few ministries. So you have some meetings on subjects which overlap through other ministries. So what? So why couldn't a number of the first-rate civil servants whom you have in your ministry be deployed amongst other ministries and do exactly the same thing? Why do we have to have a whole separate portfolio? Why do we have to ge through this absurdity? That's what we don't understand.

I don't understand the co-ordinating role of this ministry at all. There may be, I suppose, some general rationale that there are enough problems in the social development field which lend themselves to overlap and require some kind of coherence or co-ordination. I certainly don't get the impression of it emerging here. I don't get a sense of resolve; I don't get a sense of purpose. I don't see what's going on in any areas qualitatively different from anything that happened before.

We haven't moved on the physically handicapped. I have press releases and the material from the Ontario Advisory Council on the Physically Handicapped. You haven't done anything about that. The Ministries of Community and Social Services and Health could do it nicely without you, thank you very much. The only thing that has happened in day care and day nurseries is that we've gone backwards.

The other ministries can go backwards without your help. God knows they did for years. There's no reason in the world why they need your shot of reverse adrenalin in order to immobilize them. Nothing has happened with the physically disabled or the permanently unemployable that we can see of a policy kind. We didn't need your overall Social Development ministry to confuse it further. The Ministry of Community and Social Services is perfectly capable of a political default on its own.

I don't understand what purpose or role is served by this whole Social Development secretariat other than friendly co-ordination. Maybe you understand; maybe you feel the ministry or the government derives some real purpose or credit from it. I want to tell you that in the minds of the opposition, who are willing to give credit where credit is due, there is no sense of that.

Even in the case of the Advisory Council on the Status of Women, God knows the Social Development secretariat has hardly

pounded the frontier for International Women's Year or for that advisory council. I must say I continue to be bewildered. As a matter of fact, the greatest thing that could ever happen for Laura Sabia and the advisory council—forgive my gratuitous intervention—is that somehow they should come out from under the ambit of this ministry's influence and go on their own independent and autonomous way.

My colleagues and I don't see the areas where you have been effective as a minister. And those are the questions we raise. I think we divine—and that's why I want to make the separation because it is important—that the ministry happens to have a number of very able senior and middle civil servants working for it. I would not wish to lose the capacities of those people. I don't see why one of the malfunctioning ministries couldn't benefit from their assistance. We go back to the normal co-ordinating activity of a ministry. You create a ministry and you create with it a bureaucracy. It's all self-fulfilling anyway. It feeds on itself and it grows on itself.

What I want to say to you in review is that you've failed in terms of the support that should have been given to a number of key women's areas. You failed in the day nursery legislation, and you failed on the difference between the physically disabled and the permanently unemployable and on the whole question of physically handicapped. In other words, even the high-profile areas for this Social Development secretariat are not in fact successful or legitimized.

I want to raise something else with you, because it really bewilders me, apart from all of the political differences we share and that is question of mental retardation. If there ever was a Social Development secretariat which should have bridged the gap in the transfer from Health to Community and Social Services, it's your Social Development secretariat. If ever there was a role appropriate for this secretariat, it would have been in the perilous and sensitive transfer from Health to Community and Social Services of the whole mental retardation field in order to make appropriate use of the additional moneys you would have. And what happened? Absolutely nothing happened. That's what occurred.

Mr. Martel: It got worse.

Mr. Lewis: It got worse in a way that all of us were concerned about but we were afraid to say so. It's time for a little mea culpa. We were afraid to say what we really thought about the transfer of the mentally retarded from Health to Community and Social Services because we were afraid of prejudicing the amount of money which would be released by the Canada Assistance Act.

Am I speaking partly for all of us? I know I am speaking for myself. I felt very inhibited about the criticisms that should be made of that move because I saw so much additional money coming. But I felt, as my colleagues felt, that the help for mental retardation would be terrific. Do you know what I really wanted to say at the time? I wanted to say you are all crazy, because Community and Social Services doesn't know a thing about mental retardation, because the ministry is not a very good ministry. The ministry has a terrible record at institutional coping and arrangements for community settings—a terrible record. It is a ministry already beleaguered with too many pressures, on too many fronts, to be able to handle such a massive transfer as all of mental retardation to that ministry.

The Ministry of Health, as it happens, had developed some very skilled personnel. In the process there has been quite a loss of personnel. I will name their names in the Legislature in some time to come but a number of significant people have been lost in the process of the transfer.

We didn't say what we thought about mental retardation at the time because we saw all that Canada Assistance Act money coming. We felt that it would be helpful and we shouldn't prejudice it. I think it is fair to say that Mr. Rene Brunelle sitting behind you made an absolute pledge—I remember it; it is in Hansard. At the time of the Developmental Services Act bill he promised the additional money from the federal government would go directly to mental retardation; it would go in no circuitous route. It would go to mental retardation and it would be used for mental retardation programmes.

We said, "Are you sure?" We even said we didn't believe it. You assured us it would go. I remember that debate vividly.

Now we find that, of the $66 million which will have been received by the end of the fiscal year 1975-1976, $15 million has been earmarked for mental retardation. All of the internal discussions which we thought were taking place coincident with the transfer couldn't have happened. They just didn't occur.

If the Social Development secretariat was supposed to play a co-ordinating role, that role was never played because somewhere there is $51 million which has not been transferred. That's why I asked the provincial

Treasurer (Mr. McKeough) today what happens to the $51 million when it comes to the consolidated revenue fund.

I don't know what happens to it. I suppose it can go to anything from the paving of highways in southern Ontario to Andy StuParick's salary, but that's not what it was designed for. It was designed for mental retardation. That's what was pledged in this House. That's what this secretariat was supposed to effect. That is what you have all reneged on.

I phoned the Ontario Association for the Mentally Retarded and others asking "Could you have used the money?" because they came to see me some weeks ago terribly distressed. My colleague from Wentworth has a specific incident to relate to you. They not only could use the money, they even stopped submitting requests because it became clear that the money wasn't forthcoming. It was only after we started raising the issue publicly that some of the money began emerging in dribs and drabs. That's not the way you deal with the social field.

Mr. Martel: This government does.

Mr. Lewis: The concern for the issue exists on all sides of the House but you are more concerned, it seems to me, with the cadging of additional funds in order to perhaps reduce your deficit than you are to honour a commitment which was made to the mentally retarded of the province at the time. That is a very worrisome aspect of this policy field, and the way it works.

We have talked this afternoon about Henderson. My colleague from Scarborough-Ellesmere (Mr. Warner) raised the issue of the Henderson report. Do you know what really concerns anyone who reads it? It has no social priorities from page 1 to the last page! It has $1.6 billion worth of cuts and no sense of social priority from beginning to end. You never know at any moment in time what is considered more worthy of cuts than another or what is considered more expendable than something else. You don't know what, within a given ministry, is rated of higher or lesser importance. How do you have restraint in government if you don't set priorities? How, may I ask, do you deal with the money you are getting for mental retardation under the Canada Assistance Act if you have no set of priorities with which to use or redisburse it?

Mr. Martel: How do they find it?

[4:45]

Mr. Lewis: But you see, it has gone into general revenue. I don't know how those things happen but they do, and all of the criticisms we made last year and failed to make are now coming home to roost. They are on our consciences as well as yours, because some of us have had to deal with constituents and friends who have been involved, for example, in the redispersal of children at the Huronia Centre, formerly the Ontario Hospital School at Orillia, courtesy of the Ministry of Community and Social Services. They haven't handled it very well, let me tell you. We will get to that one day.

The Community and Social Services ministry is struggling desperately with mental retardation. It is tough for them, but in the process it has gone downhill, and in the process the commitments you made haven't been honoured, and in the process the kind of thing which I think you promised to do within your co-ordinating role in the Social Development secretariat just hasn't worked. It just hasn't happened.

I know if I ask you today what has happened to that $51 million, you couldn't tell me. I really believe you couldn't tell me. Yet I think you are the minister who is to co-ordinate the social policy field, and if there ever was an obvious example of co-ordination, it is the removal of a major social concern like mental retardation from Health and its transfer to Community and Social Services.

I will ask you—and hope you can reply—what has happened to the extra money, but I am sure and I would wager as I am standing here you really don't know, because the co-ordinating role of this ministry on things that are important is negligible. The co-ordinating role of this ministry in things that are discussed in a sense of inconsequential pap is very important, and I find that a little dispiriting. So do my colleagues and obviously so do Liberals, and you wonder what the devil we do engaging in these estimates at all except to use the opportunity to make these occasional points about other social issues which impinge on your ministry, even though you are clearly not preoccupied by them.

I want the mystery solved one day. What's going to happen to that $51 million earmarked for mental retardation, which you are not spending, which no one can account for, which violates in its suppression the commitment made by the former Minister of Community and Social Services? I want to know how a Social Development secretariat like yours continues to function. In the absence

of those answers, I want to know what the point of the whole business is anyway.

If we form a government—can you absorb that?—one day in the future, if that should happen, there wouldn't be a Provincial Secretariat for Social Development. I want you to know that that kind of self-indulgent extravagant waste would not exist.

Mr. Deans: Is the minister going to say anything?

Mr. Martel: On the $51 million, do you have an answer?

Mr. Deans: Let me try; I want to follow up what my leader spoke about in a specific instance for the next few minutes. On Friday last, I visited a place called the Robert Mack Home. I have been there a number of times. I know quite well the people who run it. It's a home for severely mentally retarded children and infants. It has three old houses on Delaware Ave. in Hamilton and they are joined together by a little walkway. The lady who owns it and the people who work in it are, by everyone's admission, doing an absolutely excellent job. There are very few people in the city of Hamilton who have any feeling about that field who don't agree that if you have a child who has some serious difficulty that is the place for that child to be, because the level of care, the dedication of the people employed there, the dedication of the owner, is just beyond description.

The people decided that they could care better for these children if they could build a newer, more modern facility. They went and they raised the mortgage, some $250,000 two years ago. They went to the city and they got rezoning approved. All of the neighbours in the area were delighted to have this facility provided in the area. They came to the ministry—not for money, they came to the ministry for approval to build; approval that they required because there were going to be some 50 beds available together with all kinds of treatment facilities and they had to have approval. The approval was denied.

You speak about your commitment to mental retardation. You speak about your commitment to solving the problems that confront people. You tell me about the saving of dollars. I listened to you talking about it. These people didn't ask you for any money and they're not going to conjure up mentally retarded kids to put in these beds. They're already there; they exist and they need help. They're not getting help and where they are getting help, they are not getting help of the calibre that they could be getting in this home from these people. They came and they simply asked for approval and had it rejected, had it turned down, by the ministry.

I ask you, could you explain to me how it could be, recognizing the need; understanding that every day of the year there are children born who desperately need this kind of care; understanding that there are not nearly enough treatment beds available, at least in the city of Hamilton, to meet the obvious daily need, that you could somehow turn down an application to build which didn't even involve the expenditure of one blessed cent from the provincial government; not one cent? If that's commitment, I can well do without it, let me tell you, if that's the level of your commitment to those people.

In that home there are the most severely retarded children, mongoloid and all other kinds, severely retarded. Anyone who has visited the home regularly would tell you, if you would care to go and talk to them, that the improvement in the majority of those children is almost unbelievable because of the atmosphere, the care and the concern that's felt for them and the amount of dedication that goes into trying to provide for them. Yet, when they come and make a simple request to provide an even better facility to do an even better job so there will be a little space for the kids, so there will be some swimming pool facilities right on the site that those youngsters can take advantage of, they are turned down by this ministry or by the ministry associated with this secretariat. There is something terrmibly wrong if you have, as my leader said, $50 million some place. For heaven's sake spend it; use it for something worthwhile.

Try to understand. It may be difficult, but try to understand that these kids have little enough opportunity as it is. Their lives are miserable enough as it is. The people associated with them have very little hope, as it now stands. There are far too many of them but, with help, many of them can become fairly useful. Many of them can grow up to reasonable happiness. And they have; some of them have for whatever the length of life that they have. But it has been done, as my colleague said, in spite of the ministries, not because of them, not with their help.

I, frankly, don't understand that. I don't understand how they can go and see the facilities; talk to the people; see the kids; find out what kind of care they're getting and then turn down the application. What I am asking them to do, even now, is to re-evaluate it. Go there and look at it. Come to Hamilton

with me and go through it. Talk to anyone you like in the field and get their opinion on it. Then grant them the right to go ahead and build. Just to show good faith, reach into your bag of money and make something available to them so that they won't have to carry such a massive mortgage as they might have to carry otherwise.

Surely, that is a reasonable thing for this policy secretariat to address itself to because that's the measure of their worth. It's whether or not they go out into the community, see the need and try to meet it. In this instance, the community came to them and showed them the need and they turned them down.

Mr. Chairman: Can you answer the question?

Hon. Mrs. Birch: Mr. Chairman, I'm sure that both hon. members are well aware that the whole area of mental retardation is subject to a green paper within the policy field.

Mr. Deans: Oh, damn your green paper.

Hon. Mrs. Birch: The policy field is not responsible for the operation within Community and Social Services. I'm not aware of all these situations.

Mr. Deans: No, in no way, on any of them. How can you make policy in a vacuum?

Mr. Chairman: Order, please. Allow the hon. minister to reply.

Hon. Mrs. Birch: But I am very disturbed to hear that those kinds of things are happening—

Mr. McClellan: Why don't you know about it? That is your responsibility.

Hon. Mrs. Birch: —and I am sure the Minister of Community and Social Services (Mr. Taylor) is just as concerned as I am. I don't know if he's aware of that particular situation to which the hon. member refers, but I'm sure I can speak for him and suggest to the hon member that he will be looking into it. I think the hon. member appreciates, and I'm sure that he knows, how difficult it is to transfer a programme as large and complex as mental retardation—

Mr. Deans: People should not have to suffer in the process.

Hon. Mrs. Birch: —from one ministry to another—

Mr. Lewis: I agree.

Hon. Mrs. Birch: There are a lot of very dedicated people within that ministry who are attempting to make that changeover with the least upset to parents and children alike. We're all very concerned about the programme.

Mr. Lewis: You did it for money. You didn't do it because of conception or the involvement of the philosophy.

Hon. Mrs. Birch: Well, I would debate that.

Mr. Lewis: You did it for hard dollars. That's the only reason you did it.

Mr. Chairman: Order, please. The minister has the floor.

Hon. Mrs. Birch: Of course, it is the Leader of the Opposition's prerogative to choose to believe that if he desires, but I don't believe that was the decision at all.

Mr. Lewis: Well, what was—

Hon. Mrs. Birch: The money will be available—

Mr. Lewis: Where is it?

Hon. Mrs. Birch: —and it will be spent to look after the mentally retarded of this province.

Mr. Lewis: Where is it? Can the provincial secretary tell me where it is now? Has she got it? Has she received it? I'm asking in good faith. I don't understand how these things work. I'd like to know. Where is the money now? The provincial secretary says it's her policy field, how difficult and sensitive an exchange it is. I agree. Moving a whole branch like mental retardation to receive the dollars is a very perilous thing. The least she could do is use the money. Can I ask her where it is, the money she has already received?

Hon. Mrs. Birch: The money is in the process of being spent on the mentally retarded of this province.

Mr. Lewis: Well, with respect, the Minister of Community and Social Services has written me a letter in his hand, saying that $30 million was received in 1974-1975, that $18 million has been received in the first six months of 1975-1976—and I presume, therefore, that there is an equivalent amount in the last six months—and then he points out that the programme using that money in 1975-1976 will amount to $15 million. I deduce, therefore, in subtracting $15 million

from $66 million, that it leaves $51 million. I don't know whether the provincial secretary has received it. I don't know where it is. I don't know how she is using it. I just want some kind of explanation. I think we're entitled. Does the provincial secretary know the explanation?

Hon. Mrs. Birch: No, I do not. I would respectfully suggest that the Leader of the Opposition get the information from the minister responsible for the operation of that programme within his ministry.

Mr. Lewis: But does the provincial secretary believe the money was received under the Canada Assistance Plan? She said it was being disbursed. I take it she believes it was received.

Hon. Mrs. Birch: I believe it's in the process of being received, yes.

Mr. Lewis: It's in the process of being received. Has the social policy field met to discuss these amounts of money and what should be done with the dollars that aren't used? Has that come to the policy field?

Hon. Mrs. Birch: No, it has not.

Mr. Lewis: It has not. Okay, then I can see there is only so much I can ask the provincial secretary if it hasn't come to her field, but again I say it's passing strange that the social development field, for whom this transfer was the single most dramatic event of life itself within the social development area, shouldn't know about the dollars. The Minister of Community and Social Services is confused about the dollars; the Treasurer wasn't sure about the dollars; I'm probably wrong about the dollars, but I'd like to be told, and I wish someone knew.

Mr. Lawlor: Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Lakeshore. You have about one minute.

Mr. Lawlor: One minute. Just about time:

Heaven shall forgive you, Bridge at dawn,
The clothes you wear—or do not wear—
And Ladies' Leap-frog on the lawn
And dyes and drugs, and petits verres.
Your vicious things shall melt in air . . .
. . . But for the Virtuous Things you do,
The Righteous Work, the Public Care,
It shall not be forgiven you.
Because a Doctor Otto Maehr
Spoke of "a segregated few"—
And you sat smiling in your chair,
It shall not be forgiven you.

The federal government will not forgive you if they have stumbled across this thing, they don't vouchsafe money to this government easily. There's enough strain between the two levels of government now. To discover and stumble upon the non-utilization of these funds, or the misuse of them, or the misapplication of the funds, or the application anywhere else is going to have devastating effects upon the interrelationship. That's a very large sum of money indeed, ranging up around $50 million and above. For the minister not to be able to stand in this House and give a résumé and an accounting of that particular fund, which falls—must fall—directly within her suzerainty, within the scope of her authority.

What on earth are you doing? What on earth is the ministry's role and function if it's not cognizant of that, and administering that and perfectly aware of all the diversities that flow out of that? When we sit here and listen to that kind of thing, your ministry does not regrettably become superogatory to the whole functioning of government. Have I used up the minute?

Mr. Warner: That's the best minute we ever had.

Mr. Lewis: I suspect you haven't even got the money—it's just sitting there in trust somewhere. They'll never give it to you if you don't start using it.

[5:00]

Mr. Chairman: Order, please. The time for private members' hour has arrived.

Mr. Lewis: The Ministry of Community and Social Services would not know what to do with it; they'd probably expend it on hardware.

Mr. Chairman: Shall vote 2401, social development policy programme, carry? Carried.

Vote 2401 agreed to.

Mr. Chairman: This completes the estimates of the Social Development Policy field.

Hon. Mr. Welch moved the committee rise and report.

Motion agreed to.

The House resumed; Mr. Speaker in the chair.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Speaker, the committee of supply begs to report one resolution and asks for leave to sit again.

Report agreed to.

Mr. Lewis: That's the danger in Henderson. You will choose hardware every time.

Hon. Mr. Taylor: I will take you on a tour and show you.

Mr. Lewis: That will be your Achilles heel over the next few months—the choice of hardware over people.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' HOUR:

PASSIVE SMOKERS' BILL OF RIGHTS

Mr. Godfrey moved resolution No. 1:

Resolved: That in the opinion of this House the Government should proclaim a Passive Smokers' Bill of Rights designed to enable adults and children to breathe air relatively free of tobacco smoke when present at public meetings, theatres, restaurants, arenas and other public places.

Mr. Godfrey: I would like to speak in support of this resolution, which will provide the right for the non-smoking public to enjoy breathing air which is clear or as clear as possible of the products of tobacco smoking.

I wish to make clear this resolution is not to ban smoking and infringe upon the rights of people who smoke. It is an accepted fact in our society that if a person wishes to smoke then he is free to do so. This right is a private one and is given by our society even in face of the overwhelming evidence that smoking cigarettes, cigars and tobacco constitutes a major cause of morbidity and mortality in our society.

Although our government, particularly the Ministry of Health, is concerned about this problem, it has failed abysmally to put the case with conviction to the public as a whole, with the result that smoking continues. Even though the state does interfere in preventing or lessening voluntarily assumed private risks, such as the necessity to wear helmets when riding motorbikes or the about-to-be-passed law that one must use a seatbelt when driving in an automobile, we continue to accept the risk of tobacco smoking.

I will not go into the factors, such as the agricultural and manufacturing industries which are tobacco based, nor the generation of millions of dollars of tax revenue as a result of the sale of tobacco which has caused our present position with regard to smoking. There is no point in generating further emotion in the great tobacco debate, and until we have a Ministry of Health which is truly dedicated to preventive medicine, tobacco will continue to be smoked.

My concern is for the passive smoker. This is the innocent person who has to share the air in a room, theatre, restaurant, arena or other place where the public is gathered. This passive smoker is the person who inhales tobacco smoke from two sources. The first is that smoke which is exhaled by the smoker after being strained in his lungs and returned to the general room atmosphere.

Mr. B. Newman: Recycled.

Mr. Godfrey: This is called mainstream. There is a second source of pollution of the atmosphere, namely sidestream. Sidestream smoke is the smoke which is emitted between puffs while a cigarette smoulders. Sidestream smoke, that portion emerging from the tobacco bowl or the butt end of a cigarette when it is not being puffed, is a major contributor to pollution. It represents the greater proportion of tobacco consumed during burning. It also represents the portion of smoke which has the highest concentration of smoke constituents. Until recently, this type of exposure was regarded as a nuisance, a discomfort with which the non-smoker had to put up, a burning of the eyes with some reddening or the association of stale tobacco stink to the clothing.

However, new evidence has shown that the degree of pollution which the passive smoker encounters is having a significant effect upon the health of the non-smoker. Thus we are no longer dealing with the discomfort of eye irritation. We are now dealing with known vectors of disease. While the proven data has not yet shown that there is increased mortality, in the passive smoker there is clear evidence of increased morbidity.

Studies on the chemical composition of tobacco smoke have resulted in the identification of numerous compounds, among which are established animal carcinogens and co-carcinogens, ciliostats, irritants and other noxious substances. These are emitted especially via sidestream smoke. Concentration levels of constituents such as carbon monoxide, benzopyrene and nicotine have been measured in public places indoor and in laboratory-controlled indoor environments. In a number of instances, carbon monoxide levels are found to approach, if not exceed, the threshold limit value which has been established by our ministries of Environment and Health.

Levels of air pollution which would be unacceptable at the ambient air near the source of factory emissions are not uncommon in party rooms, restaurants or where boys play hockey on Saturday mornings in arenas. In non-smokers, passive inhalation of

tobacco smoke results in elevated carboxyhaemoglobin levels and the appearance of nicotine in the urine. It has been shown in animal experimentation that animals chronically exposed to tobacco smoke developed lesions of the respiratory tract.

Related human data shows that school children from smoking families are more prone to develop respiratory infections. Further evidence is clear that the child of smoking parents who is continually exposed to the products of tobacco combustion is more prone to the hyperkinetic syndrome, the single most common behavioural disorder seen by child psychiatrists. Even if the mother does not smoke, and there is just the presence of a smoking father, there is an increased incidence of this disorder.

While most of this evidence is of recent discovery, it is obvious that further research will corroborate and widen the area of threat which is being experienced by the passive smoker. The susceptible population, particularly those with emphysema, coronary artery disease or peripheral vascular problems and the child in utero are the major targets.

I realize that smokers have rights. Any suggestion of restriction of tobacco use raises this cry. However, by English common law it would be necessary to pass a specific statute or regulation creating such rights for smokers or for non-smokers. It is agreed the smoker has the right to smoke on his own property or on public property. In all other areas, it is at the discretion of the owner or those who control the property. Most legislation dealing with smoking has been in the area of safety—smoking near gasoline, oxygen or where a fire hazard is created.

There is an increasing number of jurisdictions having regulations prohibiting or limiting smoking in particular locations such as elevators, buses and waiting rooms. There is even some enabling legislation which allows municipalities and school boards to regulate smoking. However, these strictures on smoking are not designed to prevent a health hazard. While it is not an article of law in Ontario, it is noted that Quebec civil law, article 19, states:

> The human person is inviolable. No one may cause harm to the person of another without his consent or without being authorized by law to do so.

Harm is being caused to the non-smoker by the smoker. I strongly suggest it is time for the government to prevent this harm.

I point out that the World Health Organization has recommended in a publication in July, 1975, sweeping legislation to protect the passive smoker. They pointed out levels of carbon monoxide in a room filled with tobacco smoke at times, exceeds more than twice the legal limits for maximum air pollution. The Surgeon-General's report of the United States, in 1972, laid out the basis for the protection of passive smokers. Recent publications from the Action on Smoking and Health have listed a growing area where, in various states in the United States, smoking is coming under control in order to give non-smokers more rights.

For example, in Alaska in July of 1975, it was enacted that trains, limousines for hire, buses, elevators, indoor theatres, halls, gymnasiums, and so on, should not permit smoking; smoking should be prohibited by law. It has been defined that "public places" means any enclosed indoor area used by the general public or serving as a place of work, including but not limited to restaurants, retail stores, offices and other commercial establishments public conveyances, educational facilities, hospitals, nursing homes, auditoriums, arenas and meeting rooms but excluding enclosed offices occupied exclusively by smokers even though such offices may be visited by non-smokers.

Only recently the State of Minnesota has passed the nation's most sweeping law to date which says: "No person shall smoke in a public place or in a public meeting except in designated smoking areas."

These facts are at the disposal of our government; the government is aware of the necessity of protecting the passive smoker. A task force organized earlier this year, supervised by John Keyes, has made a report which I think has sweeping recommendations which will protect the passive smoker, yet these recommendations have not been put into effect. I understand that guidelines may issue from this document. Now, you do not issue guidelines to a municipality to contain a disease factor. What we need is legislation, and strong legislation, which will protect the passive smoker.

It is not a penchant of the speaker, nor is it a matter of likes or whims, to object to tobacco smoke. It is as reasonable for me to spray this type of noxious element in the room as it is for a tobacco smoker to sit next to me and breathe known elements, which cause disease, into my face. I urge the adaptation of this resolution.

Mr. Speaker: May I just point out to the hon. member who just sat down that we don't allow such demonstrations in here. It really

didn't do any harm this time, but it is not permitted. Thank you very much.

Mr. Godfrey: Thank you, sir.

Mr. Williams: Mr. Speaker. I have listened carefully to the member's comments with regard to his resolution and undoubtedly they are most certainly well intentioned and are certainly reinforced by an overwhelming set of statistics that one wouldn't quarrel with nor take issue with. However, with respect, I believe that while the resolution is well intentioned the emphasis and direction thereof is perhaps presented in the wrong light.

I interpret the resolution to ask for a separate form of legislation or statute that would elevate itself to the status of our Canadian federal Bill of Rights or perhaps our own Ontario Human Rights Code. I just can't, with respect, see that the concern would take on the same magnitude and proportions as the fundamental freedoms that are insured to us in our Canadian Bill of Rights and again in our Ontario Human Rights Code.

I interpret the resolution that it would, in effect, suggest to us that the relevant sections of the Bill of Rights for Canada would be amended in such a way so as to read, if I might quote:

> It is hereby recognized and declared that in Canada there have existed and shall continue to exist without discrimination by reason of race, national origin, colour, religion or sex the following human rights and fundamental freedoms, namely: The right of the individual to life, liberty, security as a person, enjoyment of property and right not to be deprived thereof except by due process of law; the right of the individual to equality before the law and protection of the law; freedom of religion; freedom of speech; freedom of assembly and association; freedom of the press—

and, if this resolution could be interpreted as having that same stature, freedom from smoky rooms in public places. I don't think this is what really is intended by the resolution that is before us, but I can't help but feel that you can interpret it in no other way. [5:15]

Similarly with our Ontario Human Rights Code, if you look at section 2, I think in effect what is being asked for here is that that section be amended to perhaps read as follows:

> No person directly or indirectly, alone or with another, by himself or by the interposition of another, shall
>
> (a) deny to any person or class of persons the accommodation, services or facilities available in any place to which the public is customarily admitted; or
>
> (b) discriminate against any person or class of persons with respect to the accommodation, services or facilities available in any place to which the public is customarily admitted because of [—and if we apply this resolution—] the smoking habits, race, creed, colour, nationality, ancestry or place of origin of such person or class of persons or any other person or class of persons.

What I am simply pointing out—and I am not trying to belittle the genuine intent of the resolution—is that I just feel it is out of context in elevating it to the level of a human rights supposition as you find in a bill of rights. Rather, I think the proper direction to pursue this would be in the area of appropriate amendments to the existing provincial legislation such as we have—most appropriately, I think—in our Public Health Act and also perhaps in the area of legislation dealing with environmental concerns.

We are all aware of the fact that many of the municipalities do enact of their own accord bylaws that govern the manner in which buildings will be constructed so as to ensure proper ventilation at all times, including this bad social habit we have of smoking in public gatherings which does, as I acknowledge and agree, offend many people who are not smokers and find the smoke in rooms offensive and perhaps, over a prolonged perperiod of time, even injurious to health.

I am simply suggesting that I can not see support for the resolution in the form in which it is taken as a separate passive smokers' bill of rights as it has been presented, but rather as a matter that could be more earnestly pursued along the lines of appropriate amendments to existing governmental legislation that already recognizes this particular problem and concern.

Mr. S. Smith: It's a great pleasure to rise to support the general intent of the resolution presented by my medical colleague and my friend in the House, the member for Durham West (Mr. Godfrey), although I must say I have to agree with the member for Oriole (Mr. Williams) that probably a bill of rights is putting things a little strongly and that there are probably other ways that the subject can be attacked. But I think we do have some obligation to attack the subject and we should be grateful that on this occasion at least the noxious spray coming from the members to the right was merely a harmless aerosol as opposed to some of the com-

ments that have been mentioned from time to time.

Mr. Samis: You have endorsed that.

Mr. S. Smith: I wonder really whether the province is ready at this time for the strong action that I think would be necessary if we were to be entirely fair to both smokers and non-smokers.

Mr. Dukszta: From behind, wrong delivery.

Mr. S. Smith: I feel that there are really two issues that we have to concern ourself with and one is the health and comfort of the so-called passive smoker, that is, the person who is forced to inhale and to be surrounded by smoke due to the fact that other people are smoking even if that person, himself or herself, is not smoking. I think that the member for Durham West has made some excellent points about the fact that the health of all the rest of the people in society can be very badly affected by the habits of those who smoke in confined places.

At the same time, we have to recognize for whatever reason there is a very large population in our province and in our society that feel very uncomfortable when they are not able to smoke. For them the enjoyment of a good many activities such as movie-going, and so forth, is very much curtailed and, in fact, made impossible. Whether we want to call it an addiction or not, this habit which they have makes smoking while they're relaxing and enjoying themselves essential to their sense of well-being.

Mr. Burr: It's necessary that they have it.

Mr. S. Smith: Most smokers to whom I speak admit that they wish they were not finding it necessary to smoke on these occasions. They recognize that it's something they wish their children would not do. They see the health hazard involved.

But the government has made a lot of money over the years selling tobacco and taxing it. One of the things that has happened is that people have become addicted to it and I don't think we're going to overturn that overnight. We have to recognize that all of us in society bear, I think, some responsibility for the fact that many people in society find it necessary to be handling a cigarette and to be puffing on it while they're talking to their doctor or while they're doing other things.

I think that the way to handle this problem is to make us all a lot more conscious of what we're doing and to make smokers a lot more conscious of the fact it's not a readily accepted activity that they blow smoke at other people and to make non-smokers freer to speak up and freer to feel that they are, in fact, the real people in society and not, the way the movies would have us believe, the odd people. Unfortunately, we've been surrounded in the media by images of people who smoke cigarettes as a way of showing their manliness and, allegedly, their sang froid. In point of fact, those of us who know something about it realize it has no such connotation whatsoever.

If we in the Legislature try, to the best of our ability, to draw people's attention to these problems and, perhaps, if we do amend the Public Health Act in certain ways and introduce into environmental protection the concept of the people's environment in enclosed public spaces, perhaps people will feel a little freer to form associations of non-smokers; groups that will demand their rights; groups that will try and educate the children in the schools. I think that it's a good thing that my colleague from Durham West has brought in this particular bill at this time even though I doubt very much that it's going to be passed in the form that the resolution has been presented.

There is the question of what we are going to do to discourage smoking among the young people in our society. I'm very dismayed, and I'm sure everyone here is, whether they be a smoker or non-smoker, at the figures that we have which show that there are two groups in society that are actually increasing their rate of smoking rather than decreasing it. Adult males are decreasing their rate of smoking—slowly, but thank goodness they're decreasing it. Adult women are increasing their rate of smoking and, worst of all, very young people, teenagers and even pre-teens are actually increasing the rate at which they're turning to smoking. This is a terrible indictment of our programmes to stop smoking. I think they have failed very badly when we find these groups actually taking up cigarette smoking rather than choosing the opposite.

I would like it if we made it a policy that 'no smoking' regulations, where they exist, be enforced. After all, they exist in many places where we all know the law is more honoured in the breach than in the observance. If we make it a policy to set aside smoking lounges in schools, we should also set aside no-smoking lounges rather than make the smokers somehow more glamourous and a more rewarded group. We could make the non-smoker more glamorous and more rewarded

if we saw to it—and this may sound trivial and silly but I think it has a certain psychology to it—that the non-smokers' facilities were just that much more comfortable and that much more lavish and so forth, than the smokers' facility. These are subtle ways in which I think we can improve the situation.

All of us know the so-called smoker car on trains. You get this picture of these lavish, opulent seats in the old trains, a sort of red velvet type of thing, almost like the legislative offices. I think the non-smoking compartments of trains should, first of all, be enforced as non-smoking compartments and, secondly, made an awful lot more comfortable. These are the kinds of things which would give the general impression to children as they are growing up, that smoking is rather disagreeable habit which is accompanied by a certain Spartan type of existence; and that non-smoking is really the way to travel in this world.

I would like to see this happen. I would like to see theatres more strict in their observance of the law. I would like to see hospitals, which are after all under some provincial control, designated entirely as non-smoking areas, with perhaps some areas set aside for smokers.

I certainly think the in-patients' units ought to be non-smoking in all hospitals. I don't think too many people would disagree with that, although we found at our own hospital a lot of people refused to accept that.

I think the provincial government might give leadership in this way. I think we ought to have more clinics available, and not necessarily run by the government; the government doesn't have to do everything in our society. We ought to be able to encourage self-help groups to set up more non-smokers' clinics, ways in which people can give up smoking if possible.

I think we have to spend more money on research into effective ways of deterring our children from taking up smoking as a habit. I think the subtle means I have been suggesting so far—to make the life of the smoker less glamourous and the life of a non-smoker more modern-seeming and more glamourous—would be a way to go about it.

In terms of other things the provincial government could do, I would bring up the subject of GO Transit, for instance, where there is a non-smokers' section and a smokers' section. I think GO Transit ought to make greater efforts to make the non-smokers' section more comfortable and larger.

In fact, I think the federal government ought to take a lesson. Canadian National Railways set aside very small areas for non-smoking, or at least where the rule is enforced. With our own children during a recent trip on Canadian National, we found, in order to get a seat where the four of us could sit, we were obliged to stay in a smoking area. Our children ended up coughing and sputtering the whole trip because of the smoke surrounding us. I think the hon. member for Durham West would share my feeling that that sort of thing has to be discouraged.

Mr. Speaker, in summary I would say to you, and to this House, that we endorse—at least I personally would like to endorse—the views of the member for Durham West, although I think we need a slightly greater regard for the fact that smokers in our society are not always really at liberty to choose whether they smoke or not. I think many of them fail to enjoy what few pleasures life has to offer without a cigarette. I think we have to recognize that these people deserve our consideration as well, but I do think we ought to enforce the no-smoking laws that exist.

We ought to have no-smoking lounges, as well as smoking lounges, in various public places. We ought to have smoking areas in hospitals, but the rest of the hospital should be a no-smoking area. We ought to make very certain that whenever you have smoking and no-smoking areas that the no-smoking areas are deliberately made more lavish, more comfortable, and the smoking areas made more Spartan. In that way we could suggest that smoking is not the glamourous and manly thing to do, but is, in fact, just the opposite.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Windsor-Riverside.

Mr. Samis: Knock 'em dead, Fred.

Mr. Burr: Mr. Speaker, there are various ways of classifying smokers. For example, they may be classified by their preferences, which would be cigarettes, cigars, or pipe tobacco. There are the considerate and the inconsiderate smokers; the former ask for permission to smoke in other people's houses, the latter do not. There are smokers who know the dangers they run, but say, well, it's my own problem or, it's my own body, it's my own funeral, but it isn't hurting anyone else. Mr. Speaker, it's towards smokers of that type I hope to direct my remarks today.

The private smoker living in his or her own bachelor apartment may make such a state-

ment that no one else is being hurt. It may turn out to be true, provided, of course, the smoker doesn't fall asleep and set fire to the whole apartment building. Apart, then, from the very considerate smoker who smokes only in private or when alone in the great outdoors, it is quite untrue that the smoker hurts no one but himself. If my remarks today needed a title, it would be "Smokers Hurt Others." Every pipe, cigar and cigarette emits two kinds of smoke, as my colleague from Durham West indicated.

[5:30]

Mr. Worton: Good and bad.

Mr. Burr: The smoke inhaled or puffed by the smoker is called mainstream smoke. The smoker filters this smoke, either in his mouth if he puffs or in his lungs if he inhales, before returning it to the atmosphere. The smoke that is generated by the cigarette burning at rest is called sidestream smoke and enters the shared air of a room quite unfiltered.

If a smoker must smoke in the presence of a non-smoking companion or a child, he should at least have the decency to filter as much of the toxic components out of the smoke and into his own lungs as possible. Some members may have noticed that often when a smoker realizes that his companion is a non-smoker, he will let the cigarette sit on the ashtray most of the 12 minutes it takes to burn itself away, taking only a very occasional puff, apparently under the impression that he is somehow being kind or is accommodating his companion. Of course, in a physical sense, he is actually making things worse for his companion.

If the smoker were filtering the smoke, he would be reducing the amount of pollutants that his non-smoking companion has to breathe in. The alarming fact about sidestream smoke, which rises from the burning end of the cigarette or cigar, is that it has higher concentrations of noxious elements than the mainstream smoke inhaled by the smoker.

Studies have shown that sidestream smoke contains twice as much tar as mainstream smoke, twice as much nicotine, three times as much benzpyrene—which is highly suspected as a cancer-causing agent—five times as much carbon monoxide, which of course robs the blood of oxygen, and 50 times as much ammonia as in mainstream smoke.

There is evidence also that sidestream smoke contains more cadmium than does mainstream smoke. Cadmium is almost certainly a major cause of emphysema. Once cadmium enters the lungs, it becomes a permanent part of the body.

As far as the benzpyrene is concerned, spending two hours in a smoke-filled room is the equivalent of smoking 10 unfiltered cigarettes. When one takes this into consideration, is it any wonder that some so-called non-smokers do get lung cancer?

Many smokers are unaware that their cigarettes, cigars and pipes are emitting carbon monoxide, yet it often happens that the air in a room filled with smokers contains up to 90 parts per million of carbon monoxide. In industry 50 parts per million is the administratively acceptable level, a level that soon may be reduced to 25 parts per million. In other words, smokers often create for themselves and their non-smoking companions concentrations of carbon monoxide that would cause a factory to be prosecuted by occupational health officers, if not closed down.

The Department of National Health and Welfare puts out some anti-smoking posters of the cartoon type. I should like to see a poster designed to show that children need protection. I visualize such a poster as showing a parent, male or female, with an infant in a high-chair. Between them, balanced on the edge of an ashtray, would be a cigarette, burning at rest, with its smoke drifting towards the child's face. The baby's thoughts would be shown in some such words as these: "I wish he would smoke it himself. How long before my cute pink lungs turn ugly black? Do I need this carbon monoxide? Can my lungs tolerate this cadmium?"

Our resourceful Minister of Health (Mr. F. S. Miller) who is sympathetic towards the trials of non-smokers, could probably come up with some suitable one-liners. I trust that he will follow up this suggestion, either within his ministry or at Ottawa, despite the fact that he is not in the House at the moment.

I think it's important to mention that the American Medical Association says that at least 34 million Americans are sensitive to cigarette smoke and a leading American allergist estimates that eight million Americans are actually allergic to tobacco smoke. One of these allergists recently told the International Congress on Allergies, which was held in 1974, in Tokyo, and I quote:

> Sufferers must endure running noses and watering eyes. Breathing difficulties suffered by allergic persons when exposed to tobacco smoke can range from slight coughing, wheezing and shortness of breath, all the way to violent asthma attacks and severe coughing spells.

According to the American Lung Association:

> There are hundreds of chemical compounds in tobacco and hundreds more created when tobacco is burned. Some of the most hazardous compounds are tar, nicotine, carbon monoxide, cadmium, nitrogen dioxide, ammonia, DDT, benzyne, formaldehyde, hydrogen sulphide and dozens of others. Any one of these alone can assault the body and cause trouble. Together they make smoking the menace it is.

Other studies have shown that a pregnant woman who smokes does harm to her unborn fetus. In fact, deaths of children in the first week of life are about 20 per cent greater among those whose mothers smoke than among those whose mothers do not smoke. Fetal deaths in late pregnancy follow a similar pattern and so do stillbirths. Actual measurements have shown that within five minutes of the lighting up of a cigarette by an expectant mother, the so-called breathing time of a fetus is reduced substantially. Scientists in England have warned that a child's chances of getting pneumonia or bronchitis in the first year of life are nearly doubled when both parents smoke—

Mr. Speaker: There are 30 seconds left.

Mr. Burr: —and 50 per cent greater when one parent smokes. The purpose of today's resolution is to draw attention to the rights of non-smokers to enjoy clean air in public places. The health of non-smokers is affected adversely by the action of smokers.

The government of Ontario gives, as one of its reasons for its seatbelt legislation, the need to reduce OHIP expenditures. Protection for non-smokers would be consistent with this policy enunciated by the government.

In a civilized society it should not be necessary for one human being to ask another not to pollute his share of the air. When smokers realize the irritation they cause many non-smokers and the actual health hazards they represent to their companions, they may confine their smoking to their own air space.

It is my hope that this resolution and this debate will have some educational value that will result both in more public protection and more private consideration for non-smokers.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Windsor-Walkerville.

Mr. B. Newman: There is a government speaker, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: I'm sorry, does the member for Mississauga North wish to speak on this?

Mr. Jones: In speaking to this resolution, I would like to open with the comment that I really don't believe that there is a thinking person in this House today who doesn't have concern for the health hazard of tobacco. I know, for my part, it's a very constant concern in our household. In fact, for the past two years I have served as the industrial chairman in matters of finance for the cancer programmes. My wife's role in her community activities has been as a co-ordinator for driving activities for visitations under the cancer programmes in the Mississauga area. So, it is very much a concern of our household. As I say, I know full well that this whole House shares in that same concern. Further, I am certainly all for the programmes to help people to breathe air that is more free from smoke.

Earlier today in the question period, we heard the Minister of the Environment (Mr. Kerr) talking about the constant ongoing programmes and the concerns of this government on the issues of air pollution. But what concerns me about this resolution is that it is constant with the NDP philosophy of more and more government control of our lives and more and more dictating.

Mr. Samis: Who brought in the seatbelt legislation?

Mr. Jones: We will get to that in a moment.

Mr. Deans: I think we are going to talk about that tomorrow.

Mr. Jones: If there is any impression that has concerned me in this House or in committee—and we just saw the reaction—it has been the incessant philosophical drive of the opposition towards removing more of our freedoms. We have heard it on the discussion of land, and so on.

Interjections.

Mr. Jones: The passing of this resolution is yet another encroachment by government—

Mr. Samis: Has Ronald Reagan read this?

Mr. Jones: This is an ideal subject, none of us disagree with that, but the fact remains it has all the sounds of more clanking, of more dictates, and further dilution of self-initiative and our self-determination. I would say in reply to your comment—

Mr. Foulds: As a smoker and socialist, I resent that.

Mr. Jones: —that the government, in introducing its seatbelt legislation, certainly addressed itself to something entirely different.

Mr. Deans: Nonsense.

Mr. Jones: The member for Peterborough —one of your members—spoke earlier, and it was refreshing to hear her. She talked about individual rights—she was talking about a lady, in an example of certain circumstances, but that aside, it seemed she had just swerved for a moment from the dialogue that I have listened to since this House began sitting. It all seems to be the same. We will all be sausages living in similar shoe boxes. And a what you will do or what you will not do sort of thing—"Don't you think about it; we will think about it for you"—seems to prevail in this proposal of this resolution.

Mr. Deans: Sausages living in shoe boxes?

Mr. Jones: The seatbelt legislation that you are—

Mr. Speaker: Order please. We are speaking about this particular resolution. You are straying too far from that.

Hon. Mr. Kerr: He is drawing an analogy.

Mr. Jones: In the case of this resolution, instead of talking on the immediate life and death of the other subject, we are talking here about regulating a matter of convenience, of unpleasantness. I have listened to other comments and I saw the mover of the resolution with his aerosol can. The next thing they might be asking us is to do is to legislate as to the use of some kind of deodorants or something. But in the case of this resolution, rather than adopt this resolution—

Mr. Deans: Nice fellow, but it is a bad speech.

Hon. Mr. Kerr: You will want more space over there.

Mr. Jones: —with the irretrievable loss of yet another valued right, and encourage the state to take on even more programmes, I would like to see it accentuating—as referred to by some of the earlier speakers—more programmes of education, more programmes of friendly persuasion. We have seen them before, and some of them have been very successful.

Mr. Warner: Voluntary restraint legislation works.

Mr. Jones: For example, we have had our litterbug programme; and very successful—no one can deny that it has worked.

Mr. Foulds: For whom?

Mr. Samis: Did you support Stanfield last year?

Mr. Jones: Further, looking at the list of places in this resolution, we see the theatres—

Mr. Deans: Tell him about Hamilton harbour and the pollution.

[5:45]

Mr. Speaker: Order please.

Mr. Jones: —and we see the restaurants. We see these areas of public meetings—and most of them have been referred to by previous speakers—where the non-smokers can go, be it in airplanes or in theatres. For example, we don't have smoking in the particular arena in my town, whether it is because of the fire hazard or whatever the reasons might be that is was brought in, the fact remains there isn't smoking there. So this does exist, by choice and by request, in most of our public places. In fact, when we start to talk about public places we are covering an awful lot of our world.

I was at a meeting in my riding last Monday, I say to the member for Durham West, where incidentally the hon. member was billed as the speaker and the subject to be talked about apparently was the tricks of militancy and so on. In any event, it was announced by the chairman that, alas, the member for Durham West couldn't be there because the House was sitting. As it happens, we all know here that the House wasn't sitting last week; therefore, I hope that the wording of this resolution is also an error in his communication, because containing as it does this key word of "rights," I suggest it would be taking more of them away. Rather, let's get back to encouraging people to make their own decisions, to work for more education of our young people—

Mr. Foulds: That is exactly what he is trying to do, so the non-smoker can make his decision.

Mr. Jones: —and to cut down and, it is hoped, eventually cut out smoking by individual decision. Let's not grab irretrievable rights and freedoms from the present and the future in this socialistic style.

Mr. Samis: That sounds like a good Reaganism.

Mr. Jones: I urge that we reject this resolution in its present form. As some of the former speakers have said, indeed we do all

share the concern about the smoke and the care for young people not inheriting this urge that seems to be so prevalent in our present society. But I say give them a heritage of education and of extending to them that they might decide on their own, rather than passing on yet another restriction, yet another removal of one of their rights and giving it over to government.

Mr. Warner: You probably believe in voluntary restraints.

Mr. Samis: That's great stuff.

Mr. Deans: Can I count on your support in opposition to the seatbelts?

Mr. B. Newman: I rise to make a few comments on the resolution introduced by the member for Durham West concerning a Passive Smokers' Bill of Rights. I don't think introducing any type of bill of rights concerning the right to smoke is going to achieve anything wnatsoever. If one notices the ads in the US papers, and in magazines especially, there is one big ad that says: "I smoke because I like it." That seems to be one of the main reasons why people smoke, and if the hon. member thinks we are going to stop them from doing something they like by passing a bill of rights, well I think he is sadly mistaken. I think we can attempt to educate, and especially we need programmes to educate our youth at a very early age.

I don't think we can use scare tactics, because I can recall an article in Reader's Digest in the 1940s pointed out that each cigarette you smoked shortened your life by an hour and a half a day. You immediately started to figure out that if you smoked a package of 20 cigarettes a day, you have shortened your life by 30 days; that's one month less you are going to live. Once you start figuring out the number of packages of cigarettes you have smoked, you find out that you have been on this earth longer than you should have been.

Mr. Foulds: So much for Reader's Digest research.

Hon. B. Stephenson: Just stop reading then.

Mr. B. Newman: I don't think this is the correct approach. The approach must be to achieve a greater awareness of some of the hazards of smoking and a greater awareness as to how it affects the overall health of an individual, as well as how the health of a newborn child is affected as a result of an individual smoking. In the United States at the present time there happens to be a wave of anti-smoking legislation that seems to be passing. Half of the states now do have legislation proclaiming what the member has introduced, a non-smoker's bill of rights. The other half of the states now are seriously weighing taking any action whatsoever on this.

The group that originated such action was a group called Action on Smoking and Health. Their emphasis was on the health aspect of smoking. I think that that is a good approach to it, but passing legislation trying to prevent an individual from doing something that he likes is pretty hard legislation to get individuals to accept. I can recall about four or five years ago when there was a group called GASP, Group Action to Stop Pollution. That was going to stop pollution, not only industrial but also personal—that is, smoking pollution. You see what has happaned with that group.

We've gone through that wave and that phase where everyone was concerned about pollution. We've, gone from the phase where university students said that by the 1980s we will all be dead, we will have polluted ourselves, and the environment will be so bad that we will not be able to survive. When you use scare tactics like that, the action doesn't work.

I can recall the approach used one time in the school system concerning alcohol and the abuse of alcohol when we started to point out to people that if they are going to take to a bit of alcohol the devil is going to approach them and may start claiming them and everything we can possibly think of is going to happen to them. In the way you scare them to the point where they don't believe you any longer because they know it isn't so.

Mr. Deans: This much better than the speech of the member for Mississauga North (Mr. Jones).

Mr. B. Newman: I did receive a constituent letter as a result of questionnaires I mailed to my own constituents suggesting that some type of action be taken to restrict smoking in certain confined areas. I can accept that very much so when we are talking about elevators, since we are talking about confined locations, but it is a different matter to attempt to control and stop smoking in public meetings, in arenas, in theatres or in restaurants. I would say have separate areas for smokers if you wish. There is nothing wrong with that.

As my colleague, the member for Hamilton West (Mr. S. Smith) said by making it more amenable in areas in public buildings for the non-smoker as opposed to the smoker and by making it more convenient on transportation facilities for the individual who doesn't smoke as opposed to the individual who does smoke, it may have a tendency to drive people away from the idea of smoking, especially smoking on that type of conveyance.

Non-smoking signs seem to be up all over, but you will notice that people don't seem to pay attention to them to the extent that maybe they should. Even businesses will come along and put up no-smoking signs. It's nothing to see a no-smoking sign at the entrance to certain types of business and yet you'll find people walking in with cigarettes. Even though they have an ashtry there for you to dispose of your cigarette or cigar, people have a tendency to forget about that and walk in with a cigarette in their hand and continue to smoke, even though there may be a fire hazard.

If we enforced laws concerning non-smoking in certain areas, I think it might be a little better but we are hesitant to enforce certain laws because we know that it would take an army of policemen to police non-smoking in the various businesses throughout the province.

Two hospitals in my own community now don't sell cegarettes and don't have cigarette vending machines. I think that's a good approach. Since in the first place the hospital is trying to correct any physical ailment that you have, why should they turn around and be selling you something which can aggravate any type of sickness or illness you have?

Mr. Deans: Time.

Mr. B. Newman: Patients are told in some hospitals—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I might just point out quickly that we do have another member who did wish to make some remarks. You do have another three minutes if you wish but out of consideration—

Mr. B. Newman: From what party, Mr. Speaker?

Mr. Speaker: Does it matter?

Mr. Deans: This is the private members' hour.

Mr. B. Newman: I am entitled to the 10 minutes, am I not, Mr. Speaker?

Mr. Young: I was courteous to you last time.

Mr. B. Newman: I'm entitled to the 10 minutes.

Mr. Deans: If you've got anything to say.

Mr. Speaker: Yes. I just point out if you wanted to share some of the last part of the 10 minutes it would be in order but it's up to you.

Mr. Young: I was courteous enough the last time to let you speak.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The hon. member for Windsor-Walkerville.

Mr. B. Newman: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. You will notice that one of the restaurant operators in the city of Toronto attempted to have an area in the restaurant in which you could not smoke. He tried that out and it was not successful. It was successful for the first week or so of operation but after a while he had to discard that because he found he couldn't attract customers simply because he had a non-smoking area.

Buses now have non-smoking areas; the trains have non-smoking areas. Universities have areas in the schools in which they forbid smoking. Some high schools have smoking areas so that the students won't be smoking in the washrooms.

Mr. Deans: That's very clever.

Mr. B. Newman: One of the drugstores in the city of Vancouver in British Columbia stopped selling tobacco simply because it also sold vitamins and health products.

Mr. Deans: We should all go there to buy our drugs.

Mr. B. Newman: In other words, it felt, why should it be selling health products and at the same time be selling something which could be deleterious to the individual's health?

I could make quite a few more comments on this and bring to the attention of the House the fact that cigarette smoking is on the increase rather than on the decrease. Action such as we have here, passing a bill of rights, is not going to resolve the problem.

Mr. Cassidy: I propose to deliver a very short speech. I think the adoption of this particular resolution would be the beginning of a solution to the problem. Only the beginning—but it's obviously an essential part of it.

I want to say to the two ministers who are in the House that I think the government of the Province of Ontario has responsibilities beyond simply establishing a code which affects people outside. Our record, or the government's record, in terms of involvement in the matter of smoking and combating smoking is dismal.

According to figures which were given to me by the Minister of Health in reply to a written question, Ontario spends about $35,000 a year on programmes to stop smoking. That's the degree of involvement it has in the preventive health measures of stopping smoking. The same reply estimated that something more than $100 million a year was the cost to the people of the Province of Ontario, through Medicare and other programmes, from diseases related to smoking. That's a pretty bad imbalance.

If we look at the budget of the Addiction Research Foundation we find that out of their $13 million or $14 million budget a year, almost nothing is spent on tobacco research. Next to nothing in their newspaper is devoted to the questions of smoking research, how to stop smoking, how to prevent it, how to conduct public education campaigns against it.

I want to suggest Ontario should provide clinics across the province to help people when they are ready to try to quit smoking. It's a difficult job; a few of us have done it. Those clinics should be accessible. They should be free. They should be publicly provided and they should be there when people are ready, when they have the urge. The urge may not come frequently but when people are frightened, when they're ready for various reasons, when it's just after New Year's and they've made a resolution, Ontario should be there to hold their hand and give them a hand.

Right now we leave this matter to the private, non-profit sector, through agencies like the TB foundation. Ontario should be there. There should be education and propaganda which is financed by the Ontario government in order to help people to break the smoking habit in the same way we do this in terms of teenagers and drinking, in terms of seatbelts and other things.

Ontario should very carefully consider whether the level of cigarette taxation is adequate or whether, for public health reasons we should not be engaged in a programme over the next four or five years of deliberately raising the cigarette tax as another means of making it more difficult and less pleasant for people to smoke.

The balance of opinion is shifting against tobacco. The balance of opinion is beginning to recognize what a health hazard is involved. The balance of opinion is also beginning to recognize the economic and social costs of smoking. Ontario should move now.

Mr. Deans: He's a reformed smoker.

Mr. Speaker: This order of business is now concluded.

Mr. Cassidy: Let's have a vote on this.

Mr. Deans: You can always tell when someone has given up smoking.

Hon. Mr. Welch: Before moving the adjournment of the debate, I wanted to indicate that tomorrow we have a very heavy legislative day—hopefully second readings of Bills 26 and 27. If that were to occur before 10:30, we'd then go into committee of the whole House to do the legislation which will be in committee of the whole House in the order the bills appear on the order paper.

Mr. Deans: Are we going to have a free vote on that seatbelt legislation?

Hon. Mr. Welch moved the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to.

The House adjourned at 6 o'clock p.m.

CONTENTS

Monday, November 24, 1975

Role of parliamentary assistants, ruling by Mr. Speaker 857

Toronto teachers' negotiations, questions of Mr. Wells: Mr. Lewis, Mr. Foulds, Mr. Renwick 858

Services to mentally retarded, question of Mr. McKeough: Mr. Lewis 858

Hospital appeal board, questions of Mr. F. S. Miller: Mr. Lewis, Mr. Nixon 859

St. Joseph's Hospital staff reduction, question of Mr. F. S. Miller: Mr. Lewis 860

Toronto teachers' negotiations, questions of Mr. Wells: Mr. Nixon, Mr. Lewis, Mr. Foulds 860

Tobacco auction, question of Mr. W. Newman: Mr. Nixon 861

Arnprior Hydro project, question of Mr. Timbrell: Mr. Yakabuski 862

Port Arthur clinic strike, question of B. Stephenson: Mr. Foulds 862

Regional government, questions of Mr. McKeough: Mr. Reed, Mr. Nixon 862

Essex packers, questions of Mr. Handleman and Mr. Bennett: Mr. Mackenzie, Mr. MacDonald 863

Special programme review, questions of Mr. McKeough: Mr. Peterson 864

Comments by OPSEU president, questions of Mr. Davis: Mr. Williams 865

Cease and desist order, question of B. Stephenson: Mr. Moffatt 865

Minister's speech at Conestoga College, question of Mr. Parrott: Mr. Sweeney 865

Air pollution in Toronto, question of Mr. Kerr: Mrs. Bryden 865

Construction on Bathurst St., question of Mr. Snow: Mr. Givens 866

Hydro transformer station, questions of Mr. Timbrell: Mr. Peterson 866

Essex Packers, question of Mr. Handleman: Mr. Deans 867

Sales tax on mobile homes, question of Mr. McKeough: Mr. Edighoffer 867

Paperworkers' strike, questions of B. Stephenson: Mr. Samis, Mr. Swart 867

Bonding for food processing plants, question of Mr. W. Newman: Mr. Gaunt 867

Water pollution, question of Mr. Kerr: Mr. Angus 868

Enforcement of maintenance orders, question of Mr. McMurtry: Mrs. Campbell 868

Motion re select committee to consider Bill 20, Mr. Welch, agreed to 868

Highway Traffic Amendment Act, Mr. Young, first reading 869

Occupational Health Act, Mr. Martel, first reading 869

Estimates, Social Development Policy Field, Mrs. Birch, concluded 869

Private members' hour on Resolution No. 1, re a Passive Smokers' Bill of Rights, Mr. Godfrey, Mr. Williams, Mr. S. Smith, Mr. Burr, Mr. Jones, Mr. B. Newman, Mr. Cassidy 890

Motion to adjourn, Mr. Welch, agreed to 900

SPEAKERS IN THIS ISSUE

Angus, I. (Fort William NDP)
Bennett, Hon. C. Industry and Tourism (Ottawa South PC)
Bernier, Hon. L. Natural Resources (Kenora PC)
Birch, Hon. M. Provincial Secretary for Social Development (Scarborough East PC)

Burr, F. A. (Windsor-Riverside NDP)
Bryden, M. (Beaches-Woodbine NDP)
Campbell, M. (St. George L)
Cassidy, M. (Ottawa Centre NDP)
Davis, Hon. W. G. Premier (Brampton PC)
Deans, I. (Wentworth NDP)
Dukszta, J. (Parkdale NDP)
Edighoffer, H. (Perth L)
Foulds, J. F. (Port Arthur NDP)
Gaunt, M. (Huron-Bruce L)
Givens, P. G. (Armourdale L)
Godfrey, C. (Durham West NDP)
Good, E. R. (Waterloo North L)
Grossman, L. (St. Andrew-St. Patrick PC)
Hall, R. (Lincoln L)
Handleman, Hon. S. B. Consumer and Commercial Relations (Carleton PC)
Jones, T. (Mississauga North PC)
Kerr, Hon. G. A. Environment (Burlington South PC)
Lawlor, P. D. (Lakeshore NDP)
Leluk, N. G. (York West PC)
Lewis, S. Leader of the Opposition (Scarborough West NDP)
MacDonald, D. C. (York South NDP)
Mackenzie, R. (Hamilton East NDP)
Martel, E. W. (Sudbury East NDP)
McClellan, R. (Bellwoods NDP)
McKeough, Hon. W. D. Treasurer, Minister of Economics and Intergovernmental Affairs (Chatham-Kent PC)
McMurtry, Hon. R. Attorney General (Eglinton PC)
Miller, Hon. F. S. Health (Muskoka PC)
Moffatt, D. (Durham East NDP)
Morrow, D. H. (Ottawa West PC)
Newman, B. (Windsor-Walkerville L)
Newman, Hon. W. Agriculture and Food (Durham North PC)
Nixon, R. F. (Brant-Oxford-Norfolk L)
Parrott, Hon. H. C. Colleges and Universities (Oxford PC)
Peterson, D. (London Centre L)
Philip, E. (Etobicoke NDP)
Reed, J. (Halton-Burlington L)
Reid, T. P. (Rainy River L)
Renwick, J. A. (Riverdale NDP)
Riddell, J. (Huron-Middlesex L)
Samis, G. (Cornwall NDP)
Sandeman, G. (Peterborough NDP)
Shore, M. (London North L)
Smith, R. S. (Nipissing L)
Smith, S. (Hamilton West L)
Snow, Hon. J. W. Transportation and Communications (Oakville PC)
Spence, J. P. (Kent-Elgin L)
Stephenson, Hon. B. Labour (York Mills PC)
Stokes, J. E. (Lake Nipigon NDP)
Stong, A. (York Centre L)
Swart, M. (Welland NDP)
Sweeney, J. (Kitchener-Wilmot L)
Taylor, Hon. J. A. Minister of Community and Social Services (Prince Edward-Lennox PC)
Timbrell, Hon. D. R. Energy (Don Mills PC)
Warner, D. (Scarborough-Ellesmere NDP)
Welch, Hon. R. Culture and Recreation (Brock PC)
Wells, Hon. T. L. Education (Scarborough North PC)
Williams, J. (Oriole PC)
Worton, H. (Wellington South L)
Yakabuski, P. J. (Renfrew South PC)
Young, F. (Yorkview NDP)

No. 23



Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT — DAILY EDITION

First Session of the Thirtieth Legislature

Tuesday, November 25, 1975

Afternoon Session

Speaker: Honourable Russell Daniel Rowe
Clerk: Roderick Lewis, QC

THE QUEEN'S PRINTER
PARLIAMENT BUILDINGS, TORONTO
1975

CONTENTS

A list of the speakers taking part in the debates in this issue of Hansard appears, in alphabetical order, at the back of this issue.

Daily contents of proceedings also appears at the back of this issue. Reference to a cumulative index of previous issues can be obtained by calling the Hansard Reporting Service indexing staff. Phone 965-2159.

Hansard subscription price is $15.00 per session, from: Sessional Subscription Service, MGS, 9th Floor, Ferguson Block, Parliament Bldgs., Toronto, M7A 1N3. Phone 965-2238.

LEGISLATURE OF ONTARIO

The House met at 2 p.m.

Prayers.

INFLUENCE ON DAYCARE PROGRAMME

Hon. Mrs. Birch: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of personal privilege with regard to statements made yesterday during the estimates of the Secretariat for Social Development by the member for Bellwoods (Mr. McClellan).

The member suggested that I listened to representatives of Great-West Life Assurance Co. before introducing new proposals for day care in June, 1974. There is not one whit of truth in this, and I believe the member should apologize for his unwarranted attack on my integrity as a minister of this government.

Mr. McClellan: On the point of privilege, it was my understanding from newspaper reports that Mr. Christianson had had input into the decision the minister made. I was going on the basis of public newspaper reports when I made those comments.

Hon. Mr. Davis: That's not always a wise thing to do.

Mr. Lewis: Did the minister meet with anyone from Mini-Skools?

Mr. Deans: Did anyone meet with them?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The hon. minister has laid her grievance before the House. This is an event which happened in the committee of supply. I shall look into the matter and if there is any action deemed necessary I shall take it; but at the moment the matter rests.

Mr. Deans: What is being asked?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The hon. minister objected to an accusation that was apparently raised last night, as I understand it.

Mr. Deans: On a point of order, is it not the case that during a debate in the House in committee, if one member says something and the other member is present and able to answer, the matter must be dealt with then or else is passed? The minister could have answered at the time, if she didn't like what was being said.

Mr. Speaker: This is why the Speaker is doing nothing about it at the present time.

Mr. O'Neil: I would like to introduce to members of the House a group of young Liberals from the Quinte area, from the city of Belleville and the town of Trenton. Will members please recognize them?

Mr. Nixon: Even the mayor is among them.

Mr. Sargent: They are a fine looking group.

Mr. G. I. Miller: Mr. Speaker, I would like to present to the House 37 senior citizens from the New Horizon Club in Simcoe.

I would just like to say a couple of more words. Simcoe is the largest town in my riding and the home of the Christmas light-up ceremony, the biggest Christmas lighting display in Ontario.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you. The Legislature is always very happy to welcome guests, but I think we should leave it at that; just the introduction.

Mr. Kennedy: Mr. Speaker, would members join with me in welcoming 20 students from Port Credit Secondary School, together with their teacher, Mr. Sniderman, in the west gallery.

Mr. Stong: There are seated in the gallery 55 students from grade 8 from James Robinson Public School in Markham, in the riding of York Centre. I would ask the members of the House to welcome them with me.

Hon. Mr. Welch: Mr. Speaker, I would ask the House to welcome nine parliamentary interns, university graduate students from Ontario and six other provinces, who are in the gallery and are visiting Queen's Park today as part of their learning-by-working experience with members of the House of Commons.

Mr. Speaker: Statements by the ministry.

Mr. Lewis: I'm very sceptical about question period today.

Mr. Sargent: There are 300 people from Chesley who are outside and couldn't get in the House today.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Mr. Nixon: They don't want their hospital closed.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. Is there a point of privilege? Are you serious?

Mr. Lewis: I told the parliamentary interns this morning, Mr. Speaker, that they have seen nothing until they have seen the member for Grey-Bruce (Mr. Sargent) in question period and I trust he will oblige. I promised them that this morning.

Mr. Speaker: I think we will get on with the regular business.

EXTENSION FOR RETURN OF ASSESSMENT ROLLS

Hon. Mr. Meen: As a result of the postal strike, I have found it necessary to extend the date for return of assessment rolls in municipalities and localities across Ontario from Dec. 16, 1975, to Jan. 21 1976.

In order to give people adequate opportunity to review their assessment notices, I have also decided to extend the dates for delivering the notices and lodging complaints to assessment review courts, as provided under section 46(2) of the Assessment Act. Also, as required under the Act, a public notice of these extensions is being placed this week in daily and weekly newspapers across the province.

It should be noted that these extensions do not apply to the corporation of the township of Wicksteed in the district of Algoma, where the post office has been in continuous operation throughout the mail strike. In the few instances where property in Wicksteed may be owned by people living outside this municipality, my ministry will deliver notices if owners live in Ontario, or if they live abroad, these people will receive their notices by mail.

Each member has been given an information package consisting of a letter to all heads of council, the public notice and a letter to members explaining the extension in more complete detail.

CREDIT RULES FOR WOMEN

Hon. Mr. Handleman: Mr. Speaker, on Sept. 4 of this year the Premier (Mr. Davis) released a statement in which he asked that I undertake to develop guidelines to ensure that women in Ontario have the same access to credit as do men.

Today, I am pleased to table equal credit opportunity guidelines which have been endorsed by the Ontario credit granting industry for use in their consideration of credit applications.

The guidelines are extremely important, since they ensure that women will have equality of access to credit. They were developed in close consultation with the credit grantors, who were able to make their contribution through practical input so as to make the guidelines realistically effective. The application of the guidelines will allow all women to take full advantage of their economic status in the marketplace of this province.

Two major guidelines are set out for consideration of an individual's credit application.

1. A married woman shall be granted credit in her own name if her credit qualifications, including her earnings or her separate property are such that a man possessing the same credit qualifications and property or earnings would receive credit.

2. An unmarried woman shall be granted credit if her credit qualifications, property and earnings are such that a man possessing the same credit qualifications, property or earnings would receive credit.

Mr. Speaker, these guidelines are intended to clarify the credit granting procedures used in the marketplace. I would like to make it quite clear that we are not asking for any kind of special consideration for any group; we are saying that everyone, regardless of sex or marital status, shall have the same equality of access to credit and have the same standards applied to his or her application.

In our discussion with the credit grantors, we started with the basic assumption that although access to credit is not a right but a privilege, equality of access to credit is a right. There is no reason why different criteria should be used to judge the credit worthiness of women.

The development of these guidelines was undertaken by my ministry as our International Women's Year project. I would like to note that the project and discussions were

directed by two senior women within my ministry, Mrs. Dagmar Stafl, our staff economist, and Ms. Barbara Moffat, our ministry's women's adviser.

After very constructive discussions with the credit grantors, our people were able to draw up a detailed 12-point list of principles which guide the credit grantors in the conduct of their business. Copies will be distributed to all members of the House.

I would like to emphasize once more that we regard these guidelines as very important. We are determined to make them fully effective and operative. We appreciate the support and co-operation obtained from the credit-granting industry, and are truly pleased with the assistance that the industry has volunteered in order to implement them.

We have not approached this topic lightly. Clearly a co-operative approach to the industry is in the best interests of all concerned. We have considered a legislative approach and have rejected it for two reasons: new legislation brings new bureaucracy, and also, it is difficult to legislate equality. It is preferable to convince the industry to live up to the spirit of these guidelines, and by its endorsation we have been given assurances that it intends to do so.

However, my ministry will keep a close watch on the implementation of the guidelines. We will ensure that women know whom to contact if they feel that they are not dealt with in the spirit of the guidelines. In our discussions with the industry, we requested that they undertake the responsibility to assure that all personnel processing applications for credit are made fully aware of the guidelines. If it becomes evident that women continue to be denied total equality of access to credit, then clearly we will have to consider the legislative alternative.

Hon. members will note that a list of credit-granting associations and companies that so far have endorsed these guidelines is being distributed to the House. I fully expect the list to be enlarged over the next few days.

I would like to emphasize that while these guidelines have the endorsation of all major credit grantors in the province, I assure the members that my ministry will closely monitor their adoption and application. If modifications are called for, they most certainly will be made.

I am pleased that we have been able to develop the guidelines and I'm sure they will be supported by all members of the House.

Mr. Cassidy: Ms. Sandeman wins again.

EGG MARKETING BOARD QUOTAS

Hon. W. Newman: Mr. Speaker, recent reports in the media regarding the directors of the Ontario Egg Producers' Marketing Board have led to a great deal of discussion and controversy. As a result, the Farm Products Marketing Board met with the directors of the Ontario Egg Producers' Marketing Board on Friday, Nov. 21, 1975, to discuss certain allegations raised both in the press and subsequently by certain Ontario egg producers.

The Farm Products Marketing Board sent its recommendations to me yesterday on the matter. I would like to report to the House that the Farm Products Marketing Board is itself investigating the facts related to the allegations that certain members of the Ontario Egg Producers' Marketing Board were in violation of the Ontario egg producers' marketing plan.

Once the results of that investigation are known, I will report back to the House on the matter.

Mr. Speaker: Oral questions.

PAPERWORKERS' STRIKE

Mr. Lewis: May I ask the Premier whether he can report to the House his feelings as a result of the meeting I believe he had today, with various of the municipal representatives of the communities involved, over the lengthy strike in the woods industries? Did he meet with them today?

Hon. Mr. Davis: No.

Mr. Lewis: May I then redirect to the Minister of Labour? I had the impression that the Premier was there; obviously I was wrong. Has the minister met lately, perhaps even today, with the municipal representatives of the communities whose livelihoods are affected by the prolonged strike in the woods industries? Can she give the House some sense of her impression or intended action?

Hon. B. Stephenson: Mr. Speaker, yes, we met this morning. My impression is one of great sympathy for the residents of those communities who are obviously being severely limited in their living programme as a result of this prolonged strike. We are considering, very seriously, concerted action in this area.

[2:15]

Mr. Lewis: By way of supplementary, if I may: Might part of that concerted action—since I think the minister indicated publicly yesterday that she didn't like the adversary system in labour relations and the way it worked—be a request on her part to Abitibi and the other major companies to come back to the bargaining table and make a good-faith offer which might be the basis for a negotiated settlement, rather than the continuing adversary division which exists?

Hon. B. Stephenson: It might be.

Mr. Nixon: Supplementary: Did the minister receive a request from the delegation that consideration be given to a legislated end to the strike which began, at least for Abitibi, in early July and which has disrupted so many of these communities for so long?

Hon. B. Stephenson: Yes.

Mr. Nixon: Supplementary: Did the minister make a response?

An hon. member: Yes.

Hon. B. Stephenson: Of course.

Mr. Nixon: I wonder then if she would inform the House as to the feelings of the government and the possibility of a legislated end of this strike?

Mr. Yakabuski: Don't be too tough on Abitibi.

Hon. B. Stephenson: I'm sorry, Mr. Speaker, that I can't give the feelings of the government at the moment, since cabinet and caucus have not discussed this at great length.

Mr. Nixon: How about the feelings of the minister?

Hon. B. Stephenson: The feelings of the minister, as I said, are in great sympathy with the officials of those towns, and I think that any action which can be taken should be seriously considered at this point. I have already discussed it with one or two of my cabinet colleagues, particularly with the Minister of Natural Resources (Mr. Bernier).

Mr. Riddell: Sympathy is just a word found in the dictionary.

Hon. B. Stephenson: I'm sorry; I know, and if the member wants to look it up, he can look it up under "symp."

Interjections.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Mr. Swart: Is the minister aware that the federal Minister of Labour has now indicated that the parties should negotiate almost without regard for the federal price lines in this instance, and does that cause her to be willing to bring any additional pressure to bear on the companies—particularly Abitibi, which has not made an offer up to the guidelines—to bring them back to the bargaining table?

Hon. B. Stephenson: In effect and in fact, the offer which Abitibi put on the table approximately two weeks ago is exactly at the level of the guidelines; with a slight sweetener, I suppose I should say, within the first year. It is a small amount, but it is not below the guidelines at all.

Interjections.

Hon. B. Stephenson: It is not.

Mr. Lewis: The minister is learning the lingo.

Mr. R. S. Smith: Even Abitibi admits it's below the guidelines.

Mr. Speaker: Further questions? The Leader of the Opposition. We'll move on and come back to the question later on if there's an opportunity.

SALARY INCREASES BY EDUCATION BOARDS

Mr. Lewis: May I ask if it had been brought to the Minister of Education's attention the extraordinary salary hikes for the top members of the educational bureaucracy in the Northumberland-Newcastle area, and did he make any comment on what the board had granted in light of the feelings around negotiations and the guidelines?

Hon. Mr. Wells: Yes, Mr. Speaker, these increases were brought to my attention. I looked at them. I can't remember the exact amounts; they were something in the range of $5,000 as I recall. As I say, I am aware of them and all I can tell the member is that I asked my deputy minister to address the Association of Educational Supervisory Officers and tell them they should live within the guidelines and certainly adhere to the $2,400 maximum on increases under the guidelines.

That's the action that will be taken in the future. I can't recall exactly when these raises were put into effect, or if they were done before the guidelines were announced.

Mr. Lewis: They take effect after the guidelines.

May I ask, by way of supplementary: I think some of the money has been returned, but if the federal Anti-Inflation Board rules, as I believe they have or Mr. Pepin has indicated they will, that raises that range from $5,200 to $9,500—bringing the administrator to a level of $47,500—if raises of this kind can be justified, on averaging of all the employees of a board of education in a given area does the minister not see trouble implicit in that and might he not perhaps notify or instruct the boards that it is his request that the guidelines be observed at this point?

Hon. Mr. Wells: I think we would be willing to do that. Certainly we have told the boards the guidelines should be adhered to both in spirit and in principle. I think they should be.

There is going to have to be some breaking-in period, I suppose, for some of those people who are operating in areas where boards had settled before the guidelines came into effect and where people suddenly find their salary is lower than the group they are supervising; perhaps they will be entitled to some increase in that regard. Otherwise I believe the guidelines should be adhered to and abnormal increases should not be practised in those areas.

I might just ask my friend if he saw the ad that was in one of the papers this morning. Some of the increases in the board's offer in Metropolitan Toronto come to between $5,000 and $9,000 over two years.

Mr. Lewis: They don't end at 40 per cent.

TRANSFER PAYMENTS FROM CANADA ASSISTANCE PLANS

Mr. Lewis: A question, if I may, of the provincial Treasurer. Can he solve the confusion that may exist in my mind, and the minds of others, about the transfer payments from the Canada Assistance Plan?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: The confusion was in my mind. The money in fact has been received for two years or a year and a half or up to date. It's my understanding that the undertaking was made by the government that these moneys would be used to enhance existing programmes in the mental retardation area and that is happening.

The money is not segregated on the books. It goes into the consolidated revenue fund and an informal accounting is kept. I'm told that over a four or five-year period the moneys will be used for enhancement purposes, but it has not yet all happened in terms of the amount of money we have received. For the details you would have to ask the Minister of Community and Social Services (Mr. Taylor).

Mr. Lewis: I've learned enough from the Minister of Community and Social Services, thank you. I would like to pursue this with the Treasurer. As I understand it, the government has already received some $48 million with more forthcoming this fiscal year. What does the Treasurer mean by an accounting in an informal sense? Where does this money turn up? If this government only spends $15 million of it in this fiscal year does it spend the rest of the money it receives from the federal government this year under the mental retardation cost-sharing? And if it does use it, what does it use it for?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: It goes into the consolidated revenue fund. It could be used for any number of purposes, in an informal sense; and in more than a formal sense—we were at it this morning—the Minister of Community and Social Services has reminded us that he is carrying forward a credit.

Mr. Lewis: By way of supplementary then: The money received this year, earmarked for mental retardation, could be used for anything, as I said yesterday—I thought perhaps light-heartedly—from the paving of highways in southern Ontario to Andy StuParick's salary. In fact that is true; it goes into the consolidated revenue fund and could be used for anything and, hopefully, is compensated for at some future date.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: It might even be used to raise members' salaries, I suppose, or to pay members' salaries. The actual fact is, if I can just correct one thing the Leader of Opposition has said, no funds which come into the government and into the consolidated revenue fund are earmarked. That's something we don't do.

Mr. Lewis: Yes, I understand.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: They are not earmarked.

Mr. Nixon: Supplementary: Surely if those funds were payable by the government of Canada as its share of the programme in support of the mentally retarded facilities and staff that we have, how can the minister suggest that those moneys could be spent on anything but those facilities, because they

came from the government of Canada on the basis of that shared-cost programme?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: The fact is that because of the switch from ministries, we started to recover from the government of Canada moneys, which in our view, quite frankly, we should have recovered sooner. The same amount of moneys are being spent, plus an enhanced portion. We were under no obligation to do that. The Premier undertook, as those moneys came in, that we would be able to enrich our programme. As I recall the figures I looked at this morning, we are spending something like $160 million in the mental retardation area.

Mr. Lewis: Yes, but it has been—

Hon. Mr. McKeough: We are under no obligation to spend any more. We don't spend money which is received on behalf of the Ministry of Health in that way. That simply goes into the pot as well. It is all shown together as receipts from the government of Canada. It isn't earmarked in any specific way.

Mr. Lewis: Yes, in a sense it's money received under false pretences, isn't it?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Mr. Lewis: It's given to the government for mental retardation.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: There's no such thing going on in this government and the member knows it.

[Applause.]

Mr. Lewis: As a matter of fact—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. Can we get on with the questions, please? Are there any further questions?

Interjections.

Mr. Lewis: Have you read—

Interjections.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The hon. Leader of the Opposition has a further question, I believe.

Mr. Lewis: No, I wanted to refer to what Henderson said about the Canada Assistance Plan money but my colleague is still looking for it.

May I ask the Premier one last question and take my seat?

OPERATIONS OF MEDIA OFFICE

Mr. Lewis: Does the Premier intend, in the light of matters discussed, debated and written of, to adjust the anomaly in the way in which the media studio and the media officer operate in this Legislature and bring it under the Board of Internal Economy, as my colleague the member for Wentworth (Mr. Deans) suggested?

Hon. Mr. Davis: I must be frank and say that I haven't given this matter my most serious consideration at the moment. I'll be discussing it with the Minister of Government Services (Mrs. Scrivener) and either she or I will have some information for the members of the House a little later on this week.

PAYMENT OF FUNDS TO MUNICIPALITIES

Mr. Shore: I would like to address a question to the Treasurer. Can the minister explain how he expects municipalities and boards to properly plan and be accountable when he overpays under the provincial revenue sharing plan one year and underpays in the next; and particularly when these pronouncements are usually made at a time of their budget deliberations and very often during them?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: I suppose what the member is saying is that we don't specifically earmark funds out of a budget of $11 billion. There are often variations as the year progresses; particularly in terms of the Edmonton commitment there are two large variables. First of all, the amount of revenues which we, in fact, receive; their percentage of that is fixed but the revenues vary during the course of the year. Then, within the ministry programmes, there are a number of open-ended programmes and the actual amounts to be paid out are not, in fact, fully known until they are paid out during the course of the year.

Therefore, there are two variables during the course of the year and it so happened in 1974 there was a substantial underpayment during the course of the year. In 1975 there is going to be somewhat of an overpayment.

Mr. Shore: I have a supplementary, Mr. Speaker. I really haven't had an answer as to how he expects the municipalities to do their planning under those conditions?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Mr. Speaker, we're looking at variables of about $50 million in each year—it might be something more than

that this year—out of total municipal revenues of, as I recall, something approaching $3 billion. I don't think the success or otherwise of the municipal budget depends on that small fraction of it, quite frankly.

Mr. Shore: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker, please.

By restricting these transfer payments to five or six per cent—and, incidentally, I would advise the minister that it was upwards of 20 per cent last year, so it isn't a small variance—is it the Treasurer's intention to shift the tax burden substantially back to the regressive municipal property tax base—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please, I think the question has been asked.

Mr. Shore: —or is it his intention for municipalities to get further into debt?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Mr. Speaker, the last thing that would be my intention is for the municipalities of Ontario to go into debt. They have a very excellent record at this moment in time; the credit rating of the municipalities is strong and, I trust, will remain strong.

Mr. Sargent: It's a lot better than the minister's.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: The fact is there has to be some accountability. The fact is that during the last five years the government has raised the sales tax; has raised the mining tax; has raised the corporations tax; has raised the cigarette tax; the liquor tax; and the logging tax, during which time municipal mill rates went up about three per cent a year.

Mr. Cassidy: That was a matter of government policy. It was meant to be a shift.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: It seems to us that perhaps some of the strain should be put on the municipal side. I completely reject the notion that the property tax is the kind of regressive tax which the member is looking at.

Mr. Shore: The minister said it himself.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: The fact is that under the tax credit system brought about by this government the regressivity has been taken out of the property tax and if people like the members opposite have to pay the full amount, so be it. There are a lot of people who don't.

Interjections.

Mr. Speaker. Order, please.

Hon. Mr. Davis: And the members opposite can afford it.

Mr. Speaker. Order, please.

[2:30]

Mr. Cassidy: Supplementary: Will the Treasurer table in this House next week a full statement about the revenues paid by the province to municipalities in order that we can have the information to judge his claim that there was an overpayment last year; and is he prepared also to ensure the municipalities receive the amounts that were not paid to them in 1974, when he says there was an underpayment?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Mr. Speaker, the municipalities have received those amounts. There is a calculation in last year's budget, and if the member would be good enough to look at it he would find that they did receive the underpayment of 1974 in 1975. In terms of tabling in this House those calculations, all those things will be done either coincident with, or preparatory to, or immediately following, the 1976-1977 provincial budget.

Mr. Cassidy: That's too late.

Mr. Good: Supplementary: Relating to the answer and the Edmonton agreement, since the minister concedes the transfer payments are directly related to provincial income under the Edmonton agreement, how then can he penalize the municipalities next year when the provincial income was directly lowered by action of this government?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. We are debating the matter now. We allowed the question; if there is an answer, fine.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Mr. Speaker, we are not penalizing them next year for something which happened this year. The payments which were made to them this year included their share, if I can put it that way, of the reduction of the sales tax.

Mr. Good: That is what you say.

Mr. Sweeney: Supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: This will be the last supplementary.

Mr. Sweeney: Is the minister aware that last fiscal year upwards of 30 per cent increases were granted to school boards, and on the basis of that they negotiated salary agreements—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Mr. Sweeney: —and this year—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. That's not really supplementary to the original question. That is a question to ask later.

Mr. Sweeney: Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The member will take his seat.

Mr. Shore: What provision is the Treasurer making, if any, to accommodate the inflationary, arbitrary settlements such as those for firemen in North York, Kapuskasing, and so on; which are being imposed upon municipal governments?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Mr. Speaker, I would have to say none.

Mr. Shore: Supplementary: Does the minister agree that, as a result of his inadequate planning, the municipal property taxes will increase by upwards of 25 per cent in some localities this year?

Mr. Nixon: Sure he will agree.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Mr. Speaker, no I would not agree with that. But I would agree that if there are inflationary settlements with firemen in North York, and elsewhere, or as a result of arbitration with teachers and board-teacher disputes and strikes, I think it is nothing more than a symptom of the inflationary times in which we are living. That's why we on this side of the House are giving our full support to the national anti-inflation fight; and we urge the members opposite to get off, stop riding both horses and get with it.

Mr. Sweeney: That is not fair.

Mr. Nixon: Whenever the Treasurer's point is weak he starts yelling, so he must be in trouble.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Mr. Roy: Blame it on the Davis government of 1971; blame it on the Premier—it's his fault.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Mr. Yakabuski: You can't govern and not govern at the same time.

Mr. Bullbrook: I have a supplementary to the question previously put, and the shouted response of the hon. Treasurer: In connection with his collateral responsibility relative to intergovernmental affairs, and supplementary to my colleague's question, what advice has the Treasurer given to the city council of the city of Sarnia, who are now subjected to an arbitrator's award with respect to their firemen that says that the award is exempt from AIP? The city council says it is not exempt from AIP; and in the light of the Treasurer's sincere, unequivocal and unilateral commitment to the federal guidelines, could he tell us what he is doing?

Mr. Speaker: Does the Treasurer have a brief answer?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Yes, Mr. Speaker, if the city of Sarnia would like to get in touch with me, I would be glad to chat with them.

Mr. Roy: Don't go shouting.

Mr. Bullbrook: When the Treasurer has a toughy he cannot answer it. He never does.

Mr. Speaker: All right. Does the hon. member for London North have a further question?

Interjections.

Mr. Shore: To what extent does the minister expect municipal taxes will have to increase to meet these conditions?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Mr. Speaker, I can't give an answer to that question. That depends on a great number of factors and obviously it is much too early to make that kind of prediction.

Mr. Good: You shouldn't shout so much.

Interjections.

CANADIAN OF THE YEAR

Mr. Yakabuski: I have a question of the Premier.

Mr. Cassidy: Do you know I used to do your job for you?

Mr. Yakabuski: In view of the fact that the Hon. Bryce Mackasey is the first popular politician to demonstrate that he possesses a commodity commonly know as guts—

Some hon. members: Question.

Mr. Reid: You are demonstrating—

Interjections.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. Will the hon. member get on with his question, please? I would like to hear the hon. member.

Mr. Yakabuski: –does the Premier feel like a growing number of Canadians–

Mr. Ferrier: Order.

Mr. MacDonald: The Speaker is on his feet. Sit down.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. We are just wasting the valuable time of the question period with the interruptions. Will the hon. member proceed with his question please?

Mr. Yakabuski: Does the Premier feel, like a growing number of Canadians, that this man should be the unanimous choice as Canadian of the year?

Mr. Gaunt: That is urgent public business.

Mr. Ruston: Who did you ask that of?

Mr. Speaker: Order! I am not sure that is urgent public importance. I don't know what it is about.

Mr. R. S. Smith: Throw him out.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I must confess I really have never been involved in the choice of the Canadian man of the year and I would be the last one to comment on the amount of intestinal fortitude exhibited by that particular individual.

Interjection.

Hon. Mr. Davis: It is delightful to have the thoughts of the hon. member for Renfrew South and I am sure that if he makes his point to those who are responsible the hon. gentleman will be given serious consideration. I will play no part in it myself.

ARMSTRONG ASSISTANCE PROGRAMME

Mr. Stokes: I have a question of the Provincial Secretary for Resources Development. Does the minister recall his predecessor saying in the House he had a commitment from the federal government that before the Armstrong radar base would be sold to private interests the primary concern would be the interests of the local people in Armstrong? Will the present minister look into the possibility of the federal government having undercut the chances for economic development in the town of Armstrong as a result of the disposal of the base, which was outside the terms of reference and guarantees to the provincial government and the people of Armstrong?

Hon. Mr. Irvine: Mr. Speaker, first of all I would like to express my thanks to the hon. member for bringing his concerns to my attention yesterday. He allowed me to investigate the matter. Certainly I am aware of my predecessor having intervened on behalf of the people of Armstrong to ensure that the economic prosperity of Armstrong would not be harmed if the radar base was sold, as was indicated by the federal government in 1973.

There were conditions attached at the insistence of my predecessor and the conditions were to provide industrial jobs over a period of two years. Our investigations so far have indicated that what has gone on in the base–on the base I should say–has been with the knowledge or support of the federal government. It has not, in my opinion, produced the result which my predecessor and the member wanted to happen, and that was jobs for the community.

There would appear to be no legal violation of what was signed by the federal government and the private company in regard to the contract and the disposition of certain goods. However, I can assure the hon. member I would be happy to assist him and assist the federal government in making sure that the economy of Armstrong is not lowered as was indicated some months ago.

Mr. Stokes: As a brief supplementary: Will the minister consult with his counterpart in Ottawa, the Hon. Robert Andras, to see that the intent, as expressed mutually by the federal and the provincial governments about a year ago, will be followed through so that any development will be in the best interests of the people who live in Armstrong?

Hon. Mr. Irvine: Yes, certainly, Mr. Speaker. I've already done that, as a matter of fact. I have given Mr. Andras' office all the details as I understand them at the present time. I'm awaiting word from Mr. Andras as to what he intends to do. When I have that word, I'll certainly convey to the member their expectations.

DISCRIMINATION IN CFL

Mr. Roy: A question of the Minister of Labour. [Applause.] Mr. Speaker, please try to control their enthusiasm. I have not been able to.

An hon. member: When's the announcement?

Mr. Roy: I would like to ask the minister what she is going to do to stop the discriminatory practice of the Canadian Football League which makes it virtually impossible for a Canadian to become a quarterback in that league?

Hon. Mr. Handleman: Particularly women.

Mr. Roy: I'm serious about this.

Hon. Mr. Handleman: Ever heard of Russ Jackson?

Mr. Yakabuski: A very important question.

Mr. Roy: Would the minister consider moving under section 4 of the Human Rights Code?

Hon. B. Stephenson: Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased that my colleague across the floor did not ask me what I was going to do about the Canadian Football League's discriminatory practice against women playing football.

Mr. Roy: That was the next question.

Hon. B. Stephenson: However, since the Canadian Football League obviously operates under federal jurisdiction, the only thing that I can do—yes, it does—the only thing that I can do—

Mr. Yakabuski: The member will have to go and see Lalonde.

Hon. B. Stephenson: —is to speak to the minister responsible at the federal level regarding this matter and hope that it will be improved.

An hon. member: He happens to be in Ottawa.

Mr. Roy: Supplementary: Would the minister consider talking to her colleague the Attorney General (Mr. McMurtry), and would the minister consider reviewing section 9 of the by-laws of the Canadian Football League and section 4 of the Ontario Human Rights Code? I understand we have jurisdiction in that field in this province.

Mr. Yakabuski: Lalonde took over.

Mr. Roy: We'll send that to the minister.

BOOK PUBLISHING BY CENTENNIAL COLLEGE

Hon. Mr. Parrott: Mr. Speaker, on Thursday, Nov. 20, the member for Rainy River (Mr. Reid) asked whether I thought it appropriate that a community college, in that case Centennial, should be competing with the private book publishing companies in Ontario by publishing textbooks and other books in direct competition with those firms. I answered in a supplementary statement at that time that it was a policy consideration.

So far, Centennial Press, as it is called, has produced four textbooks for college use as a practical part of the publishing course offered at that college. The numbers hardly constitute competition with private publishing companies, which in fact welcome and accept students as visitors so they can view the business on a first-hand basis. Surely no college would expand such activities to the point of providing competition, since it would not be in the best interests of their graduates, who are themselves seeking employment in that same industry.

Mr. Reid: Supplementary: Can the minister indicate how many textbooks were published by Centennial? Does he not feel, after what his government has done to bolster the private publishing industry in Ontario, that to allow Centennial College to operate in direct competition is not in the best interests of the publishing companies?

Hon. Mr. Parrott: I know the acoustics are rather poor, but I indicated there were four such books and surely that does not constitute competition.

Mr. Reid: Do they intend to publish more? Are they going to publish more?

Hon. Mr. Parrott: If one is more, then perhaps the answer is yes.

PSEUDO LEASING PRACTICES

Mr. Young: Mr. Speaker, a question of the hon. Minister of Transportation and Communications, arising out of the statement at yesterday's Ontario truckers' convention that pseudo leasing is again rampant on our highways: I wonder if the minister would tell us what plans he has to deal with this illegal use of our highways by the pseudo leasing people we thought had been eliminated two ministries ago?

[2:45]

Hon. Mr. Snow: Mr. Speaker, I am concerned regarding problems of the abuse of the leasing systems in the automotive trucking industry. I'm not concerned with the actual lease situations where trucks are leased for a reasonable period of time; but I am concerned where almost a common carrier

type of service is carried out under the guise of truck leasing. Just in the past few weeks, since taking over as Minister of Transportation and Communications, I have had discussions with my senior staff, I've had meetings with representatives of the industry and we have received suggestions from the industry. There are resolutions, I know, before the Ontario Trucking Association today. This matter has also been of concern to public vehicle operators as well—that is, the leasing of buses has got to some degree into the same type of business—and we intend to enforce the laws of the province and try to prevent this.

HOME BUYER GRANT

Mr. B. Newman: I have a question of the Minister of Revenue. Is the minister considering an extension of the first-time home buyer grant to those who have signed contracts with builders to enable them to occupy the home before the deadline date, but who, because of any number of reasons, such as material shortages, work stoppages, inclement weather and so forth, are prevented from occupying the home within the deadline?

Hon. Mr. Meen: I recognize the problem the hon. member is raising. My ministry does have that question under study, but it's got broader implications than that because, of course, of the fiscal side of it. The Treasurer (Mr. McKeough) indicated the other day that the whole question of the home buyer grant programme in all its facets was under study by his ministry, and I expect also by the Ministry of Housing.

Mr. Ruston: Supplementary: Could I ask the minister what criteria he uses in the plan, since if a person builds a home himself he must be in by Dec. 31, but if he buys a home he doesn't have to be in until June 30?

Hon. Mr. Meen: The criteria were developed in the Ministry of Treasury, Economics and Intergovernmental Affairs, and I can't answer with any kind of authority as to the reason for the six-month spread.

PAYMENTS FOR COW-CALF PROGRAMME

Mr. Wiseman: A question of the Minister of Agriculture and Food: Could the minister inform the House what the average price has been on heavy calves, heifers and steers to date in regard to our cow-calf programme? Many farmers in my area have been asking me this question.

Hon. W. Newman: As far as I know, as close as I can come, it's somewhere between 33 and 34 cents at this point in time. Our final calculations won't be done until next week.

Mr. Wiseman: Supplementary: Could the farmers expect a cheque before the end of the year, or could the minister inform us when a cheque might go out for the balance?

Mr. Reid: Right before the next election.

Mr. Samis: Ask the member for Middlesex (Mr. Eaton).

Hon. W. Newman: I am well aware of the concerns of the farmers of this province and how they would like to have it before the end of the year; we are going to do our utmost at least to have it dated and in the mail. It will depend on the circumstances whether they will have them at that point in time, but we anticipate we will have them done by the end of the year.

Mr. Ruston: Lorne's not here or he would deliver them today.

WATER POLLUTION

Mr. Wildman: I have a question of the Minister of the Environment. Could the minister describe what steps his ministry is taking to implement the recommendations put forth last week by the Algoma Health Unit that the provincial government should immediately ascertain who legally owns the Hayden Park City mobile home park north of Sault Ste. Marie, and then order the owners to move the 10 mobile homes which are polluting the creek to another site—

Mr. Mancini: Why don't you move?

Mr. Wildman: —to install a water filtration system and to desist from reoccupying vacated sites?

Mr. Speaker: I think the hon. member has asked his question.

Hon. Mr. Kerr: As the hon. member knows, this is located in an unorganized territory. I am aware of the communique that the hon. member mentioned. I am discussing it with the Minister of Natural Resources (Mr. Bernier) and the Minister of Housing (Mr. Rhodes) and hopefully we will have some solution as to that whole area and the mobile home park in that particular area.

USE OF FUNDS BY RYERSON

Mr. Sweeney: A question to the Minister of Colleges and Universities: Based on a report in today's press, would the minister advise us what action his ministry is going to take with respect to Ryerson Polytechnical Institute for diverting $235,000 of government grants intended for academic purposes into non-academic purposes?

Hon. Mr. Parrott: I am aware of the article. We have contacted the chairman of the board and that's all the comment I have to make at this time.

Mr. Sweeney: Supplementary question: I understand that Ryerson has had to cut back on some of the staffing and equipment—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. Is there a supplementary question? Ask a supplementary, if you have one.

Mr. Sweeney: Is the minister aware of the fact that the implication is that some academic programmes have been cut back because of shortage of funds, when in fact the funds were there?

Hon. Mr. Parrott: I am not going to comment on that question at this time. I will report to the House later.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Oriole.

Mr. Morrow: I have a question, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Oriole, first of all, please.

Mr. Reid: How soon they forget!

Interjections.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please, we are wasting time here. The member for Oriole.

UNIFORM BUILDING CODE

Mr. Williams: Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations. This government in the last session of the House introduced uniform building code legislation as one means of facilitating and expediting housing starts in the Province of Ontario. Can the minister advise this House when the uniform building code legislation, which I understand is under the jurisdiction of his ministry, will become operative?

Hon. Mr. Handleman: The regulations are now in the final draft stage. I expect they will be proclaimed very shortly. I certainly concur with the hon. member's conclusions in that the industry is eagerly awaiting the proclamation of those regulations.

We have had an education programme with the municipal officials since the code will be administered by the municipalities and they still have some outstanding questions which have to be answered. If I may just say, I hope to have them proclaimed very shortly.

Mr. Nixon: You said that last March.

LABOUR RELATIONS AMENDMENT ACT

Mr. Bounsall: A question of the Minister of Labour: As one week has now elapsed since she met with the Ontario Trucking Association and the Ontario Haulers Association, what is her decision regarding whether the haulers will be classified as dependent contractors; and when may we expect the dependent contractors section of the amendments to the Labour Relations Act made last July to be proclaimed?

Hon. B. Stephenson: There is yet one delegation to hear. When that is done, the decision will be made and shortly thereafter this House will be informed about action regarding that section of Bill 111.

Mr. Bounsall: Supplementary question: Could I ask the minister what that delegation is?

Hon. B. Stephenson: The Aggregate Producers Association of Ontario.

MINIMUM WAGE

Mr. Riddell: A question to the Minister of Labour: In sympathy with those persons who are trying to plan their businesses next year, would she indicate what the minimum wage will be in Ontario, or when we might find out what that minimum wage might be?

Hon. B. Stephenson: About Dec. 1 I am sure we shall be able to announce precisely the staging which is being proposed, and the level.

Mr. Roy: The staging?

DEATH OF INMATE AT OTTAWA-CARLETON DETENTION CENTRE

Mr. Morrow: A question for the Minister of Correctional Services: Is the minister aware of the apparently unusual circum-

stances surrounding the death of an inmate at the Ottawa-Carleton Detention Centre last evening, and if so, what steps is his ministry taking to investigate the matter?

Hon. J. R. Smith: I regret to inform the hon. member that shortly after midnight Sunday last an inmate by the name of Julius Zimmerling was discovered dead in his cell. At present there is a police investigation under way surrounding the death. There is also an internal investigation taking place to ascertain if there was any breach of security.

Mr. Roy: A supplementary: Does the minister plan to hold a coroner's inquest into that?

Hon. J. R. Smith: There will automatically be an inquest in the death of a person in an institution.

MERCURY LAMP HAZARDS

Mr. Burr: A question for the Minister of Health concerning the United States Food and Drug Administration's recent warning to United States doctors to watch for patients with skin burns and eye burns caused by faulty high intensity mercury vapour lamps which are used in school gymnasia, arenas, parking lots, commercial establishments and industrial facilities: Has the minister ascertained whether there are similar hazards in Ontario?

Hon. F. S. Miller: Mr. Speaker, I haven't. I haven't even been advised of the likelihood of these dangers. I will try to find out if there is any study going on.

COW-CALF PROGRAMME

Mr. McKessock: I have a question for the Minister of Agriculture and Food: There are several cow-calf farmers who did not enlist in the cow-calf programme for various reasons—some of them were leery of the programme and others were part-time farmers who weren't home enough to take a look at this thing—is there any way we can bring in some of these applications now and get them into this programme, seeing that no money has changed hands anyway and they still want to get in the programme?

Hon. W. Newman: No, Mr. Speaker, but let me explain why. It ran out at the end of August or around that time—I have forgotten the exact date—and there was an extension at that time. It got a fair amount of wide publicity and we had to set a cut-off date. I think it was Sept. 10; I have forgotten the exact date now but we are living to that cut-off date. They would be welcomed into the programme next year.

Mr. McKessock: Supplementary: Seeing that no money has changed hands—this year is a little different; the premium doesn't have to be paid ahead of time—if we did enter these people now, they would be no different from the others. If the others had paid the premium—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The hon. member is debating the point, I believe. Is there a question?

Mr. McKessock: Would the minister consider making an exception for those we have—

Mr. Speaker: I think the minister answered that question.

PETERBOROUGH JAIL

Mrs. Sandeman: A question of the Minister of Correctional Services: In view of the intermittent extreme overcrowding and the age of the Peterborough jail, would the minister please tell me when that institution is to be replaced?

Hon. J. R. Smith: Mr. Speaker, I regret to inform the hon. member there are no immediate plans for replacement of that institution.

Mr. Reid: Right after you build a new one in Fort Frances.

COMMENTS BY MEMBER FOR ST. CATHARINES

Mr. S. Smith: A question for the Premier in the absence of the Attorney General: Can he tell us what action he intends to take about the hon. member for St. Catharines (Mr. Johnston) who was heard on the radio today counselling civil disobedience to the law in Ontario?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, that's a question which I am sure the Attorney General would be delighted to answer and I understand he is on his way here.

Some hon. members: Here he comes.

Mr. S. Smith: May I repeat it for the benefit—

Mr. Speaker: Do you wish to refer the question quickly to the hon. minister?

Hon. Mr. MacBeth: Oral question period has expired.

Mr. S. Smith: The question to the Attorney General is: What action is planned in view of the statement this morning on the radio by the hon. member for St. Catharines counselling civil disobedience in the event of certain laws being passed by the Ontario Legislature?

Hon. Mr. McMurtry: Mr. Speaker, I am sure the report my friend heard on the radio is not entirely correct.

Mr. Nixon: It was his own words.

Mr. Lewis: There is nothing ambiguous about Bob Johnston, let me tell you.

Mr. Good: He was misquoting himself.

Hon. Mr. McMurtry: Having come to know the hon. member, I find it difficult to accept the fact that he would counsel civil disobedience with respect to—

Mr. Good: It is the first we have heard from him in eight years.

Hon. Mr. McMurtry: —legislation emanating from this chamber. I can assure my friend I will discuss the matter with the hon. member.

Mr. S. Smith: Supplementary question: Is the minister aware—

[3:00]

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I was in error. The question period has really expired, but I was in error in not recognizing the member for Middlesex before. I will recognize him now.

WINTARIO FUNDS

Mr. Eaton: A question of the Minister of Culture and Recreation: Could the minister indicate the profits which have been made to date on Wintario and what percentage of those profits has been committed for projects?

Hon. Mr. Welch: Mr. Speaker, Wintario is so successful that I don't have an up-to-date statement with respect to the profits. As the hon. member knows, about 40 per cent of the gross goes in prizes and we have made certain commitments with respect to that. I will be glad to get more detailed information for the hon. member.

Mr. Speaker: The oral questions period has expired.

Petitions.

Presenting reports.

Motions.

Introduction of bills.

Orders of the day.

LANDLORD AND TENANT AMENDMENT ACT

Hon. Mr. McMurtry moves second reading of Bill 26, An Act to amend the Landlord and Tenant Act.

Mr. Speaker: Does the hon. minister have a leadoff statement?

Hon. Mr. McMurtry: No, I don't, Mr. Speaker. I made a fairly extensive statement to this Legislature on Nov. 6 of this year with respect to the principle features of the legislation. My hon. colleagues in the Legislature have had an opportunity, I'm sure, to read the draft legislation which has been distributed. I can only say at this time that I am, of course, anticipating with great interest the remarks of my hon. colleagues in relation to the proposed legislation.

Mr. Lawlor: Mr. Speaker, the—

Mr. Lewis: Hold on a moment, we'd like to pound our desks.

Mr. Lawlor: The revisions in the landlord and tenant legislation, on a fairly massive scale, took place in the latter part of the 1960s. At that time a whole host of archaic documents, doctrines in the law, interessi termini, the use of distress were knocked out of the law which had descended for about 400 years as it stood at that time.

In 1972 again there were fairly substantial amendments to the legislation, and we come to a landmark position, as I see it today, in this new legislation before us, granting security of tenure. I would have the House reminded that security of tenure, on two points, is quite different from Bill 20, which has to do with the rental matter.

One, it's of an indefinite duration. It will last into the future; it will be embedded in our law, and as I see it, there isn't any danger that it will run like water into the ground as the other legislation will do. The other thing is that it has wider application than the other legislation and special provisions have to be made for those individuals

and that type of tenancy and that range of accommodation which fall within Bill 20 and have contradistinction to all other types of residential accommodation within the definition of the section.

Those two features are to be commended and the legislation, in its basic principle, is acceptable and, again, welcome. It's been long sought. It acts as an adjunct to the other legislation and I trust in my initial remarks the minister will agree that it will be sent of the House to the same sitting committee of this House as will peruse and look at the previous piece of legislation, Bill 20.

As I say, it's a companion piece in certain of its dimensions but not in the fullness of the legislation. I don't think it's going to take all that time outside the House in its dissection, although I think members of the House who are acquainted with it will find it's quite complex legislation. It has all kinds of ramifications and to give it a thorough going over could take a little more time perhaps than I have anticipated.

What it basically does is supply security of tenure to a very wide range of residential accommodation indeed. It operates basically within five categories, the five traditional categories of the law, having to do with weekly tenants, monthly tenants, tenants on a fixed term less than a year, tenants on a fixed term greater than a year, and a fixed term of year to year.

In each one of these instances, different times are given with respect to the notice of termination and, in certain circumstances and overall, as a general principle. They're not able to increase the rents or to bring about the termination of the tenancy without having very good reason so to do.

The situation, for instance, on the weekly tenancy is a 28-day period, whereas those month to month are not all that different from the present law, which requires you to give a notice prior to the first day of the month to terminate as of the last day of that month. And so the differentiation there isn't all that great. But it's the weekly tenants who are benefiting most from the notice of termination features of this legislation.

As I read them, there are five major exemptions written into the legislation. They have to do, first of all, with the landlord wishing to take possession of the premises basically for the purposes of his family and within a certain range of relationship. On that score if he decides to do that, he has to give a 60-day notice. If he doesn't give the notice within that time or within that 15-day period thereafter on which the matter is set down for court hearing, then it's taken that he has simply recognized the ongoing tenancy situation.

The next one has to do with demolitions. We would like to have a fairly thorough discussion with the minister when the time comes on the aspects of demolition—just how it may be misused or abused as a way of circumventing your legislation. We're wondering if it's all cases of demolition; whether it's a demolition done under certain types of permits given recognition by municipalities; or might it be used in circumstances as a subterfuge to escape the legislation?

Another small area within the second one is the conversion or use for purposes other than rental. Of course, we take it to mean that if they convert to condominium, that would be a case in point which would escape the purpose of the legislation. I think that should be scouted and looked at fairly carefully.

The massive conversions of apartment buildings to condominium now taking place may not all be all that socially beneficial as things presently stand. After all, condominium means by definition that they have to have a down payment and they have to find the wherewithal in order to continue to inhabit the premises. There is a wide range of people who are not in possession of initial moneys or in a position to carry ongoing costs of mortgages, tax payments and other things like that, who are in vital need of apartments. And so, on that sociological note, I think we should have some fairly searching discussion as to the cost-benefit ratios involved in that particular proposition.

The third one has to do with repairs and renovations so extensive as to require vacant possession. I think when the hon. minister initiated this legislation he must have spent a few moments sometime worrying about that —just how nice that wording was, how close it was to the bone, and whether it lent itself to circumvention; or whether again the thing ought not to be qualified somewhat; that the repairs or renovations perhaps should be done under the terms or mandates of the building codes or local bylaws, or involving the restructuring of premises which aren't in good condition. Surely, it would be a most difficult thing to draw the lines and to find the demarcation points where these repairs or renovations are of a magnitude that brings the landlord outside the legislation as it now stands.

There is a series of other grounds, but before I get to those, of course, the obvious ground of termination is failure to pay rent. I think there is adequate provision made for that, and commendable provision, because if the tenant falls behind and he receives notice of termination he is given an opportunity of redress and given an opportunity to appear before court on seven days' notice.

First of all, he can pay the rent within the seven-day period and nullify any proceedings that have been commenced. If proceedings have been commenced but the judgement not finally obtained then he has, by way of an ex parte motion, the right to have it set aside and a hearing on the merits gone forward with in order to determine his position. In other words, the legislation under this head is well drafted and takes into cognizance a very wide range of personal peril indeed. With that in mind, I can only give my accolades on that particular count.

Oh, by the way, in the drafting of the statute, I think that parliamentary draftsmen and those interested in these matters would agree that the denotating of everything by a, b, c, d and e is most confusing. I would have hoped that a better method of designating sections of the statutes by cardinal numbers and letting it go at that would have been arrived at. I think the legal profession would find the construction and utilization of the statute much assisted if such was the mode of adoption.

On the other side, the parliamentary draftsmen I think should be congratulated in this legislation as in a previous piece. They have initiated a new policy, which is new to this House at least—not so in other jurisdictions; in the House of Commons in London or up in Ottawa—of writing in the legislation the clauses from the previous legislation that are being appealed or amended in substance. To set that forth is a great time saver and has at our fingertips the necessary requisite wording on which to base one's perusal and analysis of the legislation. So I take away with my left hand and I give with my right.

Within the five areas of exemption, under the fourth head there are five set up—103f, subsection 1, going on down through a, b, c, d and e—in which each of these things again must undergo considerable scrutiny. The first one, having to do with undue damage, is palatable and well worth having. The second one, having to do with the tenants being kicked out on the basis of any noxious, offensive or illegal act, trade, business, occupation or calling, is again moot, nebulous, difficult to construe and you are throwing an emblazoned rock at the courts in order to construe that. What is noxious, I pray to know? Since a great deal of time was spent by the Attorney General on this legislation, I would ask him to give me a further inkling of what it possibly means? What is offensive? Well, lord, what's offensive to me might be totally gratifying to you. That's the way life is.

Hon. Mr. McMurtry: And vice versa.

Mr. Lawlor: If these are adequate then you are beginning to wheel a coach and four through the barriers of your legislation, and cutting back and rendering the thing up to a point somewhat nugatory.

[3:15]

The third one has to do with conduct which substantially interferes with reasonable enjoyment of the premises. Again, I'm not going to take too much issue with that one. That's fairly acceptable legal wording. It's in many forms of statutes and I would give the judges credit enough to be able to construe what reasonable enjoyment would mean in any particular context.

The fourth one has to do with the safety or other bona fide lawful right, privilege or interest of any other tenant on the premises.

The fifth has to do with the number of persons when health and contravention of health or safety standards are involved. I cannot nor will not take any exception to that particular setup. It comes down to this: That there are about eight grounds upon which writs of possession can be obtained in our courts, which is quite an expansion over against the previous law. In a sense, it is not so much an expansion but a putting your finger on or a designation of the specific grounds upon which it can be done whereas, previously, it was quite amorphous and there was very little definition written into the law.

One is the payment of rent or the family situation to gain possession. Another count which hasn't been mentioned yet is the persistent failure on the part of the tenant to pay his rent. There is the business of employee relations when an employee is occupying premises and the employment ceases.

We finally come to the business of material breach. Again, while there is an enormous body of jurisprudence on materiality and the terms of contracts, I would turn to the Attorney General and to the law officers of the Crown in order to determine what they mean. Had they any specific meaning in mind when they brought the legislation in or are they simply relying upon the present

body of law to determine what may or may not be material breach? I think it's fairly agreed that this parsing is not all that well established. It allows an enormous amount of discretion on the part of the judiciary and the possibility of some play inside the legislation which is not altogether designed to forward its purposes.

In the area of the purely legal, so to speak, or court procedural matters, the legislation has introduced several new features which will be, and in time to come will prove to be, beneficial. The first bleating, whimsying recognition of something called a class action by the government over there, after all the years I've been in this House, has come to the fore in this particular legislation.

In every other area of law, in environmental law and in the law of contracts and in areas with respect to suits before the Ontario Municipal Board, the concept of a class action or a representative action has been thrown out, discouraged. Previous Attorneys General of this province have turned thumbs down in instance after instance, despite our pleas and despite the numerous briefs and hearings we've had in these divers fields of law with respect to this kind of procedure, which is well accepted pretty well throughout the English-speaking world in an evolving concept.

We get the glimmerings. We get the beginnings of a new concept in representative action and we welcome it. It doesn't say very much and just what it means in terms of having a sameness of purpose or an identity of clause, again, I would ask the Attorney General to set forth for me, to describe and to tell me how he thinks that clause is going to operate on the basis of a common interest.

If one person's rent is $275 and another one's is $210, is that a common interest? Is the common interest in respect to the amenities? Suppose there is a differentiation between one tenant and another in a great apartment complex? Where does the common interest cease and where does it have continuity? When may they join forces? The reason for doing so, obviously is expedition, time-saving. If there are going to be 500 cases tried from a particular complex of buildings, then it is a darn sight more sensible to have all those cases tried on a single occasion and determine the issue once and for all.

In this business—and this is not uncommon in certain kinds of courts at some levels—the appearance of an agent is to be commended too. Many of the people who are going to be most afflicted under the terms of this legislation, seeking redress, say, for repairs not done by landlords under section 96 of the Landlord and Tenant Act, could use a knowledgeable friend rather than having to employ legal counsel to appear in those cases. I don't think legal counsel, first of all, are all that anxious to get involved in the proceedings arising out of landlord and tenant applications, from the way most lawyers, particularly those who are very highly trained in litigation matters, treat the family courts of the province.

The landlord on application doesn't pay enough money in most instances to encourage the appearance of high-priced counsel on these matters. There is a provision, therefore, to have a friend who is knowledgeable. There is also provision made under the legislation that anyone who is obnoxious in effect, doesn't seem to understand the rules and gives the judge a bad time is going to get tossed out. The legislation is so minutely drafted as to take that particular contingency into account and seek to wipe it out.

In two areas of the rules of evidence, there is a break with tradition in the past. The parole evidence rule is excluded. People may give oral evidence. Secondly, they may give photostats by permission of the judge in certain circumstances. These various moves are made with respect to lifting the weight of those long accumulated and terribly barnacled rules of evidence which make everything so difficult for everybody and getting down to the meat of the matter, where a judge can well sift the quality of the witnesses before him and decide as to the merit of their statements. At least I think most of them gain this capabality after a few years on the bench. Winnowing out the chaff, he can come to the substance without arbitrarily excluding very vital documents and things that, from the point of view of the layman at least, may be the very substance of his case and which if he has stamped on before he begins the case, he comes to have a very poor conception of what to do in the courts and what the thing is all about at all.

May I say at this stage I still hold that the courts are not the proper tribunal for the hearing of these matters. In the first instance, they could be and should be heard at a considerable saving to the public realm by officers who would get some kind of training in this particular area. Certainly I would always argue that the courts must be the last realm of resort, and that the divisional court would be the court of appeal. If the

individuals giving these rulings were ill-equipped or mistaken or obtuse or any other thing and natural justice didn't apply, or they misconstrued the statute—and it isn't all that difficult that a fairly intelligent layman couldn't administer that statute okay—then, of course, as the final mode of redress and to forfend against that possibility the courts could have their jurisdiction and sway.

I would welcome that, but that is not the way the Attorney General seeks to have it done. What he is going to have to do in the county of York alone, it seems to me, is to appoint three or four more judges in order to handle this thing. Judges' salaries are quite high these days and administrators will have to surround them. In one instance, where there is no dispute filed the bill does make provision that the clerk of the court may issue the writ of possession, etc, under these terms, subject always to the ex parte hearing. That seems to me a recognition of the density and weight that presently fall on the county court level of court adjudication.

If he ever goes into the office down there, the Attorney General will find they have cards. I was in there the other day and the card was number 60. I laid it on the counter and disappeared. I noticed a lot of fellow lawyers were doing the same thing. They can't stand around while the other 35 are being serviced up in front of them. They might be there for several weeks.

This is the kind of difficulty that the minister is involved with as a purely administrative matter in trying to make this statute work. I don't envy him. I think he made the wrong move in that particular regard by not taking the line, or our nostrums, to heart as to the tribunals themselves. But that is the way it is. Working within the legislation, I don't find it all that offensive; I just think it is a mistaken gesture on the minister's part.

There seem to me to be a couple of defects in the legislation apart from what I have discussed thus far. Wouldn't it be better to have a definition of rent in the legislation—a definition in line with that which is contained in Bill 20? Curiously enough, in the Landlord and Tenant Act, as far as I know, there is no definition of rent. Under this legislation there is no mention of the extra embroideries or amenities worked into the picture of the tenant, such as what services he may avail himself of and whether they fall within the terms of the tenancy or not. Ought these things not to be caught up in some kind of definition?

Secondly, I notice that the minister worked in the business of regulations again. That sends a chill up my spine every time I see the term. The minister can carve out exemptions holus-bolus in any way he pleases as to how this particular legislation is to apply, after the event and wholly within his descretion, subject only to the high degree of attentiveness that we pay to the official Gazette of the Province of Ontario, which no one, just no one, ever in the history of mankind, has read. So the minister leaves himself a fair amount of elbow room to do pretty well what he pleases. However we may debate and at whatever length we may debate the legislation in front of us, it comes back to the minister's hands as a final esoteric and secretive determination as to what may or may not be done.

The legislation for the first time contains clauses—which would be 111 to 114—with respect to mobile homes. I will not on this particular occasion go into the interstices of that particular area; that can be perused in committee. It is valuable, it is worthwhile, it is a good move and we give the minister credit for it on that score.

Tacked on at the end of the legislation, section 115(1) deals with the notice of rental increases, as to the times at which this may be given and the times at which the tenant may give notice to quit on such notice. In other words, the basic weight of the legislation falls at its nether end. But it is clear, and I don't think it requires any severe alteration. As I see it, it is basically beneficial to the people of this province.

Therefore, in winding up, simply let me say that I trust the matter will go out to committee. There are quite a number of niggling points which need perusal—not insignificant, but not enough to upset the basic tenor of the legislation.

[3:30]

Mrs. Campbell: Mr. Speaker, I have difficulty with this bill. That doesn't mean that we are not prepared to support its principle. But I would like to address myself in the first instance to what seems to me to be a very unworkable dichotomy between the two pieces of legislation which, like the mtmber for Lakeshore, I regard as companion pieces.

I agree with what he has said, but I do not see that the proper procedures under the legislation for security of tenure should continue to lie directly with the courts.

I was interested that the Attorney General, I think at the time of introducing his statement with reference to this bill, talked about

meeting with the senior judge of the court to ascertain whether he felt satisfied that the court could handle this particular volume which one might contemplate. I did not notice the Attorney General indicating that perhaps he had taken the federal government into his confidence although I would have thought that would be his move as presumably it is still appointing the judges who will be handling this kind of legislation.

The American experience, may I point out, has indicated that continuing the use of the courts in these matters is not that satisfactory. When we have set up in the companion piece a completely different form of procedure, I would have hoped that the Attorney General—who has been so forthright in bringing forward legislation pertaining to hockey violence and things of that nature—might have come into the 20th century with this particular piece of legislation so that we might have a separate means of determining the problems between landlord and tenant.

Another thing really bothers me and since ministers seem to be having some very tender or sensitive problems as they relate to statements made by members of the opposition, I shall try to frame my problem in terms which will not offend the Attorney General when I refer to section 103d. I am very puzzled as to why he particularly would introduce this particular section.

During the campaign recently passed, he was made very much aware by one of the aldermen of the ward of a problem at Nos. 1 and 23 Oriole Rd. I'm advised that he expressed concern for what was happening here. God forbid that I would suggest that because one of those owners was a former Tory candidate this particular section is in but let me tell members—

Hon. Mr. McMurtry: Now, come on. Let's remain on the high plane at which you started.

Mrs. Campbell: I am just saying what I believe and I know the Attorney General will be able to articulate his own response.

Here is a case where there were two apartments. People have been living in those apartments for some time. In advance of this legislation, the owners started giving notices to vacate. It caused tremendous concern in the city. The mayor of the city was directed to take the matter up with the Premier (Mr. Davis) because of the unconscionable action in this case. The excuses were that they were going to do renovations but what would appear to be the case was that they were going to turn these apartments into furnished apartments. That has not been actually verified, but this would appear to be what was going on.

There was, in effect, a harassment of these people, in that they were advised that the repairs were going to be such that they hoped the people would not be too upset; but when the apartments themselves were vacant, not all that much repair went on. We found people painting and tiling in the place, presumably in advance of any proposed plumbing changes, which is a remarkable way to proceed.

In any event, I have grave concerns about this particular section, because I can see it being used, and used very broadly, to affect security of tenure, and in this particular case many of these people, as I believe the Attorney General knows, were older people who had been there for some time and who were really very frightened about what was going on.

So I really do feel very strongly that this provision should not continue in the legislation. If you had not experienced it, I could see that one would simply question it—as I believe the member for Lakeshore did—but when you see it in action, you have to take another look at that type of provision.

Then we come over to those provisions under 103f which have been pointed out by the member for Lakeshore. I would like to hear from the Attorney General as to how he would define "noxious." Would this include noxious odours? Presumably it covers noxious weeds, but what else are we talking about when we use the term noxious?

Hon. J. R. Smith: Ragweed.

Mrs. Campbell: If one thinks in terms of cooking odours, believe me I have had complaints in my riding about people who use different kinds or herbs and so on to cook with and other people don't like it. What does it really mean? It's noxious in the eyes of—you can't say the beholder—

Mr. Givens: The smeller.

Hon. J. R. Smith: Smeller; sniffer.

Mrs. Campbell: —the person with a nose.

Mr. Givens: The sniffer, not the Smither.

Mrs. Campbell: Are we going to say to somebody who likes to cook in a certain fashion, "If you promise that you will give up this kind of cooking, you can stay." Where are we and where are we going?

Another thing that is bothersome to me is when we look at the number of persons occupying the residential premises on a continuing basis; ideally I can accept that kind of provision, but for the immediate present I am concerned with it, because in my riding there is a great doubling up because people have not been able to afford the rents which have been charged. I would like very much to see something to temper that particular clause, at least at this time and until such time as we find a government which is going forward to build housing, to make available those units which are needed, so that people can occupy units on a healthy basis, if you like.

I don't think that it really behoves me at this point in time to go into any kind of clause by clause discussion of the bill. That will come, hopefully, as the bill proceeds through the committee dealing with Bill 20. I think it is sufficient for me to say at the moment that I find that it is a very complex piece of legislation. I do commend the Attorney General for coming forward with something which is at least an attempt to give security of tenure. I wonder why we have dichotomies between the two bills on the matter of who shall have security of tenure without rent control, and I hope we can get some answers to that.

I am concerned about any suggestion that someone may be evicted from premises because his or her conduct creates a nuisance to other people in the building—and I will tell you why. When I was drafting the piece of legislation which I had, there were many representations made to me that we should provide that anyone who created a nuisance to the other tenants in the building should not be permitted to remain. If you know anything about what happened during the war years, when things such as housing units were in short supply, you realise great pressures can be put on tenants by landlords if they want to get somebody out. I just draw it to the attention of the Attorney General for his consideration and remarks.

In conclusion, this party will support the principle of the bill, but we do have serious questions for discussion in committee.

Mr. Wildman: I want to echo the comments of my colleague in commending the Attorney General for introducing this legislation. I want to speak in support of the principle of the bill in regard to the particular sections of the bill which deal with tenants of mobile homes. The bringing of mobile home tenants under the purview of the Landlord and Tenant Act is a great step forward, and I sincerely commend the minister for doing that.

This has been long overdue, because for a long time this tenant group of our population in this province has been treated as second-class citizens. They have been very vulnerable to arbitrary rules, rent increases, charges for other services, and summary evictions—in some cases, at least, almost without apparent reason.

The reason I am very concerned with this matter is because my riding has one of the highest concentrations of mobile home owners in the province. I can point to a number of reasons why the provisions of this bill are very necessary.

Just to give a recent example, there is a woman in my riding who was evicted from a mobile home park—and her family along with her—apparently because she supported and campaigned for a party in the election campaign—and the owner of the park did not support that party. I would hope that that isn't the reason, but it is unfortunate that she, of course, was not given any reason. She is now having to look for other accommodation. Hopefully this bill will prevent that sort of thing from happening.

[3:45]

Of course, there are other examples. There is the infamous example of early last summer when the entire group of tenants in a mobile home park in southwestern Ontario was evicted mainly because the ownership of the park had changed; a new owner had bought the park. One of those tenants had been in the park only for eight days. Hopefully this sort of thing will end.

I would also point to the provision of this bill which makes it impossible for a person to be evicted if he has appealed to a government authority or a government agency which is his legal right to do. I have an example in my riding of a tenant and his family who were evicted apparently because he appealed to the health authorities and requested, on a number of occasions, that the water in the mobile home park where he lived be checked. He then tried to persuade a number of other tenants to co-operate with him to persuade the owner of the park to clean up the water. This bill and the provisions dealing specifically with mobile home parks should stop that.

I would agree with my colleagues in their questioning of the problem of having to appeal to the courts. Many people—although not all, of course—living in mobile home parks are not in a position to afford expensive legal

advice. Perhaps a tribunal which could judge these matters as a first resort would be much more useful than having to appeal directly to the courts.

I do support the provision which gives the tenants the right to appeal to the courts to ensure that services they have been promised as part of their renting of a lot in a mobile home park will be provided. There are many cases in my riding of parks where roads have never been graded—I shouldn't say have never been graded but have been graded very infrequently. Being in the north, we have now had our first winter snowfall. It's been on the ground for three days and the roads have yet to be ploughed in some of the parks.

Most important, I think, is the fact that it will be necessary now for the landlord to provide adequate water and sewage facilities. This is a terrible problem in some of the parks. It speaks to the question I asked the Minister of the Environment (Mr. Kerr). There are parks in my area where the water is of questionable quality and others where the Ministry of Natural Resources and the Ministry of the Environment have had to move in and order filtration systems and so on.

I would hope that in areas where municipalities can govern the setting up of mobile home parks there will be some provision governing lot sizes. In my area of course, it's a little different in that most of the parks are located in unorganized territories and so they are under the control of the Ministry of Natural Resources.

I have only a couple of questions on the bill and the provisions regarding mobile home parks. The first is the definition of what a mobile home is in section 2. It seems to me that in the bill the minister is basically saying a mobile home is different from a trailer, which I would agree with. I don't think he has adequately defined what a mobile home is or what a trailer is. I think that is something which should be looked at and which should be dealt with in committee.

Also I feel the provision in section 9 which says that a tenancy agreement may provide for the right of the tenant to sell, lease and otherwise part with possession of his mobile home and so on is a good thing. In many cases mobile home park owners have charged extensive entrance fees and exit fees and in many cases made it almost impossible for people to sell their mobile homes when they wanted to leave, unless they sold them back to the owner of the park, which they did at a loss in many cases.

The fact is that it says "may." I understand the reason for that in subsection 3 of section 9, but the problem with it is that as long as there's a shortage of lots on which to locate mobile homes then it becomes necessary for tenants to locate in parks whether or not they like the agreement. All that has to happen now is for landlords to continue to refuse to have that provision in their agreements and tenants will still have to locate in those parks, and thus not be protected by the provision which is intended by the minister, I'm sure, in bringing that in. If possible, I would like that tightened up some way.

In general, as I said before, I support the bill. I think it's a great step forward for people, especially those in the north who many times have to move into mobile homes because there just are not enough apartment facilities available and housing is very expensive. I commend him for introducing it and hope that those two or three things that I mentioned can be tightened up when it's dealt with in committee.

Mr. Sweeney: Mr. Speaker, I would ask the minister if in making his response he would explain the unusual comparison between section 103b and section 103d? In 103d, it would appear as if a landlord wishing to demolish his building can give notice at any time; not at the end of the tenancy but at any time. It says, "The landlord may at any time," and he has 120 days to effect that termination.

Going back to 103b, if the landlord wishes to use the building for his own purposes or those of his family, he must not only wait until the end of the tenancy, he must then give 60 days' notice, which is even more than other sections of the Act call for if it was, for example, on a monthly tenancy. It seems unusual that if he wants to tear the building down he can do it at any time, but if he wants to use it for his own purposes he has a much longer waiting time.

The second question I'd like the minister to address himself to comes under section 3, subsection 2, where it says that the tenant may terminate "where the tenant alleges an act or omission on the part of the landlord that constitutes grounds for such termination." Are there going to be any kinds of regulations or guidelines that would define what the tenant may allege to? Or does it include anything?

Those are two points where I think further definition and clarification would appear to be necessary.

Mr. Warner: First, because this is a reading dealing with the principle, I agree with the principle of the bill. I'm particularly concerned about some of the clauses that are in here and with one in particular. Since, as was pointed out, the numbering system leaves something to be desired, I shall refer to the page numbers.

It's found on page 5 of the bill. It's the section dealing with "where the landlord requires possession of residential premises for the purposes of," and it lists three particular items, including, "conversion to use for a purpose other than rental residential premises, or repairs or renovations so extensive as to require vacant possession of the premises." I would like some response from the minister as to how that could be interpreted in the case of Nos. 1 and 23 Oriole Rd., a situation of which the minister is well aware and a situation to which the Premier of the province was asked to respond and to which there was no response. In those two particular buildings, there is at present a move to remove all of the tenants of the building so that the owner can turn that building into what could be loosely called apartment hotel accommodations, without so specifying, because that kind of specification requires approval by the city of Toronto. It would be done in such a way as to accomplish the fact and thereby double or even triple the rents and provide a special kind of gouging. And that is being proposed for the high-priced executive talent from St. Clair. Ave.

The whole business itself is damaging. It is obviously damaging to the tenants. It should be pointed out, as I know the minister is aware from the briefs he has received, that there are tenants who have been in that building for 15 years and more. There are tenants in the building who are senior citizens. The worst thing that could happen is to tell these people they must now get out and must now go somewhere—where we don't know, but they must now go somewhere.

I am disturbed because I was under the impression there had not been a response from the government because the legislation that was being brought in would cover this very matter and the tenants could then rest easy that they all weren't going to be turfed out into the street. If I have misread those particular sections, I stand corrected and my mind will rest easy and so will the minds of those citizens who now are under harassment by the owner. I would very much appreciate a comment from the minister as to his interpretation of those two sections. If the sections are vague enough to allow the kind of treatment that these people are now receiving, then it is quite obvious the bill needs to be tightened up in that area. Under no circumstances should an owner be allowed to perpetrate that kind of social crime upon people who have been tenants in those two buildings, and good tenants, for so many years in those two buildings. I rest my comments at this in anticipation of a response from the hon. minister.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. Before the next speaker continues, the Chair would like to draw to the attention of the hon. members that the debate is to be on the principle of the bill rather than clause by clause which can be dealt with in the committee of the whole or in the standing committee. I would ask you to keep your comments to the principle, unless there is a comment on a point of clarification which more or less refers to the principle of the bill.

Mr. Ruston: Very briefly on this bill, the one part of it I would address myself to would be with regard to mobile homes since we have about three large mobile home parks in our riding.

There has been some problems with them in the past as to how they pay rents for the property. Now that they are assessed as a residence, one of the problems is dealt with by another department. In the past year the taxes on their property were assessed directly to the owner of the park and not to each individual mobile home owner, which created some problems as to the exact amount that they were being charged for their rent, plus services other than their taxes.

Then there is the description of what a mobile home means and the interpretation of what it is. Some people may call these modular homes since they are homes that have all the wheels taken off and are closed in around the base and so forth and fastened down quite permanently. In the description of what a mobile home is, it might be worth considering whether there should be a minimum size for a mobile home. I give that point to the minister; perhaps he might consider that necessary. What that size would be, of course, could vary. I would assume that somewhere about 500 sq ft would be about the minimum. In other words that's 10 ft by 50 ft; most of them, of course, are 12 ft by 60 ft or much larger. That may be one way to preclude other smaller units which we actually classify as travel trailers.

[4:00]

There have been some problems with regard to when someone wants to move from a mobile home park and the selling of the mobile home. We have had some problems previously with regard to whether or not they have to sell them to the park owner or an agency. I believe now we have that covered under section 9 subsection 5 of the bill. The way I understand it, that section will probably clarify that.

I feel good that the minister has included these in this Act and I'm looking forward to the clause by clause discussions in the committee.

Mr. Angus: I, too, would like to address my comments in support of the bill and hopefully as much as possible within the principle and not clause by clause.

I think it's about time we had this kind of legislation in Ontario. It's probably past the time. Too many people have been unfairly treated by landlords and I think at times landlords have been unfairly treated by tenants. What I see this bill doing is making the situation much more equal, with landlord and tenant on a more even-Steven basis than they ever have been in the past. I truly support that concept.

The length of notice is fair in my estimation. The inclusion of the mobile home tenants is an important step as my two colleagues have just mentioned. I won't dwell on that; they've done adequate jobs on that.

The bill seems to be firm but provides a certain amount of flexibility which is necessary for good human relationships. I think that's important, too. We can't legislate equality as has been mentioned earlier today.

There is one drawback that I can see and it seems to me that it does speak to the principle of the bill. In Bill 20 there is provision for rent review officers but in this bill the initial authority is the judicial system in Ontario. I would be much happier with this bill if it would consider the same type of approach as Bill 20. A rent review officer or a tenant-landlord officer—whatever we would like to call him—could be instituted to deal with the problems between the landlord and tenant.

We've seen the situation in municipalities where they have some type of landlord-tenant bureau. If this Act were changed to reflect that concept so that our courts—I think the minister would be one of the first to agree that our courts need some reduction in the workload they have—if these cases, these problems relating to this bill and tenants' rights were to go to some type of government officer who could adjudicate the complaints on a one-to-one basis or a one-to-two basis I think we will provide for a smoother operation in terms of implementing this bill.

That was a short form of my comments. I think a lot of what has been expressed by my colleagues in the NDP caucus is important and should be considered in the clause by clause debate.

Mr. Roy: Mr. Speaker, just a few comments on the legislation itself and on the legislation protecting tenants generally. I find it exceedingly difficult now to understand why the government, having set up a Ministry of Housing, especially going into the field of tenancy where we get involved with the previous bill, the bill on rent control—Bill 20, I think—why the tenant when seeking some form of security of tenure or when seeking some relief in relation to his apartment and his rent, would have to make a two-pronged attack.

For instance, if his rent is affected, Mr. Speaker, in accordance with the guidelines that we've agreed to or in legislation in this House under Bill 20, he would go before a rent review board or a rent review officer acting under the Act. Of course, that Act is being administered by the Minister of Housing. But if the tenant should receive a notice that his lease is terminated, and not be given sufficient reasons by the landlord for the termination, then he is involved under the Landlord and Tenant Act and with the ministry of the Attorney-General and he has to go in the courts in a different form.

I really want to emphasize that point. It seems to me that in our haste to enact all sorts of social legislation which we as the elected representatives feel is necessary, we are confusing the individuals who we are trying to protect under the legislation.

I can cite examples of this in the various programmes that we've enacted in this province. The individual who is supposed to be protected has a series of doors to enter, and it's extremely confusing when he doesn't know exactly which door to open. If he enters the wrong door, we must say: "No, no, your protection comes under the Landlord and Tenant Act, not under rent review. Therefore, you've got to go under the Attorney General and you've got to end up in court."

I can't understand a government which prides itself on being responsive and responsible to the public not understanding that. Very often it is the essentials of legislation designed to protect the tenant that you can't get through to him because of the confusion

of jurisdictions and the confusion of ministries. He really doesn't now where his relief is. Half his efforts are spent sometimes in finding out exactly under what statute, under what ministry he is to get relief.

It seems to me we have clear evidence here of a government which has failed to respond to the needs of 1975. I make this point because it was raised, for instance, in the latest report that we've obtained from the former Auditor General, Maxwell Henderson. He talked about duplication of ministry programmes and duplication of work done by ministries. I suggest to the minister that this is clearly the case.

I'm sure the minister has a deep understanding of the problems. He worries, for instance, about violence in the hockey rinks and he is concerned, as I am, about the rights of young Canadian quarterbacks to play professional football. These are all matters the minister should think about.

I suggest the government should give consideration in putting the Landlord and Tenant Act under the Ministry of Housing. If you have a Ministry of Housing—

Mr. Cassidy: You don't have to talk about football to get this one's attention.

Mr. Roy: No, no. He's with it. He's with it and I am sure he understands the point I'm trying to make—that having established a Ministry of Housing and having enacted certain legislation to protect the tenant, the rent control Act, Bill 20, why would we have legislation now, the Landlord and Tenant Act under the Attorney General. I know there's a long tradition for this; it's always been under the Attorney General

You will agree with me that at the time we first started talking about this legislation, we didn't have a Ministry of Housing. But we have one now, and surely we're rendering service to the taxpayer of this province when we give him protection in a particular field under one roof—that he is not chasing over a series of ministries or a series of jurisdictions, or institutions, to get some recourse when he feels he has been wronged by certain individuals.

That's what concerns me about the legislation. It concerns me that the Premier of this province has not seen this. Why would it be difficult to say that we're going to transfer all matters under the Landlord and Tenant Act into the Ministry of Housing? Why hasn't that been done?

Some members have pointed out, for instance, the problem with the statute as it now exists is that recourse has to be obtained from the courts. The courts are not the easiest, the most accessible institution we have in this province for the taxpayers. Very often, for taxpayers who cannot afford to have counsel, it gets to be exceedingly difficult with the rigid procedures or ways to get into the courts. If the taxpayer doesn't follow particular steps he has to wait an extra week to have his motion heard and this goes on and on. Besides I don't think the court or the judges are always the best people to be deciding exactly what's in the best interests of a landlord or tenant or whatever.

I'm suggesting that serious consideration be given by this minister and by the Premier of the province to having the rights of tenants—if they are going to talk housing surely they are encompassing tenants—all under one roof, under the administration of the Ministry of Housing and not the Attorney General.

The other point I would like to make on this bill—and I mentioned it briefly earlier—is that under this statute recourse again has to be obtained in the courts. It seems to me—and the Attorney General would be the first to agree with me—that the court process in this province has been neglected since 1971. It is not the most accessible nor the most expedient way to get recourse.

If the tenant is going to seek recourse, for instance, under Bill 20 he goes to see his rent review officer or the rent review board. Why could we not have that sort of board regulating or making decisions under the Landlord and Tenant Act?

I understand the problems because there has been long jurisprudence, I suppose, enacted under the Landlord and Tenant Act over a number of years. Slowly but surely legislation is taking over from jurisprudence and we are setting the guidelines. For instance, an open contract entered into by a landlord and a tenant is hardly valid at all under this legislation. We are going further, I suppose, than has been contemplated by anyone who supports the free enterprise system when you tell an individual: "If you are going to tell somebody to get out of your property, your apartment, you are going to have to tell them why."

This is something which was unthinkable, I would think, five years ago but we are doing it now. The tenant's protection and even the landlord's protection is pretty well guided by legislation and the jurisprudence becomes of less importance.

I say to the minister, surely on the long term, if we are talking about an efficient

administration which is catering to the taxpayers of 1975, he should try to be cohesive and not try to make it so difficult on the individual he is trying to protect. Surely this type of legislation or the approach taken by a tenant or a landlord should be under a common board, the review board, under the Ministry of Housing.

Mr. Moffatt: I wanted to deal briefly with a couple of points with regard to the legislation in connection with the mobile home parks and the effects this particular legislation should have, I think, and probably won't have.

In various parts of the province, mobile home parks have become somewhat of an answer to the problem of a housing shortage. I suspect that all members would agree they are at least a partial answer and, dealt with in the appropriate fashion, could pose some solution.

What happens currently is that people who own mobile homes or purchase them in order to enter a mobile home park are caught in a kind of lock-step arrangement. What happens is that when one purchases a mobile home, one buys it from a person who, in most cases, owns the park in which that home will be located. It is located by the landlord and one is assigned a lot and various amenities and attachments to that lot in the context of the entire park.

That seems to work reasonably well except that for a variety of reasons people from time to time have to move from one park to another. What happens is if one owns a mobile home one is denied entrance to a particular park. Unless one wholesales the particular unit back to the person from whom it was bought and then purchases a new mobile home in the new park one is denied admission.

I discussed this briefly, privately, with the Attorney General the day after the bill was introduced. I think he agreed with me that it was somewhat of a problem. I wonder if, in the sort of general discussion which will take place on third reading, we could come to some kind of agreement whereby there will be a formula or some method by which people who have to buy a mobile home in order to gain entrance to a park will at least have their rights protected.

[4:15]

I'm aware that the minister says, and I at first thought, that an amendment would be suitable, suggesting that the possession or ownership of a mobile home would not be any reason to discriminate against a person so as to prevent entry into a park. That might have been a workable solution, but on second thoughts, and after discussion, it seems to be an unworkable solution.

I submit to the minister that unless something is done within the context of this bill to protect those people, we are indeed going to be faced with that problem more and more. I can document the problem in specific terms to some extent.

I can cite an instance where a person paid $22,000 for a double-wide mobile home in 1972, and in 1973 was posted to Vancouver and had to get rid of that particular home and had to sell it back to the owner at a price of $9,000. Now that, I would suggest, is a significant ripoff. I think that that kind of thing should somehow be taken into consideration.

People might argue that the original buyer had a right to sell the home to whomever he chose, but in fact that's not correct, because he had no right to sell it to anybody other than people who were going to live in that particular park. So that becomes a kind of discriminatory lock-step arrangement.

I would suggest to the minister that this kind of thing needs to be dealt with in the context of the bill and I hope that we'll be able to deal with that during third reading.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Port Arthur.

Mr. Laughren: Nickel Belt, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Speaker: Nickel Belt.

An hon. member: Same area.

Mr. Laughren: Was that a fellow northern member who said it was the same area? They're just mad because studded tires aren't being included with the amendments to the seatbelt Act.

Mr. Moffatt: Studded tires on mobile homes.

Mr. Laughren: I don't understand my colleague from Durham East's comment that we couldn't legislate prevention of the kind of ripoff that he talks about. I know of a situation in which the mobile home park operator requires that the mobile home be bought from a certain distributor—it's not even himself, but from another distributor.

I know of one case where the person moved the mobile home a considerable distance at considerable expense only to be told, when he got there, that he couldn't come into the mobile home park. And it was the only

mobile home park in the entire area. It seems to me that legislation could very well be introduced, which would prevent the ownership of a mobile home having anything whatsoever to do with admittance into a mobile home park.

I think it should be kept in mind as well that there are areas in the province where there is no competition among mobile home park operators; there is only one in the community and, therefore, whatever that mobile home park operator says, goes. There is no choice whatsoever.

You can imagine the consternation of the person who owns the mobile home, when he is transferred—for example the Ministry of Natural Resources might transfer one of their employees into a northern community—and then is told that he can't bring his mobile home into that particular park. And there's absolutely no competition, no alternative for that person.

I'd like to hear also from the Attorney General, why such an amendment could not have been included in this bill.

Mr. Cassidy: I want to say first to the minister, that it's a pleasure to debate this particular bill, and it's a pleasure to debate this kind of legislation. I would hope that these moments came more frequently in the life of the Legislature, or had come more frequently in the life of the Legislature over the past four years, because it might have been more pleasant being here over that period of time.

The second thing I would say to him is that honeymoons like this don't last forever; so take your rosebuds while you may because we may become a bit more contumacious in a few months' time.

The bill makes a fundamental change to the way in which landlords and tenants have got along in North America and, I believe, under English common law, over a very long period of time. It's a pretty fundamental change and I would suggest, on the ideological plane, a very welcome change as well.

It's a change in relationship which also reflects a change in the tenure of many of the people who are living in our major cities in Ontario. In the past, tenancy was for many people a relatively impermanent or temporary kind of thing. People were tenants for a period of time while they piled up capital and until they were able to have a house of their own. In times that were demographically stable, when there was not that rapid urban expension we have right now, that was a possible thing to do.

People who were tenants, who were working-class people, did at least tend to enjoy a more stable relationship with their landlord. In conditions of fairly adequate supply of housing, even if they moved around from time to time—because they couldn't pay the rent or for other reasons— they would probably stay in very much the same district. The area of Cabbagetown is a very good example.

If the minister has read "Working People" by James Lorimer, which I recommend to him, that book documents the last years of the working-class culture of Cabbagetown before it was decimated by urban growth and white painting and other factors like that. There were many people who had been tenants all their lives yet had lived within one extended community with friends and relatives close at hand and enjoying a fairly stable and decent relationship with their landlords. All sorts of reasons, including the greed of landlords, have brought that to an end. Now it has become necessary to legislate in order to give tenants the kind of security they previously enjoyed, both because of the market situation and perhaps because of a rather more benign attitude on the part of landlords, who tended to have a personal rather than an impersonal relationship with their tenants.

As our society changes in major cities, there is the prospect of more and more people being tenants for life. Unfortunately, I have to say this, to be a tenant has been to be considered second-class. Working-class people might have a stable kind of community in parts of our major cities but they were looked down upon by the people who lived in Deer Park, Forest Hill, Rosedale, and the posher sections of other cities. They were considered as being spendthrift; they were considered as not contributing in the same way to the community; they were denied the vote for very many years. They were given only a qualified right to vote in the municipal franchise and generally they were thought to be will-o'-the-wisps and people who caused social problems rather than helped to cure them.

Of course, that was to some extent a self-fulfilling prophecy. If tenants didn't have the right to vote, tenants would feel less involved in their communities. If tenants were subject to eviction or to intimidation by their landlords, they were less likely to play a part in their particular community. The roles of helper, volunteer, provider, home and school parent and that kind of thing in a community would therefore tend to gravitate to the peo-

ple who were resident homeowners rather than to those who were tenants.

It has come to the point where to be a tenant is to be someone who is very transitory. Large landlords with no compunctions have been evicting or have been refusing to renew leases. This has affected families in particular which, for various reasons, are being harassed and discriminated against; and there has been no respite until now.

Now, however, we have legislation which amends the Landlord and Tenant Act and which will provide security of tenure. It seems to me this bill cuts two ways because it talks of both rights and responsibilities both for tenants and for landlords.

On the one hand, landlords are bound against arbitrary and irrational evictions or refusals to renew a lease. When they take a tenant, it is a relationship which is liable to be fairly permanent; they therefore may have to consider more carefully, when they accept a tenant, if that tenant is going to be a decent tenant. They also have to relate to that tenant, bearing in mind that they may have the tenant for a very long period of time.

On the other hand, the obligations of tenancy, which were spelled out to some extent in the Act before now have now been spelled out in more detail, because there are court-ordered sanctions and reasons or justifications for which a tenant can be evicted. The tenant has therefore certain obligations to which he must live up if he is to continue in a position of tenancy.

We would hope that the protections of tenant organizations that are provided for in this bill and which are valuable will encourage or permit tenants to get together and to begin dealing with the landlords in a group rather than singly. In cases where there are large buildings of 100, 200 or 300 suites, it doesn't make sense for an individual tenant to deal with the rental agent or the superintendent, or whoever happens to be the landlord's representative. However, it's very difficult for the landlord, or the manager of the landlord's company, to meet with each tenant individually. The tenant should be able to get through to the responsible people to make decisions, however, and they can only do so in a group.

I believe, personally, that the form of association will be fairly flexible for the time being. In a middle-class kind of apartment building, it may be a very loose-knit association or a kind of group that emerges of 10 or 12 tenants who tend to work together and who have the confidence of the rest of the building. In a more working-class apartment in Scarborough, or in parts of my riding, it might take the form of a more formal association which holds meetings and decides what its requests and demands are going to be and then arranges for meetings with the landlord. In some other cases, the tenants may be relatively happy, and the fact that they have the right to associate may be sufficient to enforce reasonable behaviour on the part of their landlord.

There are several points I want to raise about the bill and about the inconsistencies between this bill and Bill 20, which is the rent control bill. One has already been brought to the attention of the House. It's serious. If we're making a fundamental change in landlord-tenant relationships through the security of tenure provision, if we're making it on an indefinite basis and if, as seems probable, the government intends that this be permanent, then why doesn't the government shore it up with an indefinite kind of basis for rent control or rent review?

The dangers of eviction by arbitrary or very high increases in rent are well known to the minister. They mean, if there is no rent control after the middle of 1977, that a landlord who is enjoined from evicting a tenant who has fulfilled his obligations because of Bill 26, will be able to turn around and force that tenant to leave by a rent increase of $100 or $150 a month and there will be no recourse for the tenant.

Some landlords have suggested that an anti-discriminatory clause, to ensure that no tenant receives a rent increase of more than the average for the building, might be a means of providing security of tenure without rent control. Frankly, I don't think that's possible. I think it's an awkward and unhappy way to proceed.

Roomers are covered in this bill but are not under rent control. That is an inconsistency. It means that when these bills are proclaimed, let's say Jan. 1, 1976, roomers with whom the landlord is unhappy but who are protected from eviction because of the security of tenure bill, will be forced to leave because of arbitrary and very big increases in their rents. That's a problem that I think the minister has to contend with.

There is a problem which may emerge with apartment hotels, and particularly there is a problem that could emerge with the attempts by certain landlords to find a vehicle by which they can convert apartments into some kind of property which is exempt. We have, thank God, not tried to make an exemption for furnished properties

as was done in Britain. The result of that, many years ago, was that a landlord would buy a few sticks of furniture, call his property furnished and evade the post-war rent controls and other security of tenure provisions that existed under that law.

[4:30]

There are in my riding, however, a large number of apartment hotels, and it could be that that euphemism will be used, as the member for Scarborough-Ellesmere (Mr. Warner) was saying, in order to hide an intent to evade the Act.

There may be a need for the prohibition of evictions and refusals to renew leases to be made retroactive, as the member for Scarborough-Ellesmere has talked about, in order to prevent the injustices of bringing in a bill now after landlords have had ample notice and after some of them have clearly been taking advantage of the time between promise by the government and the actual fulfilment of that particular promise.

As the member for Lakeshore (Mr. Lawlor) said, we are concerned about the demolition, conversion and renovation sections. We question letting these evictions happen in the middle of the lease. When the tenant signs on for quiet enjoyment for one or two years, he should surely be protected against an eviction because the landlord decides to redevelop the property.

If the landlord is intending to develop the property, then the normal thing for him to do is to put his tenants under a month-to-month lease at the time that the leases expire, and at that point he would then be able to evict in order to demolish with 120 days' notice. The 120 days could possibly be reasonable notice in all cases, including those where a lease is about to expire. We felt that this should be left open for discussion during the committee stage of the bill. We are worried that repairs and renovations could be used as a loophole to evade the Act, as a number of members have set forth.

We were pleased that the reasons for evictions that were set out in the minister's statement have been narrowed, but we still feel that the question of illegal activity should be taken out. An illegal activity that annoys or disrupts safety, or which annoys the other people in the building, will be covered under that particular section. But an illegal activity that does not annoy or disrupt or in any way interfere with the rest of the tenants in the building, is surely not a matter for the Landlord and Tenant Act to cover. It opens a tenant to a form of double jeopardy.

For example, suppose that he is convicted for possession of marijuana or for smoking hashish in his apartment. That is an illegal activity with an noxious weed, but it is not an activity which will have affected anybody else in the building, unless the floors are not tight against smoke. The sentence in the courts, given the tenor of the courts these days, might be probation for three or six months—might even be whatever it is that you get when you don't get any sentence at all on your first offence. But the landlord could look at the fact that there had been a conviction for the possession of pot and say, "You have been convicted of an illegal activity in this building, and therefore I will go to the courts and seek to have you evicted."

There is a kind of double jeopardy there. The courts could say that that is unfair and that the eviction on grounds of the pot charge was an unreasonable kind of use of the law, but nevertheless it doesn't seem reasonable that the landlord could even have a leg to stand on, on going to the courts.

We are concerned about the question of musical mothers-in-law. That means revolving mothers-in-law, who go from apartment to apartment at the behest of their beloved sons-in-law, who are landlords trying to clear out unwanted tenants. The right of a landlord to evict a tenant in order to take over the apartment for a member of his family should be restricted in some way so that if there is any evidence that this is being used on a consistent basis as a technique of property management and not as a compassionate gesture towards one's kith and kin, that the courts would have the power to prevent those kind of evictions.

At one point, when we were developing our bill, we suggested that this right on the behalf of the landlord and his family might be open to the landlord only once every year, or every two years, or every five years. There is some possibility of that. Certainly it should not be a right that is open to corporate landlords.

We felt that the question of the material covenants being breached was ambiguous. The lawyers in our caucus suggested that this could enhance the tenant's protection, because the breach of a non-material covenant in a lease would then not be enough for a landlord to justify terminating the lease.

The counter-argument is that this bill effectively takes over from the lease as the basic

document governing the tenant's tenure and continued tenure, so that he can't be kicked out unless he breaches this law and, therefore, that any breach of the lease is not subject for eviction unless it is also a breach of the law. In that case, the reference to a breach of a material covenant in the lease expands the powers of the landlord to evict a tenant rather than restricting the power of the landlord to evict the tenant and there's clearly some legal opinion that may be needed there as to whether this enhances or reduces the protections given to the tenant.

I want to say a word on behalf of landlords. The minister looks up in some surprise.

Mr. Sargent: I would hope he's surprised.

Mr. Cassidy: And so does the Liberal Party obviously.

Hon. Mr. McMurtry: No.

Mr. Sargent: That's the same speech you made last year.

Mr. Cassidy: There is a very practical question which a number of landlords have come to me with over a period of years which reflects their frustrations with the courts as a means of enforcing their rights vis-à-vis the tenants.

Many of our people have spoken about the need to take these matters outside of the courts and to put them into one common administration. I think both in British Columbia and in Quebec the complaint of people enforcing the rent control bills is the fact that there are two, three or even four legal authorities which all have a piece of landlord-tenant relations. It would surely make much more sense for the first avenue under any circumstance where there was a landlord-tenant dispute to be the rent review officer or a landlord-tenant officer or someone like that who provides flexible, quick kinds of decisions which then in certain cases can be appealed either to the courts or to the rent review tribunal.

What the landlords have complained about in particular and where I think I have some sympathy for them is the losses they incur if they have a tenant who isn't paying his rent and decides to bull it out.

Under the present law, they first have to establish that the tenant is trying to evade the rent. It often takes a month or more before they wake up to the fact that this time it wasn't that the money was coming on the 15th of the month, it was that the tenant was trying to play games for serious. Secondly, they have to notify the tenant; they have to take him into court; they have to wait for a date; and they have to get their court order, a process which can take anywhere from three weeks to eight weeks. Thirdly, if they have a court order, there is the problem of enforcing the order.

In Quebec, and I think possibly in this province, it may be that the court order to evict for non-payment of rent has got to be accompanied by a small claims court order to collect the rent, and even there they may have difficulty making the tenant pay up, particularly since he may do a midnight flit when he realizes that the game is up and not leave any forwarding address.

Under the bill that's proposed here, the landlord has first to establish that the tenant is not paying the rent. That's a process that may take, if he's really tough, one or two days, but normally it's going to take a week or two. Then he has to give 20 days' notice which gets us up to, let's say, day 35 from the date that the rent was due. The tenant has seven days in which to comply, and then the landlord has to go to the court. That means, as the timetable works, it takes roughly the same time as it does now to get to the court, possibly a bit longer, because it may be 40 or 45 days before the landlord can have his application into the court for an eviction or for the payment of rent.

I don't think it's clear from the bill whether the court could order the payment of rent, in addition to agreeing to an eviction for the non-payment. If it continues to take three to eight weeks to get the order to evict, you're in a situation where it may take as much as two, 2½ or three months before the landlord has the right to kick out the recalcitrant tenant. Since the tenant, almost by definition under these cases, is probably not paying rent, then that may mean three months of lost rent on behalf of the landlord.

I don't say this purely because my heart weeps for landlords. I say it also because of the fact that that non-payment of rent by a tenant who is irresponsible will be reflected in the rents that are paid by other tenants. The landlord will do his best to pass that unpaid rent on to other tenants and, I would suspect, the rent review officers under rent control will allow the non-payment of rent to be a cost that can be passed on to other tenants.

I just sort of suggest ideas. I hope they can be discussed in the committee. One is that if the landlord goes through that 20 days plus seven days plus going through the court routine and then the tenant pays and settles

his affairs on the second round, if the tenant does it again, then it would seem to me that the process should be short-circuited so that the landlord could go directly to the court in the same way as he is allowed to go directly to the court where a tenant overcrowds the apartment for the second time, or starts to tear down the walls, and the landlord goes after him for the second time.

I hesitate to suggest that persistent failure to pay rent on time could be cause for an eviction during the course of a lease. That's rather more draconian, but we might come to that as some kind of a balance to the fact that in general, and quite rightly so, we are giving rights to tenants and making the balance between tenants and landlords more even than it has been in the past.

So much for the tenants. I'd like to say a word about the giving of notice. Since, for a while, leases of one year or two years will continue to be the order of the day, although in time they may begin to disappear under rent control and security of tenure, I think that the proposed notice should be looked at a bit more closely. For one thing, the minister has changed the date for the giving of notice from the last day of the previous month to 30 days. That 30 days can range from Jan. 28 for an end of February eviction to the second of the month in a month that has 31 days. If one wants to change it, possibly it might make more sense to have it the first day of the month in which the termination is to take place.

Second, in general the pattern in the legislation proposed, the package in Bill 20 and Bill 26, has been to extend the advance notice for various actions to be taken. If a landlord wants his family to move in he has got to give 60 days' notice, even if it's a monthly tenancy. If he wants to demolish, it is 120 days' notice, although in effect that's a shortening of a notice where there is a yearly lease in force. If the landlord wants to raise the rent, he has to give 90 days' notice. But we're still stumbling along with a proposed 30 days in the case of a month-to-month tenancy.

If month-to-month tenancies become more common, as they are liable to because the tenant doesn't have to have a lease to prevent being kicked out the day that his kids are going to go back to school, then it would seem to me that that period of notice ought to be extended, probably to at least 60 days, which in effect might mean the first day of the previous month, in line with the comments I just made about a simple notice period. So 60 days or 61, whatever it might happen to be, might be more reasonable.

That would mean, in turn, that there would be a fairly clear pattern that would take place in terms of rent increases and the tenant reaction thereto. If a landlord gave notice 90 days before the effective date of an increase in rent, and the tenant had 30 days before deciding whether or not to get out because he didn't like the increase, then the landlord would get more reasonable kind of notice of what the tenant's intentions were.

It is possible that the notice to be given by tenants need not be as prolonged as the notice to be given by landlords, because it is easier to rent a building or an apartment within 30 days than it is to find a suitable building or apartment within 30 days. It's pretty tough to do it in that period of time, and to arrange for moving and so on, whereas in rentals you put an ad in the paper and you probably have people knocking on the door within a very short period of time.

I would also like to suggest this, that where the landlord intends to evict for cause, it is desirable for a number of reasons that any court proceedings that take place, or, we would hope, any proceedings that take place before a rent review officer, should happen before the effective date of termination and not afterwards. If you have a 30-day notice period, and given the fact that the courts are not particularly speedy, then most of the cases surrounding evictions where the landlord is seeking to show cause, will take place after the 30 days has expired.

Then the question will be raised: If the tenant loses, do you then give him two days, seven days, or a month from the court order justifying the eviction before he actually has to get out? That's a question which the minister should consider too. That becomes less of a question, however, if you go to the courts, let's say around about 20 days before the termination is due to take place, which would happen if there were a 60-day notice on the landlord rather than a 30-day notice. I suggest that the minister look to that fairly seriously.

[4:45]

The final point I want to raise is that this bill does not enjoin against adult-only buildings. It seems to me that is the one major area of landlord-tenant law which demands action right now before the Law Reform Commission comes forward with its report.

In the Quebec civil code it says quite bluntly one can't discriminate against people because they have kids unless they are going to overcrowd the place. We have covered crowding and we should follow the example of the Quebec civil code. In European juris-

dictions, such as West Germany, which we have looked at, they don't even understand what is meant by an adult-only building. They don't exist over there and they do exist here in Toronto.

The Ministry of Housing recently made a study—it was over the summer—of 800 apartments in Toronto which found that one-third of those apartments were in adult-only buildings. This was a random sample taken through the pages of the telephone book. One-third were in adult-only buildings and our observation of the advertisements in the Toronto Star is that a much higher proportion of apartments on the market is directed only to adults.

I would ask the minister to consider seriously adding this to the bill and bringing in a provision which, among other things, would protect landlords as well as tenants. It would protect landlords because right now, because of the additional profit to be made from adult-only buildings, landlords may feel they can't continue to accept families. They may feel they will lose potential tenants who will go to the building down the road where they don't have such a soft heart and where they will not accept people with kids.

The landlords need to be protected against themselves and the place to do it is here in this Legislature. I think it would be sufficiently within the principle of the bill that the minister could bring in that amendment, whether or not it will be open to members of the opposition parties. The question of adult-only buildings is important perhaps, too, because of the fact that this bill effectively prevents the eviction of a family with kids simply because they have children.

I don't think the courts will say it is a material covenant in a lease that people not have children. I really can't see the courts saying that. Unless the children are holy terrors, there is nothing else in the bill to permit the eviction from an adult-only building of a young couple who have a kid because they happened to have the kid. There is a law being created here which benefits people who are existing tenants even if they happen to be in buildings which are adult-only and which also benefits tenants who are in existing buildings where the policy on new rentals is changing to adult-only. They can't continue to clean out buildings in the way it is being done in Don Mills and gradually turf out the families; at least, I hope that's the effect of the bill.

Why shouldn't that apply to people who are becoming families as well? Why shouldn't that apply to all the special circumstances of people who need to rent and who are in very peculiar circumstances which may require them to have, say, a suite in a downtown apartment building? One of the people working here in Hansard, for example, may have a young child and may find that the schedule of working from 2 p.m. until 10 p.m. fits in with the day care and allows them to spend the mornings with their young child if they have an apartment which is within telephone reach and easy access of the Legislature. They could not do so if they were separated by eight or 10 miles and a long transit trip from their particular family.

They should have access to a building here in central Toronto whether or not in the past that building has been designated for adults only. They are the best judge of that, not a landlord who will inevitably rule for profit; nor a bunch of fellow tenants who, I am afraid, will rule on the basis of discrimination against children in a way that the law would prevent them from doing if it happened to be an attempt to discriminate against people of another race, colour, creed or religion.

With those comments, we commend this piece of legislation the minister is bringing in and look forward with pleasure to the clause by clause study.

Hon. Mr. McMurtry: First of all, I should say I am very grateful for the contribution of my colleagues to this debate which I understand is restricted to the principle of the legislation that has been introduced. I very much appreciate the fact that most, if not all, of the members seem to be in favour of the principle of the legislation and that matters that will be developed or discussed in committee are really the best method for attaining the principles of the legislation which seem to be adopted on all sides of the House.

As my colleagues have recognized, the legislation does represent a very serious departure from existing law because it does in effect create a situation which may well be to leave in practice leases in perpetuity insofar as tenants and landlords act reasonably. I would suggest with respect that the importance of that principle not be lost sight of when we come to discuss this matter in committee. As some of my colleagues have observed and as I would like to repeat, we know the Ontario Law Reform Commission will soon report to us on the analysis of the landlord and tenant relationship.

I want to make it clear that this is not intended to be the last word on landlord and tenant legislation as far as this province is

concerned in the immediate future. At the same time, we recognize the importance of the legislation and the fact that we welcome and await with interest the report of the Law Reform Commission. However, I did not want to indicate that this in any way undermined what we consider to be the very essential importance of this legislation because of the precedent that has been set in relation to the very basic landlord-tenant relationship.

In introducing this legislation, I would like to indicate to the hon. members of the Legislature that considerable thought was given to whether or not legislation would be introduced as amendments to the Landlord and Tenant Act or whether or not a bill which might have been called a security of tenure Act might be introduced—or indeed, a whole new residential tenancies Act. As I think most of my colleagus are aware, the existing landlord and tenant legislation is really quite extensive and fairly complex. In order to provide the security of tenure that I believe all members of the House desire at an early time to be undertaken by this government, the best method to obtain this end was to amend the existing Landlord and Tenant Act.

In relation to the forum in which these matters will be dealt with in the event of a dispute, again I would like to assure the members of the House that very careful consideration was given at this time as to what would be the appropriate form to determine any disputes which might arise. Certainly one of the underlying principles of legislation such as this should be related to the accessibility by both the landlord and the tenant to the forum which is going to have the ultimate or, for practical purposes, the real determination of their respective rights.

In choosing the county courts as the forum that has been provided for by the amendments, I want to make it clear first that we do not rule out the possibility that a new forum or court structure may be necessary in the future in order to deal with the landlord and tenant relationship, which is of course so fundamental to our society. What we were most concerned about was to provide a forum that was going to be accessible to tenants and landlords at an early date; and, of course, with the county court structure well in place, this was a consideration.

Secondly, there is a matter of constitutionality which I did not wish to discuss at length at this particular point in time, because constitutionally writs of possession have always been dealt with by courts constituted of federally appointed judges. This is a matter that has given us some concern, notwithstanding the fact that we are aware that other provinces have not—I don't say they have ignored the constitutional issue, but they have not been dissuaded by it from setting up special landlord and tenant courts.

More important than either of these matters, I think, should be the recognition of the very important legal relationship that exists between a landlord and tenant and, as I'm sure was well known by all the members of the Legislature, there is a very large body of jurisprudence already in existence in relation to the landlord and tenant relationship. Not just because of that, but considering the very special legal relationship that will continue regardless of any legislation that is passed by this Legislature or any Legislature in the future, it's our very strongly held belief that such a forum should be provided and staffed by people who do have some special understanding of this legal relationship.

When it is suggested, for example, that a forum to consider rent review may be the appropriate forum for landlord and tenant matters or for the determination of disputes or issues under the Landlord and Tenant Act, I would like to point out that the issues involved in a landlord and tenant relationship on the one hand, in relation to the amendments that are before this House, and the issues related to the rent review, in my respectful submission, are very different issues and may very well require a different type of forum in order to arrive at the best justice that can be reasonably be made available. I just want the members to consider that as this matter has been developed and as this matter is debated.

Most important of all at this particular time, again emphasizing the fact that we are not ruling out the thought of providing special courts down the road, we do want to provide a forum that is now in place and that will be available as soon as this legislation has been passed, assuming that it's going to be passed. It's a matter that I have also discussed with the chief judge of the county court in relation to the number of judges that will be available in order to make the county courts accessible to applications under the Landlord and Tenant Act on a reasonable basis.

It is my understanding that while it will undoubtedly require the appointment of additional county court judges, it does not require a large number of additional county court judges.

My hon. friend, the member for St. George (Mrs. Campbell), earlier wondered why we would not consult directly with our federal friends to assist or obtain information with respect to what county court judges might be appointed or whether they would be prepared to appoint the additional county court judges. I should like to assure the Legislature that the federal government traditionally has always acceded to the wishes or the requests of the Attorney General of the Province of Ontario when it comes to the appointment of additional judges.

The federal government has recognized the fact that the individual provinces are the best people to determine when additional judges are needed and traditionally do provide those appointments upon request. It is our understanding and our belief that under the county court system as presently established and functioning in the province, that these courts will be available if and when this legislation is passed.

Mr. Cassidy: The only problem is that they discriminate against tenants.

Hon. Mr. McMurtry: I just cannot accept the statement by my hon. friend that the courts of this province discriminate against any individual coming before them. There are on occasion individual judges who may be possessed of human frailty, as I am sure we all are, but to suggest that the courts of this province discriminate against any class of person I just simply state is a very unfair comment, and I can assure the Legislature that it is really quite unfounded.

In relation to the legislation, I think it has been recognized by my hon. colleagues that it is our desire to deal with the landlords and the tenants in as even-handed manner as possible, because of the very importance of the relationship to the community. If landlords feel that they are without basic fundamental rights, then it goes without saying that the availability of rental accommodation is going to diminish—and only to the detriment of the tenants of this province.

I am very grateful to learn that my friends in the official opposition are receiving briefs from landlords and that they have come to the recognition that all landlords are not tycoons. Indeed, the great majority of landlords in this province are people like the rest of us, who are struggling to get by, to support families, and to meet the demands of a very difficult economy.

Mr. Cassidy: Do you struggle? Do you struggle?

Hon. Mr. McMurtry: If we were to pass legislation which would be seen by the landlords of this province as something less than even-handed, then I am sure that we all would agree that ultimately it would be the tenants of the province who would suffer.

For a few moments I will deal with respect to some of the observations made by certain of the hon. members. I should state at the outset that certainly I welcome any suggestions or proposals that have been made or will be made by the hon. members that will assist us in achieving the very important principles of this legislation, the virtues of which are apparently accepted and recognized on all sides of the House.

We of course are very concerned for example, as my friend the hon. member for Lakeshore (Mr. Lawlor) has posed, about the danger that some of the sections of the legislation will be open to abuse; that demolition, for example, or extensive repairs or renovations will be used or that these sections will be abused or will be vulnerable to subterfuge in order to get rid of tenants who are, generally speaking, law abiding tenants and responsible tenants. We are very concerned about this.

We believe the legislation has been drafted carefully and really avoids the possibility of this subterfuge, but if my friends have any specific amendments in order to tighten up these, or any other sections which have been drafted, in order to achieve the principles about which we have spoken, then of course they will be welcome.

Several of the hon. members have made reference to a situation that exists at, I believe Nos. 1 and 20 or 23, Oriole Rd., in the city of Toronto and one of the colleagues made the suggestion that this section of the Act was drafted in such a way as to assist the landlord who "was known to have been a Tory candidate." I hasten to suggest that I don't believe for one moment that the hon. member from St. George (Mrs. Campbell) was serious because if she was serious, I can only state to the Legislature, Mr. Speaker, that I consider the suggestion most offensive and even in the context of partisan politics, totally unwarranted.

The truth of the situation is that the legislation was drafted with that particular incident in mind. As a matter of fact, two of my staff, who are in the Legislature this afternoon, have worked very hard in the preparation of this legislation. They attended a meeting in the mayor's office dealing with the situation at 1 and 23 Oriole Rd. and in

drafting the legislation, that unfortunate situation has been or was, very much in mind.

Now I don't pretend to know all the details of what occurred there but it's my undertanding and belief that this situation could not have occurred if the legislation that is now before the Legislature was in fact in force. The situation at 1 and 23 Oriole Rd. was this. First of all there was no demolition permit. Secondly, it was my understanding that it was not a conversion to a different purpose; and thirdly, my information and belief is that the repairs on those premises were not so extensive as to require vacant possession. Indeed if this legislation had been in force, the tenants at 1 and 23 Oriole Rd. would not in fact be faced with the very tragic situation with which they are now faced.

Mr. Warner: Those aren't escape clauses—

Hon. Mr. McMurtry: And if any of the members of the House have any suggestions with respect to how any of these provisions can be further tightened, I repeat that certainly I will welcome such suggestions.

I hope there will be full time, of course, to debate this matter and improve the legislation, where possible, on a clause-by-clause basis in committee. I can only state that I look forward to working with the members of the committee in that respect in order that we may produce the best legislation which can be made available to us, or can be made available to the public of this province.

A number of items were raised by the various members of the House. We have made note of them and it will not be necessary and, as I understand it, not appropriate for me to deal with them on a clause-by-clause basis as this is not the purpose of second reading.

My hon. friend from Lakeshore (Mr. Lawlor), in his own very articulate and persuasive fashion, has made some suggestions with respect to further consideration to be given to terms such as noxious and offensive. There is a fair amount of jurisprudence in relation to those terms but again it is the intention to protect not just the landlord but other tenants by adopting these terms in relation to prohibiting activity which is only going to be to the detriment of other tenants who are enjoying the premises.

Mr. Cassidy: That's covered in other sections.

Hon. Mr. McMurtry: I'd like to comment briefly on some of the comments of the hon. member for Durham East (Mr. Moffatt) in relation to mobile home parks. We have discussed this problem and again are very concerned about the difficulty some mobile home owners may have in gaining entry to parks, particularly when there is a shortage of parks. I think all members of the House would agree that the only real solution to a problem such as this is to make more mobile home sites available.

In the meantime, and again this is a matter which will be discussed in committee, I think the best answer to my friend's concern—and it is a very legitimate concern—is the remark made by the hon. member for Ottawa Centre (Mr. Cassidy). During his remarks he stated—I don't pretend this is totally accurate quote—he made an observation which I would like to adopt. I believe it is relevant.

That is, the landlord must decide, or be very careful in making the determination at the beginning of any tenancy agreement, whether or not the individual is going to be a decent tenant because of the possible permanency of the relationshp. I think that's a very valid observation. Again, it presents difficulties, in my view, with respect to forcing mobile home park owners to accept any tenant who comes along.

In view of the importance of the initial relationship which is established, one must be aware of those considerations. Again, this gives me some difficulty in relation to making these mobile homes or parks accessible or available to any tenant who comes along, regardless of many other circumstances which I think a mobile home park owner must weigh carefully and fairly and legitimately in order to protect his own interests and the rights of other tenants. insofar as who he accepts as a tenant.

[5:15]

Again, we are very concerned that the legislation be framed in such a way as to ensure that landlords—and indeed tenants, but particularly landlords—act in a bona fide manner at all times with relation to any changes in the tenancy agreement, particularly with respect to evictions. Referring to my friend from Ottawa Centre and his reference to revolving mothers-in-law, again, we welcome any suggestion for changes in order to ensure the bona fides of any evictions in that particular context.

In the matter of obtaining flexible or quick relief for a landlord who is not being paid rent, I don't want to enter into a quarrel with my friend's reading of the sections at this particular time. As I read the sections, my arithmetic comes out a little differently,

but I have never pretended to be a particular expert at arithmetic and this is something that we should deal with at the committee stage.

I do want to say that I subscribe to the concern of the members of the Legislature with respect to not only making the forum readily accessible to landlords or tenants when disputes do arise, but attempting to provide some forum where these disputes can be resolved without a long drawn out legal battle. I can say that in relation to the landlord and tenant courts, if I may put it that way, I intend to explore the possible use of mediators who might be able to assist the parties to reconcile their differences short of a formal court hearing, in order to achieve the ends that both my friend and I and indeed all members of the House wish to achieve.

Mr. Cassidy: That could be the rent review officers who could do that job.

Hon. Mr. McMurtry: Possibly, it is a matter that certainly merits some consideration.

I don't think that there is anything further that I wish to state at this particular time, other than to state again that I appreciate the observations of the hon. members and look forward to working with the members in committee.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

Mr. Speaker: I understand it is to go to committee.

Hon. Mr. Welch: Mr. Speaker, that will go to the select committee considering Bill 20, so that will now be the select committee reviewing Bills 20 and 26.

Agreed.

HIGHWAY TRAFFIC AMENDMENT ACT

Hon. Mr. Snow moved second reading of Bill 27, An Act to amend the Highway Traffic Act.

Mr. Speaker: Does the hon. minister have an opening statement?

Hon. Mr. Snow: No.

An hon. member: Why not?

Mr. Deans: It depends on how you bang your nose on the windshield.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Yorkview.

Mr. Young: Let me say first of all, as I begin this presentation, that this party, while not entirely happy with the bill and with the general concept, will support the principle of Bill 27.

Hon. Mr. Henderson: Poor leadership.

Mr. Samis: At least we are going to obey the law.

Hon. Mr. Henderson: The member for Wentworth will never make a leader.

Mr. Deans: You win some, you lose some.

Mr. Speaker: Order please, let's give the hon. member for Yorkview the opportunity to make his comments.

Mr. Young: Mr. Speaker, you and I can look back over some years of struggle in this field of automobile safety. In the early part of this century as the autombile developed, the automobile companies' general idea was transportation and sales. The design of motor cars was built up with these questions asked: Can we transport people from place to place, and will our particular brand name, Ford, General Motors or call it what you will, sell to the public at large? Sales appeal became the criterion very often of the motor car.

Over the years we saw cars built with sharp points inside and out, cookie cutters on the dashboard, pointed gear shift levers and cranks on the doors, the outside with the points and ragged edges and handles on the doors which caught and tore and destroyed pedestrians. The driver and the pedestrian more and more were being smashed up in collisions because of the configuration of the motor car itself.

Down in New York State in the late 1950s, a group of legislators there, headed by the late Sen. Edward Speno, began to ask what could be done to change this situation. First of all, they came up with the concept that if we could apply to motor cars the same idea of seatbelts that we have in aircraft perhaps we would keep people belted in and the so-called second collision after a car meets an obstacle and then the passenger or the driver moves forward and hits the interior of the car could be avoided.

Speno and his associates in New York began to advocate that seatbelts be installed in motor cars. They had a tough struggle. The motor car industry then and since fought the concept and fought it at every level.

This group did finally succeed, and in New York state legislation was passed installing

lapbelts in motor cars sold within that jurisdiction. From that legislation other states, California, for example, decided they wanted it as well. Then the motor car industry decided that they had to look after the needs of these two very large states it might be wiser, easier and simpler to install these lapbelts in all cars sold in the United States. Washington moved in and that legislation came to pass. Canada followed later on. As we have always done when it comes to car safety, we have followed blindly the lead of the United States. Sometimes that was good and sometimes that was insufficient.

Along with this concept of belts within the cars, there began to emerge the idea that the interior of a car should be modified. Then the lapbelt was not enough. In collisions the anchors were pulled out of the floors, and so standards had to be written to put in more secure anchors. Then the shoulder belt came in and the legislation was fought at every step by the industry.

I recall, and, Mr. Speaker, perhaps you do too, that New York then began to build what they called a safety car which would incorporate not only the belts but a smoothing out of the interior and exterior of the car to build the kind of package which would make it safe for people to ride. And so the safety car was designed.

At one point, Sen. Speno came to this Legislature and spoke to us trying to get our co-operation in financing and in building the safety car. Incorporated in and fundamental to that was the whole concept of the restraint system. Sen. Speno later went to Washington in an advisory capacity and passed away some years ago, and with him the whole concept of a safety car was destroyed with the active co-operation of the Nixon administration down there. It has been shattered and just now is beginning to emerge once more.

One thing I think we saw in those days was that damage to human beings was being needlessly done in situations of collisions and overturns. It was, as I say, needless damage. People were being killed, injured, wounded or crippled for life because of the failure of the motor car industry to incorporate the proper designs.

So we began to think in terms of the seatbelts and forcing people in some way to fasten them up. For awhile we thought that once they were installed, people would use them; but that just didn't happen. Fifteen per cent—up to 25 per cent in some jurisdictions, we were told—were using them. One figure I saw was 33, 34 or 35 per cent, but that was too high.

Mr. Martel: That was on Highway 401 in Metro Toronto.

Mr. Young: I guess that was shown in a survey up there. But the fact is that, by and large, the average citizen sat on the seatbelts or found some way to avoid using them, and he kept smashing himself up. Even though cars became safer as far as the interiors were concerned—the padding, the smoothing out of the dash, then the collapsible steering columns that prevented the spearing of people in the chest, which had happened up to that point—all these things came and, along with that, the hope that seatbelts would solve the problem. But again, people didn't use them. We put buzzers on them, we linked them up to the ignition system, we did all the things we could think of to sort of force people to use them and to remind them that it was not safe to drive without them, but in spite of that people insisted that they were going to have the freedom to decide whether they should use them or not, whether they should die or not and perhaps leave their families helpless, or maim and cripple other passengers in their cars at will.

Finally, we had certain jurisdictions in this world thinking in terms of legislation, saying that people should buckle up; a lot of propaganda or education was carried on. But then the State of Victoria in Australia mandated seatbelts; and since that time other jurisdictions have done the same. In 1971, the year after the State of Victoria had instituted the legislation, the Insurance Institute for Highway Safety funded a survey in that Dominion in which they compared the results of the use of seatbelts in Victoria with the rest of the nation. It was a comparison that was clear-cut and easily demonstrable as to results.

Just to give a quick résumé of what they found: Two Australian researchers compared the experience of the State of Victoria, which as I have said passed the first Australian mandatory safety belt use law in 1970, to the rest of Australia before it had passed such laws. I am quoting now:

> The researchers found that the law resulted in a 21 per cent decrease in highway fatalities in metropolitan areas and a 10 per cent decrease in non-metropolitan areas. The corresponding decreases in injuries were 13 per cent in metropolitan areas, and 11 per cent in non-metropolitan areas.

This research was the first scientific evaluation of this law.

Then we had the University of Southern California instituting a pretty thorough-going study—and I am only going to mention these two; perhaps some others will want to talk of other ones, because many studies have been done. The University of North Carolina completed a study in December, 1974, just last year; they pointed out that in single-vehicle crashes, drivers had 66 per cent fewer serious and fatal crashes at medium speeds, and 53 per cent fewer crashes in the higher speeds. In all crashes at all speeds, the results showed that 43 per cent fewer drivers were affected—that is, by death and serious injury.

And 37 per cent fewer front seat passengers—the death seat, so-called—were affected. That's a rather conclusive figure and it's something which should make us pause and think about this situation.

[5:30]

The Ontario Safety League in a study points out that in 1972 1,934 people were killed in highway collisions while another 189,492 were injured. And they applied costs. They said:

> If we apply the National Safety Council's figures to our own provincial statistics, we find that accident costs in Ontario are a staggering $671,069,318.50.

Now, that's getting it down to some degree of accuracy but, of course, in that there is a great leeway for error. But they go on to to say, "And that comes out of our pocketbooks."

Their study points out that at collision speeds of up to 60 miles per hour, belted motorists come out alive. Unbelted motorists started receiving fatal injuries at speeds as low as 12 miles per hour. Those figures, again, are startling. The minister tells us that he's going to limit the top speed on our major highways to 60, and on the other highways to 55 and 50. Putting those figures with this other one, we may well find that the wearing of seatbelts will guarantee that very few drivers or passengers who are belted will be killed in Ontario in the future, providing the speed is observed and that people are buckled up.

One of the reasons that we're not entirely happy with this legislation—

Hon. Mr. Snow: I thought you were.

Mr. Young: —is that we realize it's only temporary legislation. Coming over the horizon now are the passive restraint systems. There are air bags which will deploy in front of the drivers and the passengers and cushion impact. We will be more efficiently restrained than with seatbelts. However, many experts say that if you have both the belts and the passive restraints then, of course, your chances of survival are much higher.

I don't want today to spend too much time on the passive restraint system which we see coming up, but I do think that it's pertinent to this bill. Right now there are cars travelling the highways in North America equipped with the passive restraint systems. We are told these cars have travelled about 100 million miles and have been involved in about 1,000 crashes, most of them at low speeds which do not trigger the device. But with those devices that were triggered, the experts tell us that the passive restraint system was more effective in saving lives than seatbelts.

In the Province of Quebec, an automobile equipped with air bags saved the lives of the occupants, an entire family. Without the air bag restraints they might have all died. They felt that their lives had been saved by the device.

As far as the passive constraints are concerned we have not yet had quite enough research, perhaps largely because the motor car industry has refused to carry out the kind of research which ought to have been done and should have been done; but it's happening. General Motors, which equipped the cars which are now on the road and has been monitoring them rather carefully, now announces it is going to draw back from supplying them, even as optional devices, over the next few years and have another go at the research end of it.

If I could ask the minister perhaps he'll give us some information: I know that research in the passive restraint situation has been going on in the ministry itself. The University of Toronto department of engineering has been looking into air bags mounted on the steering wheels, I think, and they have come to the place where they are now extremely efficient for small cars. This is the information I have. Yet that research has been short-circuited and it has now ceased and perhaps the minister can tell us why this is so.

This kind of research, it seems to me, is important and it may be that this ministry should be carrying it on in co-operation with other jurisdictions across this country and across the world.

The cost of restraint systems, the automobile industry says, is still fairly high but

the DeLorean Corp. which is working in this field, has told us that right now these passive restraint systems can be made for about $139, although other estimates from the industry itself run much higher than that. DeLorean is convinced that the air cushion systems will cost substantially less than $100 in volume production when the research is finished. Sen. Vance Hartke of Indiana, chairman of the Senate surface transportation subcommittee in Washington said this, "Any increase in the price of new motor vehicles attributable to the promulgation of a passive restraint standard would be more than offset by the savings in materials costs due to the shift towards smaller and lighter cars."

He's pointing out something that I think we all ought to face. We are right now undertaking the design of smaller and more efficient cars—more efficient in the sense of packaging the passengers; more efficient in fuel; more efficient in total operation. As those new cars are being designed, there is no reason why, in that design right now, the air bag should not have a place.

It seems to me we have an opportunity now, if we insist upon it, here in this jurisdiction, to say to the auto makers: "We expect you in your designing of these new and better and smaller cars to build in the feasibility of passive restraint systems, not only the front passive restraints but lateral passive restraints so that lateral damage can be minimized."

Again, we are told that this would be costly but one figure which is rather interesting and which I have here if I can find it—General Motors Corp. claims that air bags would cause modifications costing $30 which would not otherwise be required. In other words, while other people were saying it wouldn't cost much, General Motors says the figure's around $30 for the kind of modification to its design which would provide for the air bags. This situation, it seems to me is one which we ought to look at very closely, and while legislation is now being passed to make the use of seatbelts mandatory, we should be looking ahead to the new design of the new cars which would not only make the seatbelts mandatory but which would incorporate the idea of passive restraint systems for the cars.

As far as weight is concerned in the passive restraint system, Volvo tells us that 30 lb seems to be the maximum weight that it is necessary to add to the cars, and while some of the companies are saying this is going to mean more gasoline to carry them around and all the rest of it, 30 lb is neither here nor there in the total weight of a car.

Again, one of the things that we are a bit concerned about is that this legislation be now looked upon as a complete package. I mentioned the passive restraint system which we think should be part of the total overall package. There is also the idea of better belts. I think of what has happened up to this point without the real co-operation of the industry.

The car which I drive, for example, has a belt which comes apart very easily in the centre; it's not the kind that many other cars have because it comes apart and is a nuisance that way. Also, the car manufacturer has put a little slot in the carpet to my left so that I can tuck the end of the seatbelt in and stop the buzzer. Why that was ever allowed I'm not sure, but it's there, not only on my side but on my wife's side.

That's the kind of co-operation which the industry gave, I suppose to the people who didn't want to use seatbelts. They were circumventing the whole philosophy of the seatbelt idea. We have to get better standards for seatbelts so that efficient seatbelts are easily fastened and are in one piece, over the shoulder and around the waist, and are efficient, effective and easy to handle.

Then there is the whole matter of driver training and licensing of drivers which I think we must look at. I'm not going to spend any time on it today, but that is part of it. The regular inspection of cars, which I mentioned in the introduction of my bill yesterday to this effect—all these things are part of the total package which must come and which must supplement the wearing of seatbelts.

We hear objections to this whole concept, such as the matter of personal freedom. I'm not too concerned about this objection, because all around me I see the gradual abridgement of personal freedom in the interest of society at large. I suppose the person who is a real free enterpriser would say, "I want the right to drive a Sherman tank down the highway and drive when I want to go and at the speed I want to go and no regulations for me." Society long ago gave up that concept, and so we have rules and regulations of all kinds. In connection with the motor car industry and the transportation industry, we demand all sorts of things which do limit human freedom and we even ask for licences and for tests, these things which I just said should be more effective, but we demand them and will curtail personal freedom in a thousand ways and again I'm not

going to elaborate on this. Perhaps others will want to.

Then we have this argument that seatbelts will confine people to cars. They can't get out easily. In case of a fire or a serious accident, they can't jump out. That's the whole point of the thing. Again I will quote, if I can find the quotation, from one of the ministry's own publications, "The Human Collision," which I suppose all of you have received. The studies in Sweden are quoted as well as others. It says:

> Various studies have investigated whether it is better to be "thrown clear," as some people claim. The risk of death or serious injury is many times greater if the person is thrown out of the car. About one-quarter of all passenger and driver deaths result from being thrown out."

This is a fact which has been known: When people are thrown clear of a car they hit their heads, or another car hits them or they roll over on the pavement or in the ditch and they are destroyed.

[5:45]

One study estimates that about 80 per cent of those deaths could have been prevented if the person had stayed in the car. I remember one rather graphic incident of an accident in Britain when people were burned because they just couldn't get out of that car quickly enough. Whether or not they would have unbuckled the belts and got out is a moot question but they sued on that basis—at least the relatives did. Again, experience has shown that when a person is not restrained inside the car in an accident situation he may be thrown out the window, out the back or out the side as the doors spring open and he dies on the road because of that ejection. Whereas if he'd been restrained and kept inside he would have lived to walk away. I have very little patience with the arguments about being confined to the cars or the curtailment of freedom; because in the interests of society we have to face these things.

The person who wants his own freedom to do these kind of things forgets that if he's killed because he doesn't wear the seatbelt his family is left for society to look after. His relatives have sorrow and suffering. Of course, the cost to society, as I've already pointed out, is very great because of our failure to wear the seatbelts in Ontario and across the world.

I think there are two or three other things we have to face. One is that there is fear that the legislation may give insurance companies the chance to assess damages under negligence; that because a person is not wearing a seatbelt, the company is not responsible.

Already our courts are taking this into consideration and whether or not a person is wearing a seatbelt is weighed in the final verdict in our courts today. While this may give the insurance companies a bit more leverage, I think the minister has to face up to the fact that, in co-operation with the Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations, legislation must come in to make certain the insurance companies can't use this to their advantage. I think that should be a companion piece of legislation and the minister should think seriously about it.

On the matter of children, if they are very young children they should not wear seatbelts. We are told they should not be worn under four years of age or under 40 lb.; and that under 55 ins. no shoulder belts should be used. But there are devices now on the market; some are rather good ones but some should be banned from our stores. Three, at least, are outstanding and will save lives if the children are properly put into them and properly buckled up. The children have the right, the same as the adults, to safety inside; and I would hope that this will be considered very seriously, not only by the minister but by all parents who take their children in motor cars.

There is just one other thing which I think the minister ought to look at in the clause by clause reading. That's clause 1 subsection (2) which says,

> No person shall drive on a highway a motor vehicle in which a seatbelt assembly, required under the provisions of the Motor Vehicle Safety Act, Canada, at the time that the vehicle was manufactured or imported into Canada, has been removed, modified or rendered partly or wholly inoperative.

I think the meaning there should be "modified to render it partly or wholly inoperative." Many people who have lapbelts may want to add the shoulderbelt or may want to modify the belt in order to make it more effective and more efficient. Perhaps the minister could consider an amendment to this. If he doesn't consider it of course we will offer one, but I think certainly he sees the sense of that and would be willing to get a form of words which would indicate that modification downward not be allowed but modification upward to make more safety might well be in order.

I think that is all I have to put before the House in connection with this bill. We are

pleased that it is being brought forward. We think it is an interim measure and certain considerations should be taken into account, because it is only a partial answer to the whole problem. We hope the minister will take a careful look at the things I have brought before him this afternoon and that together, as a Legislature, we can work out the kind of transportation safety and the kind of more efficient motor cars which the people of this province deserve.

Mr. Reid: Mr. Speaker, I will try to confine my remarks primarily to the principle of the bill in standing as the official spokesman for the Liberal Party and for the Liberal-Labour Party—

Mr. Bain: That's an anachronism. You're the only spokesman.

Hon. J. R. Smith: Take me to your leader.

Mr. Roy: He's the leader of that party.

Hon. Mr. Snow: He's the leader of the Liberal Party.

Mr. Reid: —to tell you that we will support the bill.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Mr. Reid: I don't know why some of us are pussy-footing around this particular bill, because I think as legislators in the Province of Ontario we have a clear and present duty to pass this legislation and to have it operable as soon as possible.

I think that we shirked our duty last year when the government backed down, under what they saw as public pressure, from bringing in such legislation. My friend and colleague who just spoke has referred to a number of studies. I will refer to a number more.

We can look at the glossy offerings of the Ministry of Transportation and Communications, which they put out instead of bringing in the legislation. We can read their report, "Motor Vehicle Collision Facts 1974."

The evidence is obvious; there is no question about it. There have been studies done all over the world and they all come to the same conclusion: The use of seatbelts cuts down on the number of deaths on highways and on the number of serious injuries in automobiles on the roads.

That fact is obvious, and for some hon. members to stand in this chamber, and maybe outside, and say they are not going to support this legislation, perhaps because they think it is against civil liberties or because some of their constituents feel that it is an imposition on them. I think is an abnegation of the responsibility that all of us have. I don't think there is anyone here who is convinced otherwise—

Mr. Moffatt: You are skirting the principle of the bill.

Mr. Samis: Standing one way or the other, that's not abrogation.

Mr. Reid: —that seatbelts are going to save lives. That's the principle of the bill. The second principle is that we have a responsibility to the entire community of Ontario to support legislation such as this.

Mr. Samis: The leader of the Liberal-Labour Party.

Mr. Reid: Mr. Speaker, it is rather interesting that a year ago we had a situation in Brampton, I believe, where a young man walked into a school with a rifle and killed two or three people; and the papers were full of nothing else. Every day on our highways, and in the streets of Toronto and in every community, there are lives lost by car accidents that could be saved by the use of seatbelts. Perhaps the use of seatbelts isn't quite as dramatic as somebody taking a rifle and shooting somebody. But the end result is exactly the same, except the horror and the loss are multiplied a thousand times.

There is no question that we need this legislation. There is no question that we should have had the intestinal fortitude to bring it in before.

I am a licensed pilot and I can tell you, as a pilot, that the first thing you do when you get in your airplane is do up your seatbelt. In my years of flying, I have yet to see any pilot, or even people who ride in airplanes, who do not do up their seatbelts automatically. It becomes a habit; you realize that it is necessary and there is really no problem with it at all. The result of this legislation is going to be that within a very few months people are going to be in the same position. When you get on an airplane, a commercial airliner, you do up your seatbelt. If you don't, they throw you off the airplane. And there is a reason for that, because it could save your life if something happens. So, obviously, this legislation is going to do the same thing.

The previous speaker was quoting some statistics from the Ontario Safety League. He was recounting just how much accidents cost the people of Ontario. If we abstract from the loss of human life and the trauma of it, obviously it's costing the taxpayers a

great deal of money for accidents in the province—and it varies, depending on whose statistics you read. In the Special Programme Review Committee booklet we just received, they estimate the universal usage of seatbelts would reduce injuries and deaths by 20 per cent, and effect cost savings of $35 million in health care.

Usually the figure we hear quoted for the savings is something like $50 million. But, obviously, the main reason is for the lives that it's going to save.

I would like to quote some of the reports on research that has been done around the world. The Cornell automotive crash injury research programme established there were 50 per cent fewer dangerous and fatal injuries to the seatbelt wearer, compared to experience of those who do not use seatbelts.

Their most recent study indicates that the failure to use seatbelts increases the risk of instant death or severe injury by at least 100 per cent, and of less severe injury by at least 40 per cent.

I would like to quote from another study, because we had a member here who objected to seatbelts in the last session. He had been in an accident and had been thrown clear of the automobile. He felt, therefore, that the non-use of the belt had saved his life. A paper put out by gentlemen by the name of Pilkey, Sherman and O'Day—all good Irishmen—came to this conclusion:

> Not only are injuries produced by the direct impact of one occupant on another, but often such contact forces an occupant into or against some interior car structure. Such occupant-to-occupant contact may cause an injury that would not have been sustained, or produces a more serious injury that would not have been incurred had such contact been prevented.

Mr. Speaker: I would draw to the hon. member's attention that it is time to conclude and perhaps he might reach a convenient spot to adjourn the debate.

Mr. Reid: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I would just like to refer very briefly to a Dutch study that proved that the use of seatbelts kept people in the car and that, in effect, this was what should happen to save lives and avoid injuries.

A lot of people say: "Well, if you go into the water, into a lake, and you have your seatbelt on, it will constrict you so you can't get out. The report showed that in those cases, if a car went over a cliff or into water, usually the occupants were knocked out and were unconscious and so would not have been able to get out of the cars. With seatbelts on, obviously, they didn't bang their heads against anything, weren't unconscious, and so were able to survive.

Mr. Speaker, there are others who are interested in this bill. I would like to reiterate that this party will support the bill. I would suggest to all members that it's their responsibility to support this kind of legislation.

Mr. Speaker: The Chair will recognize the hon. member for Mississauga South at 8 o'clock.

Mr. Kennedy moved the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to.

The House recessed at 6 p.m.

CONTENTS

Tuesday, November 25, 1975

Influence on daycare programme, point of privilege by Mrs. Birch 905

Extension for return of assessment rolls, statement by Mr. Meen 906

Credit rules for women, statement by Mr. Handleman 906

Egg marketing board quotas, statement by Mr. W. Newman 907

Paperworkers' strike, questions of Mr. Davis and B. Stephenson: Mr. Lewis, Mr. Nixon, Mr. Swart 907

Salary increases by education boards, question of Mr. Wells: Mr. Lewis 908

Transfer payments from Canada Assistance plan, questions of Mr. McKeough: Mr. Lewis, Mr. Nixon 908

Operations of media office, question of Mr. Davis: Mr. Lewis 910

Payment of funds to municipalities, questions of Mr. McKeough: Mr. Shore, Mr. Cassidy, Mr. Good, Mr. Bullbrook 910

Canadian of the year, question of Mr. Davis: Mr. Yakabuski 912

Armstrong assistance programme, question of Mr. Irvine: Mr. Stokes 913

Discrimination in CFL, question of B. Stephenson: Mr. Roy 913

Book publishing by Centennial College, question of Mr. Parrott: Mr. Reid 914

Pseudo leasing practices, question of Mr. Snow: Mr. Young 914

Home buyer grant, questions of Mr. Meen: Mr. B. Newman, Mr. Ruston 915

Payments for cow-calf programme, question of Mr. W. Newman: Mr. Wiseman 915

Water pollution, question of Mr. Kerr: Mr. Wildman 915

Use of funds by Ryerson, question of Mr. Parrott: Mr. Sweeney 916

Uniform building code, question of Mr. Handleman: Mr. Williams 916

Labour relations amendment act, question of B. Stephenson: Mr. Bounsall 916

Minimum wage, question of B. Stephenson: Mr. Riddell 916

Death of inmate at Ottawa-Carleton detention centre, questions of Mr. J. R. Smith: Mr. Morrow, Mr. Roy 916

Mercury lamp hazards, question of Mr. F. S. Miller: Mr. Burr 917

Cow-calf programme, question of Mr. W. Newman: Mr. McKessock 917

Peterborough jail, question of Mr. J. R. Smith: Mrs. Sandeman 917

Comments by member for St. Catharines, question to Mr. McMurtry: Mr. S. Smith 917

Wintario funds, question of Mr. Welch: Mr. Eaton 918

Landlord and Tenant Amendment Act, Mr. McMurtry, second reading 918

Highway Traffic Amendment Act, Mr. Snow on second reading 939

Recess 945

SPEAKERS IN THIS ISSUE

Angus, I. (Fort William NDP)
Birch, Hon. M. Provincial Secretary for Social Development (Scarborough East PC)
Bounsall, E. J. (Windsor-Sandwich NDP)
Bullbrook, J. E. (Sarnia L)
Burr, F. A. (Windsor-Riverside NDP)
Campbell, M. (St. George L)
Cassidy, M. (Ottawa Centre NDP)
Davis, Hon. W. G. Premier (Brampton PC)
Deans, I. (Wentworth NDP)
Eaton, R. G. (Middlesex PC)
Ferrier, W. (Cochrane South NDP)
Foulds, J. F. (Port Arthur NDP)
Gaunt, M. (Huron-Bruce L)
Givens, P. G. (Armourdale L)
Good, E. R. (Waterloo North L)
Handleman, Hon. S. B. Consumer and Commercial Relations (Carleton PC)
Henderson, Hon. L. C. Minister without Portfolio (Lambton PC)
Irvine, Hon. D. R. Provincial Secretary for Resources Development (Carleton-Grenville PC)
Kennedy, R. D. (Mississauga South PC)
Kerr, Hon. G. A. Environment (Burlington South PC)
Laughren, F. (Nickel Belt NDP)
Lawlor, P. D. (Lakeshore NDP)
Lewis, S. Leader of the Opposition (Scarborough West NDP)
MacBeth Hon. J. P. Provincial Secretary for Justice and Solicitor General (Humber PC)
MacDonald, D. C. (York South NDP)
Mancini, R. (Essex South L)
Martel, E. W. (Sudbury East NDP)
McClellan, R. (Bellwoods NDP)
McKeough, Hon. W. D. Treasurer, Minister of Economics and Intergovernmental Affairs (Chatham-Kent PC)
McKessock, R. (Grey L)
McMurtry, Hon. R. Attorney General (Eglinton PC)
Meen, Hon. A. K. Revenue (York East PC)
Miller, Hon. F. S. Health (Muskoka PC)
Miller, G. I. (Haldimand-Norfolk L)
Moffatt, D. (Durham East NDP)
Morrow, D. H. (Ottawa West PC)
Newman B. (Windsor-Walkerville L)
Newman, Hon. W. Agriculture and Food (Durham North PC)
Nixon, R. F. (Brant-Oxford-Norfolk L)
O'Neil, H. (Quinte L)
Parrott, Hon. H. C. Colleges and Universities (Oxford PC)
Reid, T. P. (Rainy River L)
Riddell, J. (Huron-Middlesex L)
Roy, A. J. (Ottawa East L)
Ruston, R. F. (Essex North L)
Samis, G. (Cornwall NDP)
Sandeman, G. (Peterborough NDP)
Sargent, E. (Grey-Bruce L)
Shore, M. (London North L)
Smith, Hon. J. R. Correctional Services (Hamilton Mountain PC)
Smith, R. S. (Nipissing L)
Smith, S. (Hamilton West L)
Snow, Hon. J. W. Transportation and Communications (Oakville PC)

Stephenson, Hon. B. Labour (York Mills PC)
Stokes, J. E. (Lake Nipigon NDP)
Stong, A. (York Centre L)
Swart, M. (Welland NDP)
Sweeney, J. (Kitchener-Wilmot L)
Warner, D. (Scarborough-Ellesmere NDP)
Welch, Hon. R. Culture and Recreation (Brock PC)
Wells, Hon. T. L. Education (Scarborough North PC)
Wildman, B. (Algoma NDP)
Williams, J. (Oriole PC)
Wiseman, D. J. (Lanark PC)
Yakabuski, P. J. (Renfrew South PC)
Young, F. (Yorkview NDP)

No. 24



Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT — DAILY EDITION

First Session of the Thirtieth Legislature

Tuesday, November 25, 1975

Evening Session

Speaker: Honourable Russell Daniel Rowe
Clerk: Roderick Lewis, QC

THE QUEEN'S PRINTER
PARLIAMENT BUILDINGS, TORONTO
1975

CONTENTS

A list of the speakers taking part in the debates in this issue of Hansard appears, in alphabetical order, at the back of this issue.

Daily contents of proceedings also appears at the back of this issue. Reference to a cumulative index of previous issues can be obtained by calling the Hansard Reporting Service indexing staff. Phone 965-2159.

Hansard subscription price is $15.00 per session, from: Sessional Subscription Service, MCS, 9th Floor, Ferguson Block, Parliament Bldgs., Toronto, M7A 1N3. Phone 965-2238.

LEGISLATURE OF ONTARIO

The House resumed at 8 p.m.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Yorkview.

Mr. Young: I ask the House to welcome the Ninth Downsview Scout Troop sitting in the gallery to watch the processes of democracy. I'm sure we're all glad to see them.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Beaches-Woodbine.

Mrs. Bryden: Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the House to welcome the 188th Girl Guide Company from Williamson Rd. School, who are sitting in the east gallery with Mrs. Brenda Reddick, their captain.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Mississauga East.

Mr. Gregory: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. May I ask the House to welcome members of the 54th Boy Scout Company from the beautiful land of Mississauga East.

HIGHWAY TRAFFIC AMENDMENT ACT
(continued)

Mr. Speaker: I believe when we rose at 6 o'clock, the hon. member for Mississauga South had the floor.

Mr. Kennedy: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Although I adjourned the debate, the member for Ottawa East asked if I might yield the floor, as he has an engagement in a few minutes and would like to speak first. If it's your pleasure and that of the House, I would be glad to yield.

Mr. Speaker: I think that would be agreeable. The hon. member for Ottawa East.

Mr. Roy: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. May I thank the member for Mississauga South for his discretion in allowing me to proceed, and I also want to thank the members of the NDP caucus for allowing me to proceed. I intend to be relatively brief, but I do want to say that we as a party are in full support of this legislation. I find it unfortunate that the legislation was not introduced in 1974. If one looks at all the statistics—and I suppose I could review the statistics from various countries—but if you translate these statistics, I think it is clear that had seatbelt legislation been proclaimed or been enacted in this House in 1974, we would have saved probably a hundred lives in this province last year and probably saved in the area of $50 million in provincial funds.

These statistics are so overwhelming that one can't help but accept this type of legislation. As you know, I proposed two bills last year that I considered should run parallel. I proposed seatbelt legislation last year and presented these bills to the House, and I have done so again this year. I think it was under Bill 23. In fact the minister had the good sense, when enacting Bill 26, to follow the legislation—

Hon. Mr. Snow: Bill 27.

Mr. Roy: Bill 27—that he had the good fortune and good sense to follow nearly word for word Bill 23, which I had proposed earlier.

As well I proposed legislation to reduce the speed limits, which I felt should run parallel to this type of legislation. The government has also adopted that legislation in part and has proceeded with it.

I do want to say that I can't help but feel sorry that the government did not proceed last year with this legislation. Because what happened is that the government was prepared to follow public opinion polls rather than give leadership in this field. From the statistics—from the number of deaths, injuries and the costs—all the reasons for passing legislation existed in 1974. In fact, seatbelt legislation has been in force in Australia since 1970 and in France even earlier. Had the government proceeded with legislation, it could in fact have saved about 100 lives and maybe $50 million last year. I really don't see what has more priority than that in this province.

I do want to congratulate this minister and his administration. Whether it's a fact that it is in a minority situation, whether it's a fact that it got a message in September, 1975, that it might be more responsive to

the type of legislation which was in the best interests of society—in any event, whatever the government's motives, the minister is to be congratulated for having brought forth this legislation.

I just want to deal briefly with two aspects of it. I want to deal with objections that have been put forth by many members of the House, and I think have been put forth in good faith. All members are concerned about this legislation, I think all members have probably received phone calls, and in fact many members have had personal experiences with seatbelts. Many members have a certain amount of apprehension about the enforcement of seatbelt legislation, so I want to deal with basically two aspects that have been brought out as objections to seatbelt legislation.

The first one is the civil rights advocate who says that seatbelts in fact trample on civil liberties. "Here we go again, the government telling the individual what to do in this province." It's not the first time, I suppose, in the history of government that we've been forced to enact legislation which in some ways tramples on the liberties and the freedoms of the individual.

I think back to when the government of Canada proposed legislation for the breathalyser. If ever anyone wanted to point to legislation that trampled on civil rights, it was the breathalyser legislation. Not only did it force you to blow into the machine, but at the same time, the test could be used against you. That very legislation ran counter to one of the fundamental principles of criminal law—that is that you should not be forced to testify against yourself. There was a lot of opposition to it.

But in 1975 I don't think there are very many members, in fact very many people who are responsible for representing others—politicians or otherwise; people in government—who would be prepared today to argue against the breathalyser legislation. In fact, we're considering going even further with that type of legislation and setting up breathalyser tests on the roadside or having some sort of test given by setting up roadblocks.

Mr. Speaker, you will recall yourself when we enacted legislation in this House dealing with helmets for people on motorcycles. Just last spring we were dealing with legislation and we prevailed on the Minister of Transportation and Communications at that time to have legislation to force people on mopeds to wear a certain form of helmet.

So it's always the same principle at stake, between the rights of the indivdual and the rights of society at large. There will be the individual who says, "Well, if I don't feel like putting on my seatbelt and I want to run against a cement wall and I break my neck, that is my own business." In principle, I suppose he's right. The problem that arises is that if he does not succeed in doing that and is only injured, then all of us have to pay for his recuperation.

All we are doing with this legislation is following what other segments of society are doing. Insurance companies are now assessing damages and even negligence on the basis of wearing or not wearing seatbelts, and courts are moving in that direction as well. I'm not sure whether there is any jurisprudence right on point, but I do recall being involved as a litigant in some court actions when people or counsel on the other side were consistently raising the fact that there may well have been contributory negligence in the case when the individual was not wearing his seatbelt. So basically, what we are doing, I'm suggesting, is enacting what society at large is prepared to accept.

The other argument is made that this is unpopular law and that people will not follow it. I just go back to the Australian experiment. At the time prior to legislation in Australia, I think about 17 per cent or 15 per cent of the people were using seatbelts. The statistics that I have, indicate that after the enactment of legislation, 80 per cent of the people decided to wear their seatbelts. From what I know of Australians, I think they're as independent as we are here. In France, it is the same thing. In France, you just raise a tax and you get a revolution. There, the seatbelt was not something that was accepted by popular acclaim either, but they're buckling up and their statistics reflect the fact that seatbelts are mandatory in that country.

The final matter I want to deal with is the enforcement. People have said we can enact this legislation but it's unenforceable; the enforcement is going to be difficult. I really don't understand that argument. How is it more difficult to enforce the use of seatbelts, for instance, than it is to have your driver's licence in your wallet? How does a police officer tell, when a car is speeding along the highway, if the individual has a driver's licence or his car is mechanically fit?

Speed limits are the same thing. Sure some people breach the laws dealing with speed limits, but by and large the fact that the law is there, that there is a small deterrent, that there is a fine there, only reinforces

the fact that people are generally law abiding and will follow the law.

To me, saying that it is difficult to enforce doesn't stand, because there are a whole series of laws which are not more obvious than seatbelts, and if some people want to buckle up and say to the police officer "I'm going to buckle up just to avoid the law," I suggest that is going to be the exception. By and large, the people of Ontario will accept the law for what it is. It is a piece of social legislation for the benefit of all people in Ontario.

The final point I want to make briefly is simply this: I think it is going to require, on the part of the police, the law enforcement agency, a certain amount of common sense in the enforcement of it. I think over a period of time, as people accept seatbelts for what they are, there will be buckling up. I suggest that the Attorney General, or possibly the Solicitor General—or I should direct this, I suppose, to the minister here, that he should discuss it with the Solicitor General in charge of law enforcement agencies—that the law be applied reasonably and logically; that we don't start overnight after the law has been proclaimed to set up roadblocks to see if people are wearing their seatbelts. I'm convinced that will not happen, but I would like to see a reasonable enforcement of the law.

I'm convinced that in a few years people will accept this legislation for what it is, and the people of Ontario will understand that by enacting this type of legislation we in this House have accepted our responsibility for all of the people of Ontario.

Mr. Kennedy: Mr. Speaker, about five years ago there was a terrible tragedy, a plane crash at Malton, which took 109 lives. It made headlines around the world. The grief and sorrow of that still remains with us. Multiply by about 15 times the grief and sorrow associated with that and one will begin to get some conception of the extent of the carnage on our highways. On a visit to Australia, I was in Sydney at the time, their mandatory law requiring the wearing of seatbelts came into force. I had not bothered with the use of them. I thought I had better obey the laws—when in Rome do as they do—and after a day or two of discomfort it became second habit. One started the car, put that belt on and in no time at all it was part of our mode of travelling.

Speaking to the bill for a moment, I commend the minister for bringing this forward, the government for screwing up its courage and bringing it to the advanced stage that it is now, and also the members who have spoken and are to speak with respect to this proposed legislation.

[8:15]

There are just a couple of points that concern me with the bill. One is the tender age at which the enforcement becomes applicable; two years old. I'm not sure what the age should be where restraining devices, as applied to youngsters, are made mandatory, but I might point out that the children's automobile safety research committee, in a report—it's not dated but I think it was within the last year or so—points out that its researchers expressed concern about placing children in lap belts before the age of seven or about 50 to 60 lb; yet most car seats can handle only up to 40 lb, it says here. The other interesting statistic in this article is that few people realize that if a child weighs only 10 lb and he is in a car travelling at 30 mph, he has an effective weight of 300 lb. So I'm not sure if a child just out of the infant stage is better protected by a lap belt or some other device. That leads me to my second point.

There is a great variation in the quality or more accurately, I think, the comfort of seatbelts. Some are hardly noticeable, while others seem to draw in on you and there is some discomfort with them. I think this legislation might give the industry an incentive to do further research on this subject and to come forward with something that is less constraining while doing the job for people. Perhaps the day will come when the used car salesman will use the quality and comfort of the seatbelt as a selling point. This could very well be.

At the time I moved the introduction of the bill in 1973, actually 2½ years ago, there was evidence—and I'm not going to add to the statistics, which everyone here know—that there would be a 20 to 25 per cent reduction in fatalities and perhaps an even greater reduction in injuries.

We know the huge medical, social and property costs; the bereavement and grief, of which I have spoken; law suits and prolonged legal actions. We know, based on the experience with the mandatory wearing of seatbelts, that we could adapt ourselves to this feature and cut out much of those subjects I have mentioned. We also know, based on the evidence we have, that about 250 lives would be saved each year here in Ontario, as well as countless injuries.

The matter of a so-called infringement of our civil liberties is really a small bother in

comparison to the benefits which can be projected into the benefits associated with the programme.

I want to make brief reference to some authorities that I deem to be authorities on this subject. In an article in the local evening paper, Ray Stapley laments the fact that we pay so much for a car, including this safety feature, and then we don't utilize it. He re-refers to Swedish auto statistics, which I hadn't seen in quite this context:

> One out of every 2,434 belted occupants was killed, while one out of 244 unbelted occupants was killed. Therefore, the chance of survival is 90 per cent greater if you are protected by the safety harness.

He goes on to say he can't understand why anyone would venture out on to a highway without that restraining device in place.

Cornell conducted a study in response to all those people who seem to be able to relate that they know of someone whose life was saved because he was not wearing a seatbelt, whereas he would have been killed if he had been wearing it. I don't know how they know this, because at best it can only be subjective. But Cornell's latest figures show that persons are 30 times as likely to be killed if they are thrown out of a car than if they remain inside. That speaks for itself.

We're told that without the wearing of a seatbelt the likelihood of a multiple collision, that is to say a multiple impact, is eight per cent greater than if the belt is being worn, because you lose control of the car, the vehicle.

Hospitals in Australia are reporting a 24 per cent drop in bed occupancy since introduction of the law. They have other statistics which prove the benefits.

The Ontario Safety League came out very strongly last year with many statistics and figures in support of such use. Unbelted motorists started receiving fatal injuries at speeds as low as 12-miles-per-hour. Yet some other statistics, I think the member for Yorkview would sustain me on this, stated that at 60-miles-an-hour, with belts, fatalities were avoided.

An interesting sheet from the Department of National Health and Welfare came to my attention and this lists the causes of mortality among different age groups of our populace. In the 20 to 24 age group almost half the mortality was due to motor vehicle accidents.

I am pleased to have the opportunity to make my views known again on this subject. I wanted to touch briefly again on the so-called infringement of personal liberties and I endorse what the member for Ottawa East (Mr. Roy) has brought forward. If it is perchance deemed to be an intrusion into our civil or personal liberties, certainly it is no more than the compulsory wearing of safety helmets, motorcycle helmets, safety shoes and, as he pointed out, the breathalyser test.

Mr. Bullbrook: Of course, the breathalyser is no analogy at all. You shouldn't accept what he says.

Mr. Hodgson: Have you just entered the leadership race?

Mr. Bullbrook: No. The safety helmets are fine, but why do you talk about breathalysers? They're not analogous at all.

Hon. Mr. Henderson: You're in full bloom.

Mr. Kennedy: I don't think the hon. member was in here when his colleague spoke. What he was saying was, at the time the breathalyser test was brought in, this was the basis of a substantial attack against it. It just doesn't hold up.

I have a little clipping here from Australia with respect to enforcement; it might be interesting.

> Discussions with police in Victoria have not brought to light any particular difficulties in enforcing the law. They have not been required to prey on motorists to ensure compliance, mainly because they do not have to. Seatbelt wearing is now regarded in Australia as the accepted behaviour and not the exception.

I'm not going to speak at any length on this. I'm pleased the Legislature is doing this. I'm sure the public will join with us in considering the overall results of the carnage on our highways, and against that, the small intrusion, if we want to use that terminology, of requiring the use of these safety devices. When we bring together all this material, all the evidence, and examine it calmly without any prejudice, we can only come to one conclusion. Use of seatbelts is to the benefit of all of us and so I urge the passage of the bill and acceptance by the public. I am sure this will result in more lives saved, and happier lives, in the years ahead.

Mr. Swart: Mr. Speaker, I think most of the arguments that ought to be made and could be made in support of the compulsory seatbelt legislation have been made so far in the debate. However, I am going to repeat

some of the things that have been said and give some further evidence in this regard. I do this because I think it is important that here in this Legislature we take a strong stand, that we give the reasons which we believe make it necessary for this legislation to be enacted, and that we give to the public the reasons for which they should support this.

I suggest that public opinion in support of this, if it is going to be effective, is important. As has already been said, I suggest that we got this legislation because of public opinion. It was introduced because of public opinion—that public opinion that was expressed on Sept. 18 and caused the government to reconsider some of the things that it had done and had not done prior to that time.

Just as an aside, I suppose my giving up my time to give priority to the member for Ottawa East, who has now left, probably had something to do, too, with the public opinion which was expressed on Sept. 18—that opinion that finds some in that caucus having to make frequent trips, those who aspire perhaps to be leader of that party as a result of the public opinion on Sept. 18.

I think we all recognize that this proposed legislation is not the total or the ultimate answer to the prevention and reduction of highway accidents and deaths and injuries. But I do suggest that this type of legislation will always be valuable in providing something in addition to what all of the other safety features can provide. Whether it's making cars safer by redesigning the interior and the exterior, whether it's the reduction of the speed limit, or whatever other measures are developed to make the use of the automobile more safe, this will still add something to them. It is legislation which should be permanent.

I suppose a discussion on this subject could be divided into five parts and we would cover everything in a discussion of those five parts. The first of those parts is: Does the voluntary plan work? Whether it is in Ontario or elsewhere, does voluntary buckling up work? Second, is this sort of legislation innovative? Is it new? Third, can it be made effective? Will there be compliance with the law? Fourth, does it in fact save lives and reduce injuries and reduce costs? Fifth, and finally—and this has been covered by other speakers, as they all have—is it the type of compulsion or restriction of our civil liberties that will be tolerated? Are the health and the economic benefits from it worth the price of any loss of civil liberty?

[8:30]

I want to deal briefly with each of these five parts. There is ample evidence to show that the voluntary buckling up without compulsory legislation just simply doesn't work. There is an article in the June 22, 1974, journal of the Canadian Medical Association by a Dr. D. J. Hauser who gives a great deal of information. He deals there with the question of voluntary buckling up and what has happened in other jurisdictions. He talks about the very sophisticated advertising campaign that was done in England and the results of that—something like the advertising campaign, I presume, that has been done in Ontario recently. Then he goes on to say:

> The response at first was excellent. After three months, the seatbelt wearing rate doubled from 15 per cent to 30 per cent. However, the campaign is continuing but the wearing rate has been stabilized.

Another more experimental campaign was carried out in the United States to test the effectiveness of a television campaign alone. The campaign was well controlled, using two equivalent viewing populations in one city. The advertisements had won advertising industry prizes for originality. However, after nine months, both experimental and controlled groups had the same 18 per cent wearing rate.

Also, the motor vehicle collision facts which were presented to us earlier in this session show that of those who had seatbelts in their cars, and were known to be buckled up was only something like 16.3 per cent of those who were involved in accidents, even after the advertising campaign which has been done. Perhaps some of my colleagues wouldn't mind me saying that even in our caucus, to show how ineffective voluntary buckling up is, two of my colleagues said that they believe it is a good idea. They said they don't use them now but if compulsory legislation is enacted they will use them. I don't think there's any question—

Mr. Good: Your House leader wouldn't even buckle his lip.

Mr. Moffatt: Is that the member for Waterloo North? That is not like him.

Mr. Swart: —that voluntary buckling up doesn't work in any jurisdiction. Is it new? Of course it is not new. We have had evidence here already of the countries and the states which have introduced such legislation. This same article points out that some 22 states in United States last year proposed compulsory seatbelt legislation.

Hon. Mr. Snow: How many passed it?

Mr. Swart: Not very many, but it was proposed, and perhaps in the same way as here, once it has been proposed, the idea will take hold and even a reluctant government may be willing to bring in such legislation. It certainly can be made effective. Other speakers too have covered this point. Will there be non-compliance?

Again the report by Dr. Hauser shows that it is effective where it has been introduced and where they have tried to enforce it. It states here that the most immediate effect of the legislation was the doubling of the safety-belt wearing rate literally overnight—and this is in Australia. Prior to the legislation the wearing rate was 20 per cent. Six months afterwards it was 75 per cent. Now three years later, it is 80 per cent with a higher wearing rate observed in the cities than in the rural areas.

I am going to another jurisdiction. In the first 10 months after the law was enacted in New Zealand, there was a doubling of the seatbelt usage rate, a slight reduction in the deaths of front-seat occupants and a reduction in the severity of injuries sustained by belted occupants. At the same time as that reduction was taking place, drivers who were not wearing seatbelts had an increase in fatalities of something like 40 per cent.

I think it has been amply proved that it does save lives and it does reduce injuries. I would like to give two or three quotes in addition to what have already been given in this regard. The Cornell automotive crash injury research programme, which has been quoted here before, established that there were 50 per cent fewer dangerous and fatal injuries to belt wearers compared to non-belt wearers.

A recent study at the University of North Carolina of 8,822 cases of 1967 and 1969 model cars involved in accidents shows that through the use of lapbelts an overall reduction of 43 per cent in serious and fatal injuries in frontal collisions were reduced 32 per cent; serious and fatal injuries in single-car off-the-road accidents were reduced 49.5 per cent through the use of the lapbelt.

Again, the Cornell laboratory's most recent study indicates that the failure to use seatbelts increases the risks of instant death or severe injury by at least 100 per cent and of less severe injury by at least 40 per cent.

Hospitals in Australia are reporting a 24 per cent drop in bed occupancy since introduction of the law. One Melbourne hospital to which persons with spinal injuries in traffic accidents are referred had to keep a neurosurgeon and plastic surgeon on duty at the hospital each night. After the belt law became effective the need for the surgeons' services declined so sharply that the two specialists were placed on call instead of having to be physically present at the hospital.

Also, the Canadian Medical Association journal again reports substantial reduction in injuries with the use of seat belts. It states "One major review of the evidence concerning the effectiveness of the automobile safety belt concluded that it reduces the risk of major injury or death by at least 60 per cent. The lap-shoulder belt is significantly more effective than the lapbelt alone."

A publication called "The Seat Belt Argument," put out by Transport Canada, says this:

> Studies in the UK have also shown that the death-and injury-reducing potential of seatbelts is greater for passengers than for drivers; that effectiveness is greater in low speed accidents; that effectiveness in preventing death is higher than effectiveness in preventing serious injury.

An American study supports these results, concluding, on the basis of data from 14,000 accidents, that failure to use seatbelts increased injury risk as follows: "Of immediate death or severe injury by 100 per cent; of non-trivial injury by 70 per cent and of any injury by 40 per cent."

Of course, finally as proof, I would quote from a document tabled here, "Motor Vehicle Collision Facts, 1974," which shows that although about 20 per cent of the drivers involved in accidents wore belts, of those who they could tell for sure were using seatbelts only 10 per cent were killed compared to 20 per cent not using seatbelts.

I would also like to make some comments here relative to the saving in costs—the economic saving from the compulsory use of seatbelts. Figures have been given here before and I don't think there is any doubt that there can be figures which will show widely varying amounts depending upon what statistics are used. In January this year, the executive director of the Ontario Hospital Association made these comments, according to the Globe and Mail, "Victims of motor accidents fill 10 per cent of hospital beds all the time and cost Ontario $1 million a day to care for them."

If we conclude there would be a saving of only 25 per cent in injuries with the compulsory use of seatbelts—and that is low accord-

ing to most of the estimates given—even if we had only 25 per cent saving, we would have a figure of something like $90 million saved in hospital costs alone. If we add to that the loss in wages and production, which is apparently about equal to that, it is another $90 million. If we add to that the loss of the earning power of the some 450 people who are killed annually on Ontario highways, most of them fairly young people—the majority of them in their prime earning time or just before it—the estimated loss is at least $100 million. According to these statistics, we find that the total annual savings in the Province of Ontario from the compulsory use of seatbelts could be $300 million.

Finally, I want to deal briefly with the subject of whether the compulsion is worth the price. As has already been stated, the annual death rate is about 450 people who could be saved with the compulsory use of seatbelts. There are also about 25,000 personal injuries that could be eliminated with the compulsory use of seatbelts. The economic costs are probably in the neighbourhood of $300 million annually. The public generally has to bear the majority of that cost, and there is some justification for the public saying: "We feel that the individual driving the automobile must take some responsibility toward his safety when we are paying these costs."

I suggest the time has come when the public does want this kind of legislation. Not long ago the Gallup poll took a survey on the question of whether people approved of the growing tendency of government to protect people from themselves through such things as the use of seatbelts, lifejackets, etc. It showed that 77 per cent of the people were in favour of increased legislation in this regard. I am convinced that the majority of the public want this, will accept it if we are prepared to take a stand and are prepared to give the reasons why it is necessary.

On one specific item on the bill, I understand it's a general provision that a $20 to $100 fine will be levied for people not using their seatbelts. I would ask the minister to give consideration to perhaps using the point system in a substantial way, for drivers at least, rather than very high fines.

And secondly, we notice in the bill that there are exemptions which can be made. I think I can say for myself and for my party that we are glad that there is a provision where exemptions may be made for certain classes of motor vehicles and certain classes of people using motor vehicles. There may be the necessity for legitimate exemptions for some operators, such as taxi drivers, particularly if they are in the urban areas with reduced speed limits. I am not sure what exemptions are made, but I am glad that that is in the bill.

I conclude by saying that I, personally, and my party are glad that the government has seen fit finally to introduce this bill. We think it is a measure that will help financially in this province at a time when there are severe financial problems, and my party will be voting in favour of this bill.

[8:45]

Mr. Bullbrook: Mr. Speaker, this is the first time since the beginning of this Parliament that I have had an opportunity to rise and I want to, therefore, beg your indulgence. I've been down in that Hydro committee learning about system expansion and their load forecast and megawatts. I don't know anything about what they're doing down there and little about what they're doing up here.

In any event, I wanted to take the opportunity, if I may, to congratulate you. This is the first time that I've had this opportunity of congratulating you in connection with your elevation to the seats of the mighty—you individually as chairman of the whole House. It was a well-deserved appointment, but I want you to know it wouldn't have happened if there had been a majority government. Your popularity was not dictated by us, but by the people of Ontario, but that doesn't minimize one tittle the great joy that it gives me—

Mr. Wiseman: Or one jot.

Mr. Bullbrook: —to convey my congratulations, and through you to Mr. Speaker Rowe on his elevation. I notice he's been subjected to—

Mr. Renwick: He is out of order, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Bullbrook: My colleague from Riverdate points out that I'm out of order. Probably I am, but I think, frankly—

Mr. Renwick: You should buckle up.

Mr. Bullbrook: —when we're talking about seatbelt legislation, we're talking about the protection of the individual, therefore I see some type of casual connection between my comments with respect to the Speaker and his function in this chamber. I thought to myself today after reading Norman Webster when he pointed out what a raucous, disjointed assembly we are, that at no time

have I seen, in my eight years here, any disrespect during the prayers and it shows where you do have authority, inferential or direct, it works on this assembly, and I ask you to convey that through to the Speaker. A little more deification on his part and I'm sure we'd listen.

Mr. Ferrier: That is out of order.

Mr. Bullbrook: Now I want to come, if I can, to order.

Interjection.

Mr. Bullbrook: Would you ask that colleague from Riverdale to come to order? I listened to him quietly for 45 minutes this afternoon.

Mr. Ferrier: He was very short if he only spoke that long.

Mr. Bullbrook: Make no mistake about it, we wouldn't have this legislation, as my colleague from Waterloo North (Mr. Good) pointed out and my colleague from Welland (Mr. Swart) so ably supported, if it weren't for OHIP.

The government has finally reconciled the problem here in favour of dollars and cents, which is in the true Conservative tradition of social legislation. It truly is. They've decided now that they can save some money. They've statistically proven to themselves that it's all worthwhile as far as the buck is concerned, and so we're called upon to support this type of legislation.

One has to have some degree of lack of receptivity to it, I must say. It's easy enough to talk about the breathalyser and analogize—and I don't defame, in his absence, my colleague from Ottawa East (Mr. Roy), because he was a prominent Crown attorney for many years—but I see no great analogy between the breathalyser and this type of legislation. The breathalyser was a subservience on the part of the individuals to society's need for the protection of society, not for the protection of the individual. It never was intended for the protection of the individual. It was the coming together of impairment together with the driving of a motor vehicle.

This is truly the same as the insistence we had that motorcycle drivers should wear their helmets. That is the analogy, there's no doubt about it. But anyone who has ever thought about what the function of the state is and what the responsibility of the state must be, had to have reservations about the breathalyser legislation and they have to have some reservations about this type of legislation. It becomes a balance of priorities, I suggest, through the chairman to my colleague from Welland, and I and my colleagues are prepared to accept those priorities on balance.

I was pleased to see that at least one member of your caucus did decide to exhibit some reservations about it, as I do now. I agree with him as to the motivation of the legislation; I entirely disagree with him as to the public acceptance now of the legislation. We might educate them too. But yesterday morning I did an open-line show in Sarnia. There were nine calls on this, seven being against it. I'm not a great believer in statistics from Sarnia or otherwise, because as I said facetiously, and perhaps in a vulgar manner, when they got rid of the cosmetic surgeon in Australia after the buckling up of the seatbelts, there were two answers: either there was no more need for his services or the patient was dead. In either case, you don't need him. So statistics can be used to fly the fancy that you wish to fly at the moment.

In any event, I'm going to accept the legislation because I'm convinced by all members of this House—not by the government, but by all members of the House—that it's in the benefit of the individual himself and collaterally in society, only from an economic point of view, because if we didn't have the obligation of society as a whole to provide for the medical and hospital welfare of people, I wouldn't support the legislation.

I want to say frankly that this is not breathalyser legislation; it never will be and it never was intended to be. If an individual wants to buckle up or not, it is his inalienable right to buckle up or not, because when he becomes involved in an intersection accident, it isn't a question of whether he has a seatbelt on or not that's going to cause that collision; in many circumstances, I'm afraid, the buckling-up might well lead to the collision.

There are certain things I want to bring to the minister's attention, and I would like to have a response from him. I was interested also in the minister's byplay with the member for Welland when he mentioned 22 states had proposed legislation and the minister asked how many passed. I want to make sure, as a result of that comment, the minister does support this legislation? He is in favour?

Hon. Mr. Snow: Oh yes, very much so.

Mr. Bullbrook: There is a section here that I wonder about. It's subsection 6:

> No person shall drive on a highway a motor vehicle in which there is a passenger who has attained the age of two years and is under 16 years of age and occupies a seating position for which a seatbelt assembly has been provided unless that passenger is wearing the complete seatbelt assembly and it is properly adjusted and securely fastened.

Frankly, I read that to mean that there is no offence committed if a four-year-old is standing between his parents. I read it to mean that if a six-year-old is kneeling, looknig out the back window, there is no offence committed. As my colleague pointed out, I read it to mean that if a 15-year-old is sitting on her boyfriend's lap, there is no offence committed. I invite the minister's reconsideration of the wording of the section, unless I am in error, as I might well be, in my interpretation of the section.

I appreciate the opportunity I have been given to make some comment on this. It's obvious from the comments made that we don't accept this totally without reservation; and when I say "we," I mean that I don't and some others don't. I wanted to get up just for the sake of putting on the record the reservations I do have.

Mr. Jones: Mr. Speaker, first I'd like to commend the minister for bringing this bill on safety belts to the House. Unfortunately, some of my comments probably will run parallel to those made by some of the speakers who have come before me, but I think we have seen quite a joining of thoughts on the major portions of the statistics or the reasons this legislation is here and on what we, as a joint body have to do to make it acceptable and so that it achieves the reason that it's needed and at the time it's needed, which is right now.

Before the member for Sarnia leaves, I would like to comment that I know, for my part, that my reasons for supporting this bill certainly weren't twigged by the monetary situation, which was an aside. We did note the comment of the Minister of Health about the $90 million. We heard the comment of one of the members just a few moments ago discussing $300 million as a possible saving. To be sure, money is a factor but it's very much an aside. My concerns are very different and I would like to run through them right now for the benefit of us all so that we can once again put them in capsule form as we go out to make certain that this does gain the acceptance it must.

We know that yesterday in this House, last evening as the member for Durham West (Mr. Godfrey) might recall, I did speak in opposition to what I put as an intrusion of government unless it absolutely had to be there. The subject being discussed was a proposal to legislate on a matter of convenience and unpleasantness. This seatbelt legislation is different and it is a matter of immediate life or death and I believe that most sincerely.

We've heard it related to safety helmets for motorcyclists, and having been in the insurance industry I was very familiar with those statistics. One only has to know some cases of youngsters who became vegetables to have it brought very much home.

We have—and we've heard recounted here this afternoon and this evening—a veritable mountain of statistics which can no longer be ignored and which show how many lives can be saved by mandatory use of safety belts. We've had this programme of buckle up, but we need to save further lives and it's too urgent not to have this legislation at this time.

Before coming to this House, as I say, I was in the insurance industry and I was constantly faced with these gruesome reports and pictures in many cases. They showed the need for this legislation. I lectured at the safety league and other groups of that type and constantly these statistics were before one.

I would just like to capsule a few short highlights of this issue under four headings, if I may. The figures that the member for Welland (Mr. Swart) alluded to just a short time ago set it out for us all very clearly, I think. They can't be ignored and probably they capsule many others available to us. They show that 476 drivers were killed when the seatbelts were installed but weren't in use, out of the total deaths in 1974. Reverse this and those that were installed and were being used, saw only 46 deaths; that's some 10 per cent. It is a rather startling statistic not to be ignored.

When we look at other areas of jurisdiction, as has been mentioned tonight, and I think it is important for us to remember, that as one of the members across the floor said, Australians are known for characteristically being very much opposed to any encroachment on their freedoms. They are world known for defending their rights. Yet the facts are that the first legislation was in 1971 in Victoria and during this time the propor-

tion of people wearing belts rose from 25 per cent to about 75 per cent. When we consider that only about 65 per cent of all Australian cars at that time were equipped with seatbelts this implies an overall wearing rate in the area of somewhere around 50 per cent. However, over a nine-month period Victoria experienced a 19.7 per cent drop in fatalities and a 14.8 reduction of injuries to occupants of vehicles.

There was no similar reduction over this same period in evidence in the rest of Australia where no such law existed. We can conclude, therefore, that this dramatic drop in fatalities was due to the increase in seatbelt usage.

The other Australian states which subsequently followed Victoria's lead experienced similar results in due course. New South Wales shows the vehicle occupant fatalities in 1972 were 25 per cent lower than would have been expected without such a law.

I'm not going to outline all of the important and, to my mind, timely article which appeared in one of the Toronto papers last Saturday which capsuled a lot of it.

[9:00]

Here's an example. It is the case of the three-year-old daughter of a man who describes his trip to the hospital. It went on to talk about statistics of those wearing versus those not wearing seatbelts. It talked about what the policemen had to say. These are the men and women who are at the scene immediately after these tragedies occur. These are the people who attend the victims in those first instances. They are the ones who see the windshields with the holes punched through. Their condensed comments were basically that indeed they could see problems in administering the law but, nevertheless, they all urged that the legislation be amended and for their part the sooner the better.

We heard earlier, the comments of the member for Welland. He gave examples of hospitals where I'm sure for the people on the staff it was a happy observation that they were able to cut down on staff which had heretofore been attending people being rushed off roads and into the emergency sections of hospitals in that jurisdiction.

We had a lot of comments on Australia tonight. It did pioneer, but there is also Britain. In fact it's mentioned in this article that last year they had 4,000 fewer accidents and 400 fewer road deaths since they had their legislation implemented. The police in all jurisdictions which I looked into agreed that any inconvenience in making sure that justice prevailed in the implementation of wearing seatbelts was far outweighed by the lives which would be saved by the legislation.

I believe the member for Wentworth (Mr. Deans) earlier mentioned air bags. These are probably something to which we need to give some consideration. My work in lecturing the safety league has made me quite familiar with this. There are pros and cons to these bags. I'll mention a few because it is something, I think, we should be looking into quickly. It relates to this legislation as it comes to us today. There are advantages, the major one being there is no action required on the part of the occupant. It's an instant thing, and in addition the air bag has the ability to provide a high level of protection for a frontal collision.

Unfortunately, there are some disadvantages. The research I've studied is available in an excellent document I commend on safety belt use called, "A Mandate for Survival." It is pointed out that a mid-section safety belt needs to go hand in hand with the air bag to gain maximum protection from these so-called air bags.

The member for Wentworth mentioned that the price is about $139 or $140 right now, and hopefully they would come to be $100. They're certainly something we should be encouraging in the marketplace, but for now they have not proven to be the answer for damage and injury in collision from other angles than frontal, unless, as I say, they are in conjunction with a lap belt.

Mr. Young: They have a lateral protection too.

Mr. Jones: In addition to the extra cost of these air bags, it would be somewhere about 10 years from now to get them into this price range and get them into cars. In fact 90 per cent of our cars are now equipped with belts. So that's the priority of this legislation in course today; and hopefully for tomorrow, as the technology of air bags is further improved upon, we'll see them come in their turn.

Mr. Foulds: All it needs is mass production and not technology.

Mr. Yakabuski: There are a lot of air bags over there.

Mr. Foulds: You should know.

Mr. Yakabuski: Yes, there are a lot of them over there.

Mr. Foulds: You're speaking from experience for a change.

Mr. Jones: I agree with some of the other comments which have been made and some of the proposals and recommendations for safety. I think it's timely to remember these when we hear comments, as we did from the member for Mississauga South (Mr. Kennedy), with his concern about the young drivers, and they're very real, because they're very much statistics in this same condensed "Collision Facts 1974" that we've been alluding to.

Mr. Foulds: I thought they'd be real because they were people, rather than because they were statistics.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Mr. Jones: He's concerned about them because they're people, but he's concerned about them because of the size of the statistics that relate to that age group, and I think we all are.

I think we also should pay some thanks for some of the programmes that have been coming in and are seeing increasing use, such as the pro drivers course, which has shown us a reduction of no less than 40 per cent in occurrence of accidents and no less than 40 per cent in severity of accidents, where the youngsters in those age groups are taking these courses. This is being reflected by the insurance industry, which monitors those things. We're having a 40 per cent reduction where those youngsters in that age group do take the course versus those who don't take the course.

This is to be commended. We see the newspapers encouraging it, we see some of our local radio stations actually sponsoring it, we see the police departments working on it, we see our educational departments encouraging it and in fact subsidizing it. I think this is something we should continue on, because these statistics relating to the seatbelts show the urgency for carrying on that programme, which has proven itself.

There are critics—and we have all sensed some of the testiness that was apparently afield in certain of our caucuses—there are critics of this bill. Some of these are those who claim that the seatbelts can cause injury. But studies have shown—and again they're available to us, just a veritable mountain has come to deluge us—that injuries due to seatbelts are generally slight in comparison with those injuries which would have been sustained had the occupant not been wearing a seatbelt. In high-speed accidents one can't expect to emerge entirely injury-free, of course, but seatbelts generally reduce the severity of the injuries.

Another myth of critics concerning seatbelts is that they can trap the occupant in a burning or a submerging car. I stand here tonight as someone who was in a car that was broken completely in half on the Queen Elizabeth Way and bounced down the road, and they tell me had I stayed in there I would have been dead for sure, according to the local police. As it happens, again, I am in that small percentage that was in that kind of odd situation versus the mountain of others that would have been saved by them.

Statistics have shown that one per cent of all serious accidents are followed by fire or submersion, and yet we have a lot of people concerned about that; that they would be trapped, there would be a fire, they would be submerged in water. In 1973 in this province, no one wearing a seatbelt was killed by fire. One person drowned wearing a belt, but he was intoxicated. A belted occupant is far more likely to remain in a conscious state and, therefore, be able to escape from the vehicle. Thus, the chance of injury or risk of entrapment is far lower if a seatbelt is worn.

There are those who say—and we've heard it earlier tonight and I talked about my comments on another issue last evening—that this is an infringement on their rights and some say it's an invasion of privacy. The logic behind these arguments pales in the light of the figures we've been reviewing. It is simply faulty to have that kind of logic.

Highways built with taxpayers' money are public property, and, as for driving, one's private automobile on them, it's a privilege, it's not a right. I can't buy the logic of the arguments about the invasion of privacy and the infringement of rights. We are going to have ourselves a job, all of us, jointly, from whatever side of the House, in bringing this acceptance to the people in our respective ridings. Hopefully, we'll do the job because it's terribly important, regardless of the fines or the fact that the law will exist. Nevertheless, it's still a friendly persuasion, if people were to use them rather than risk a $20 fine and sit on the belts in any event. So we do have a job to do, but hopefully this will accentuate it and bring people to accept it.

I listened to the comments of one of the earlier speakers. He talked of taking a survey in his caucus and I was delighted to hear that a lot of people made the honest admis-

sion that, "No, I haven't been buckling up," but they certainly would be once the law came in. Grumble as they might, they would be doing it; the habit would be formed and they would go on to use it. Indeed that is the essence of this whole legislation to my way of thinking.

We did have the comments, again, by the member for Sarnia (Mr. Bullbrook) where he was being, I sense either a little cynical, or perhaps he was giving us a little levity there after some heavy discussion of statistics; but he made this comment, that the Conservative government brought this about after they came to a "look at the buck," as I recall the comment. I know for my part, and for all those in my caucus that I spoke with, that was not at all their motivation in supporting this bill.

Mr. Bullbrook: Why was the gestation period so lengthy?

Mr. Jones: I am talking about the current situation, Mr. Member, and I—

Mr. Bullbrook: You can call me Jim.

Mr. Jones: I talked with these people, and they were all sincere. Some were here before, in that period you talk of, and some weren't; but the point was the consensus today was very clear. The things of concern were the things I talked about, as I have to this point.

Also I know in my case one of the things that was very important to me, as I looked at these statistics and put together this debate, was the children. They were a large concern to me. As we consider this aspect, there are certain things that are unique to small children in these accidents. They have a relatively heavy head and they have a fragile skull, as we all know, and for this reason a small child is very likely to suffer a more serious head injury, even in low-speed accidents.

In 1972 children under the age of 14 made up 16 per cent of those killed and injured in motor vehicle accidents. For this reason, children would definitely benefit from increased seatbelt use.

I could talk of my personal experience and my youngsters not using them. I know certainly, now, since we have been considering this, they ride in the back and they are using them. Probably this is because there has been the influence, there has been the surge toward this legislation.

I hope an increasing number of other parents in this province will take advantage of the approved child restraints that are available for their children under four. These restraints have been tested, they have been proven and they are effective in protecting these small children in most accident situations.

So as we go about our job to convey this legislation and to have it gain its acceptance so that people use belts, quite apart from the law side of it, I hope that we at least convince the parents. We all know it is not completely possible to strap in every youngster. If you are driving to the local arena, six youngsters might be crowded into the car in these circumstances; but on those long trips to the cottage and all those other trips on the higher speed byways, let's hope that people will use seatbelts. I hope we all, as individual members, will encourage others, especially our youngsters because we know that they can come flying out of the back seats. We all know the gruesome story without even being reminded in these articles and pictures that so vividly brought it to our attention.

I am indeed pleased and honoured I had an opportunity to speak to what I feel will be a very important piece of legislation coming down in my time here in this House. I do support the bill and indeed ask all other members of the House, as I say to carry the word of it and their belief in it out where it will do good; will save lives and avoid injuries. Thank you.

Mr. Ferrier: Mr. Speaker, I rise to support this bill. I would like to say, along with the member for Sarnia, that I realize this bill has had rather a long gestation period. We sat here in the House back in the late winter or early spring and heard the government in the Throne Speech say that mandatory seatbelt legislation would be introduced and passed. Of course we felt that would be in effect for this summer.

Hon. Mr. Snow: All in the fullness of time.

Mr. Ferrier: Well, you know, some of the back-bench boys laid a heavy hand on the former minister—

Mr. Young: They didn't come back.

Mr. Ferrier: They didn't come back. That's probably why there are so few there today.

Interjection.

Mr. Ferrier: If the government had gone ahead with this legislation in the spring and been more progressive at that time it may not have suffered the results that it did.

But the minister decided not to introduce the legislation, and what he decided to do was to bring in about a $500,000 buckle-up programme.

[9:15]

Mr. Hodgson: It was a good programme.

Mr. Ferrier: We had that pre-election advertising to overwhelm the electorate with the wonderful things the government was doing. Had this legislation come in and been passed, we could have saved that $500,000. And we could have saved another $500,000 on the report by the Treasurer (Mr. McKeough) and his right wing friends.

But to the credit of this minister, perhaps he has been able to realize that action has to be taken to protect the people of this province and to cut down on the number of personal injuries and deaths that do occur in accidents. Statistics have shown quite conclusively that the wearing of seatbelts reduces injuries in accidents. Fewer people are thrown from cars, the reason why a lot of people lose their lives.

This legislation does impose compulsion on the drivers and passengers in this province. I suppose this interferes with civil rights, but lots of things we do in this House interfere with civil rights. We feel that it will be of value to the people if they put their seatbelts on and take this extra precaution.

The advertising programme the government had certainly didn't have the effect that it thought it would. It probably did a fair little bit to enhance the advertising industry, but it didn't do the job that should have been done. This is the legislation that we should have. We in this party are in favour of safety legislation in whatever form it comes in to protect the public, and we believe there should be enforcement of this kind of thing.

Some people say that it will be difficult to enforce. Because it is compulsory, I think it will provide a significant incentive to people who do not now wear their seatbelts to buckle up. I think it will have the desired effect. The penalty is not meant to be punitive. I suppose it will be enforced in some degree in the courts and people will grumble about having to pay fines. But I think that if people do follow the intent of the legislation and buckle up, that will be of value in itself.

As statistics show, and as quoted by colleagues from Welland and from Yorkview, there's a significant reduction in deaths and injuries and the degree of those injuries. And there is also a significant effect on cutting the costs that the insurance companies bear and money paid out in settlements. If there is a reduction in insurance industry costs, surely there can also be some kind of decrease in the premiums that the insurance companies have been imposing upon us with such regularity. I hope that it has that effect and that the government checks into this matter and will monitor the insurance industry to a significant degree.

I have some statistics to quote about the effect of the seatbelt law on injury patterns in Victoria, Australia. A spokesman for the Royal Australian College of Surgeons compiled a sampling of medical data and an opinion on traffic accident injuries for a submission to the Secretary of Transportation in Washington. Some excerpts from the report are here in my hand.

It noted that spinal injuries were reduced by one-third; lung and chest injuries were down; those with multiple injuries dropped from 14 per cent in 1971 to six per cent in 1972. There has been a 40 per cent reduction in kneecap and hip injuries among accident victims treated at St. Vincent's in Preston and Northcot Community Hospital since the law took effect.

There has been a 50 per cent decline in the number of vehicle occupant victims treated for severe facial injuries at Weston General Hospital, reports R.V.S. Thompson, plastic surgeon. Comparing the 12-month periods before and after the legislation was enacted, fatal accidents with fractured skull and brain damage have fallen by 30 per cent; in non-fatal cases, fractured skull and brain damage have marginally increased indicating that victims are surviving because head injuries are less severe. Fatal accidents with fractured femurs have decreased from 22 per cent to 15 per cent; in non-fatal accidents the incidence of fractured femurs has risen two-fold indicating that victims are surviving who otherwise might have died.

The statistics which have been put forward here tonight are extremely convincing and are the record of serious research in other jurisdictions into this wearing of seatbelts, especially when accidents are concerned.

I was involved in an accident about four years ago and we were hit quite hard. Both my son and I were wearing our seatbelts and there was absolutely no personal injury to either one of us. I feel this legislation is a very good step which the government is taking. I think the cutting down of the incidence of personal injury and the degree of severe personal injury which has taken place in other places and likely will take place here with this legislation, is bound to have a

significant effect on the medical costs and the hospital costs that we, the general public, bear.

It was a few years ago, I believe in 1971, when the no-fault insurance and amendments to the Insurance Act took place. This government across the way took the insurance companies off the hook and made the public Treasury bear the expense of accident costs in this province as far as hospitalization and medical treatment were concerned.

We have borne those quite considerable expenses and it is about time the government brought in some kind of legislation like this to cut down on the expenses of accidents which we are bearing.

As I say, it is good legislation. I certainly support it and our party supports it. I think I would like to tip my hat to the member for Yorkview (Mr. Young) who is sitting before me tonight who has consistently spoken in favour of safety measures. He convinced a former Minister of Transport, Irwin Haskett, to bring in legislation to require motorcycle drivers to wear helmets.

An hon. member: That's in a lost cause.

Mr. Ferrier: He has consistently fought for safer vehicles and safer driving procedures and I am glad to see that the leadership he has been giving in this House is bearing fruit in the kind of legislation the government is bringing forward.

As I say, I rise with my colleagues to support this legislation, which should have been brought in during June or July; I guess the election has forced it upon the government. The results have taken away some of the people who weren't as progressive as they should have been in the government party, and perhaps the government has got in a few more who have seen the light. Anyway, we are glad it's coming in, better late than never.

Mr. Ruston: I would like to have a few words with regard to Bill 27, an Act to amend the Highway Traffic Act as it pertains to seatbelt legislation.

I suppose I must admit that I have not been as good a performer in the wearing of seatbelts as I should have been, considering the miles I drive yearly. I figured out one day that I have averaged about 30,000 miles for the past 25 years, so I guess I have gone around the world once or twice. It has only been in the past year or so, that I have started to get more conscious of wearing a seatbelt, and I must admit it was one of the younger members of my family who convinced me that we should be wearing them. Maybe it takes the younger generation to educate some of us older folks as to what we should be doing in terms of seatbelt safety.

Mr. Ferrier: You're not admitting that you are getting older, are you?

Mr. Ruston: I find, though, the minute I sit down in an airplane, the first thing I do is hook up the belt and I never undo it all the time I am in the air—except, of course, on some long trips—

Mr. Bullbrook: When the necessities of nature deem otherwise.

Mr. Ruston: —and I feel quite comfortable On one occasion when I was in an airplane the road was so rough up there that you were mighty glad to have the seatbelt on because you might end up in the ceiling or some place.

There are always some concerns with regard to any new legislation, and while some of the ones I have in mind regarding this bill may be minor, on the other hand they are of concern to me and to people in a family of different age groups as to where they are going to sit in the car. I think the member for Sarnia mentioned subsection 6 of the bill and raised questions as to what is considered a seat, where the belts are so located, and whether someone has to have a belt on if they are sitting, standing or sleeping, with special reference to small children.

We have raised a number of children, and we were blessed with twins on the first occasion. When we were driving, the wife held one of the twins on her lap and the other lay on the back seat, so I guess if I had to stop suddenly, he probably would have ended up on the floor. Something that I suppose will have to be considered in the regulations is just how we are going to handle this.

I would caution the government that this isn't the end-all and everything to solve the accident situations on our highways. Maybe we should call them collisions. I think Mr. Haskett's name was mentioned here once or twice—

Mr. Foulds: Only in vain.

Mr. Ruston: —and he said we should be calling them collisions instead of accidents. I consider an accident as something that is unavoidable. Many of the collisions on our highways today are avoidable, providing we use a little more common sense; and probably we should have a little tighter control of our driving regulations as to who should have a driver's licence and who should not.

The attitude of drivers no doubt has a great deal to do with some of the accidents on our highways. I have found that one of the states in the United States has made a study of this, and they have found that from 15 to 20 per cent of the accidents and deaths probably are caused by sheer negligence on the part of the driver and his carelessness and disregard for other people on the road. I don't think we can say that this will be the end-all to the accident situation and to avoiding deaths on our highways.

In September, 1974, it was stated that Ontario was going to get tough on drunk drivers, but that's one of the problems that no doubt is still with us.

[9:30]

Another thing is the construction of our highways in some areas and the traffic light situation. Many intersections we find have a continual accident ratio. It is rather depressing that sometimes you almost get the impression from the people at the Transportation and Communications ministry that unless we have at least three deaths and 50 accidents in so many months, they don't want to put a traffic light on a corner. That's another thing which adds to the death toll and accident rate on our highways.

I think that in the coming years—and I've stressed this in the Ministry of Transportation and Communications estimates over the last two or three years—maybe we've built enough highways; now let's make them a little safer. Let's get down to the brass tacks of where are the areas of high accident rates. I'm sure that isn't too hard to have figured out or fed into a computer. Maybe, from the figures over the last few years we can tell where the high accident rate is going to be in the coming years, by doing some of these systems.

I think Texas or one of the states in United States—one of the southern states—is doing this. They even have police cars in these areas in advance so that they can keep motorists down to the speed limit. If certain driving conditions are worse they have a constant patrol on the highways in the areas where the high accident rates are. There are many things we can do to lower the accident rates on our highways.

On seatbelt legislation, I attended a conference in Toronto in the fall of 1974, I think. It was the American Association for Automotive Medicine; a two-day conference at the Holiday Inn here in Toronto. Although it was quite a technical conference it was very interesting to hear the medical doctors and the medical profession from all different places in United States and parts of Europe giving papers and talks on accidents and the causes of them. The use of seatbelts was one of the very interesting parts of their presentations, with moving pictures—actual moving pictures and so forth—of what seatbelt restraints do for people. Air bags were also shown in some of the presentations. They haven't been brought down to the right precision just yet—as well there is the cost factor—but I think they will be one of the factors in the coming years which will be of help in this matter.

I think as far as the three-point strap belt is concerned, which we have now, there are some people who find them very uncomfortable. In my own car I have the lapbelt and the other one hangs up across the side of the car. When I put it down it's about ready to cut my neck off when I hook it up. These are, of course, on the older cars and maybe they don't have quite as good a system as some of the new ones. I have been in some with a three-point system which does seem to me to be more comfortable.

Someone mentioned a while ago the rural mail carriers. I guess they don't drive over 25 miles an hour so I suppose they'd be exempt from this. It would be impossible for them to wear a seatbelt and deliver mail in the rural areas. I am sure that will be one of the things which will come under the regulations, to allow exemptions for them.

As far as child belts and some seats are concerned, that is another thing. I was looking at the papers at the conference of the American Association for Automotive Medicine. There was some very detailed explanation of some of the problems the Canadian government and the Canadian Standards Association have had in trying to get a proper seat for small children in cars. Actually they still haven't agreed on one which was really considered perfect. It was good in some areas, sideways and so forth, but from what I can gather there is still some concern as to how good they are. I'm sure there are one or two on the market now, from what I can gather, which seem to have come up to some of the special standards in the United States. Not too long ago, one of the companies in Canada was fined $100 on pleading guilty to a violation of the regulations for selling a seat that wasn't proper and wasn't strong enough to carry the load it was meant to do.

I just want to reiterate that with new legislation I would hope, as the member for Ottawa East (Mr. Roy) said, that the enforcement of it would be given the lenience that is possible under common sense. Some people can en-

force regulations differently than others and it's a human element that gets involved. Having been involved in the enforcement of the Customs Act for 10 years, I find that people interpret it differently. I suppose it's the same thing with policemen. Different policemen interpret regulations and Acts differently. I would hope there would be some leniency until they get this more or less on the books for a while and people are educated to wearing them and accepting them, which I'm sure they will.

I'm sure they will accept them but it may take a few months to get this across to them. Then they will realize in driving with the proper restraint system they're more comfortable and that there is a greater degree of safety and so will feel safer in their vehicle.

Some people will look at statistics over the next year or two and probably at the end of two years say this has been a great thing since accidents, deaths and so forth have gone down. But we are already doing one other thing that maybe would also cause the accident rate to go down in that we're lowering the speed limits on our highways. There is no doubt that this has quite a bearing on the accident rate. Maybe it would cloud the issue a little bit as to what the benefit of seatbelts will be.

The other thing is that as gasoline prices go up due to the world oil shortage it could be there will be fewer cars on the road and less mileage driven. This again naturally causes less accidents.

This is one of the things in the United States that some of us fail to think about in saying that the toll on the highways has gone down there. They had their shortage of gas about two years ago when they had the main problem and lowered the speed limit to 55 miles an hour. No doubt the two of them made a great contribution to cause some of the lower accident rates. With the combination of the lower speed limit with the seatbelt legislation and with more determination on the part of government to improve our highways where we find they are unsafe—and we should have statistics to show the accident rates on them—and by weeding out the drivers now on our roads that shouldn't be driving, I think we can certainly cut down on the death rate and the accident rate on our highways.

Mr. Grossman: I wanted to rise on this issue for three reasons really. Firstly, there has been substantial talk about how this legislation affects our personal freedoms. Secondly, my family is one of those most typically affected by this type of legislation so I can speak from first-hand knowledge as to the direct effect it will have. Thirdly, among very many of the voters in my riding and across this city at least, there is some evidence that the legislation will be unpopular.

Dealing with the last first, the fact that the legislation is unpopular is no reason why this House should decide to withdraw from such progressive steps. The unpopularity is not so much real as apparent. As is the case with very many issues, those who get on the phone, those who send telegrams, those who send communications, those who stop one on the street, are rarely those who are willing to accept the legislation—indeed who willingly and happily accept it—but are those who resent the intrusion into their private little automobile.

It really is without reason. It's one of those things that those people affected feel a real interference with their lives, when in fact they should be just as upset when their lives are being interfered with due to inflation—indeed due to strikes. Yet it is something like this, something that they feel every time they get into their car, that causes them to get on the phone and call their members. I hope the members of this House will not interpret whatever telephone calls they've been getting as an indication that the majority of the public is against this legislation.

Notwithstanding that, even if that were the case, I suggest it would be incumbent upon us to act in this field. On dealing with the issue of personal freedoms and whether or not we should act in this type of field, we have not seen fit to act in the field where we have chosen to save the lives of people who want to die.

There are many people who have attempted murder-suicides—and can successfully complete the murder aspect of it but fail on the suicide aspect of it—and yet we exercise every possible effort, spend every possible nickel and dime we can, to save the lives of those who indeed don't want to live. Why then should we hesitate to go into the field of saving the lives of people who want to live and who have not chosen to attempt to die? I talk now, of course, about the horrendous sensation I feel when I drive on the summer weekends up to the cottage, and one can see accidents almost every weekend. Almost any weekend one can see a doll or a toy in the median and a child on the road. I can't believe that any member of the Legislature or the public who has ever witnessed one of those sights can suggest for one

moment that there should be any second doubts about this legislation.

We haven't concerned ourselves with rising costs on automobiles when it comes to installing safety factors. We haven't even been concerned when we have been faced with excess dollars on purchase of automobiles for anti-pollution devices. The real health hazards requiring those anti-pollution devices, for example, have been established, but in terms of saving lives directly they can't possibly come anywhere near the effect this legislation will have on saving lives. Yet we didn't object when probably upwards of $1,000 was added on to car costs because of anti-pollution devices and because of other safety equipment. Yet we object when we are not asked to pay any more, but we are only told to do up seatbelts.

Let me say that I and my family are a typical reason why this legislation is necessary. To be honest, after having witnessed those horrendous scenes on Highway 11 weekend after weekend, I am still one of those persons who will not take the extra effort to do up my seatbelt.

Mr. Deans: That was hardly a lasting impression.

Mr. Grossman: Likewise, my wife—and she is the one who will suffer the brunt of this legislation in our family in any event—will now be faced with having to buckle up, in the front and back seats of our car, three children, two, three and four years old. She has been cursing me for several days now, because when the legislation was announced I suggested to her that it was now incumbent upon her to begin to obey the spirit of the legislation and she's been buckling up three kids as well as herself since then. Indeed I've been doing the same.

[9:45]

I should at least report to the Legislature my own experiences, in that I do it almost automatically now. I don't feel it's a great intrusion on my life. It's not too darned comfortable, but I can live with it; and I will live with it instead of dying without it.

I'm ashamed to say to this House that, in spite of the advertising programmes, in spite of the clear facts; I've not only continued to permit myself to drive without those seatbelts, but ashamedly have permitted my children to do so as well, for which I cannot forgive myself.

But over the last few weeks particularly I've taken the time to read the facts on seatbelt legislation. And having read that, I must say that it's only in the last several days that I've begun to force my family to do the same—for which there is no excuse; for which there is no apology that will be sufficient, except that we've been fortunate enough to stay accident-free, which is not easy to do on Highway 11.

Mr. Speaker, I hold myself up as a bad but accurate example to this House, of the type of person who needs this type of legislation. I'm sorry to report that, but I must say that I'll be happy to vote for the legislation. It's badly needed and it may well result, together with the reduced speed limits, in a time when I can travel to the cottage and other places in this province without almost regularly seeing those horrendous scenes of limbs and bodies scattered across medians and highways.

Interjections.

Mr. Grossman: If you've driven up Highway 11—

Mr. Bain: We have and we've watched the lousy drivers from the south.

Mr. Grossman: That's quite true, but I'll be happy if I'm at least safe in the knowledge that if one of those bad drivers from the south, as the member puts it—

Mr. Deans: Why didn't you buckle up before?

Mr. Grossman: If one of those bad drivers from the south crosses the median and hits my car, completely beyond my control, at least I'll know my children are buckled up in the back seat of the car. Indeed, that's quite an important step.

Considering the freedoms that are relinquished, I suggest to you that the fact that this legislation affects someone each and every day as they get in their cars, should not be overrated; indeed one should not underrate and underestimate the saving in lives.

It is with some relief that I can support this legislation and I can assure the House that I, like others, will not hope that I will avoid getting caught; I will indeed abide by the legislation and be thankful for it.

Mr. Renwick: Mr. Speaker, I rise mainly because of the questions which you addressed to me in the caucus of our party this afternoon when we discussed this bill to decide what the position of the party would be and we agreed to support the bill in the principle of the bill; all of us with varying degrees of reservation, which I think are shared by many members throughout the assembly.

I regret very much that my friend the member for Eglinton, the Attorney General (Mr. McMurtry), is not here tonight, because this bill touches, of course, upon the question of civil liability as well as the question of infractions of the Highway Traffic Act and minor monetary fines which may be imposed for a breach of these provisions.

I think it is fair to say that we all understand that the bill attempts to deal with something called human life and injuries to human beings, and monetary damage and other losses which may be suffered as a result of something called the failure to wear seatbelts.

My concern, of course, is that the mere infraction of the Highway Traffic Act has all sorts of gradations within its frame. This, as I understand it, will fall within the general penal provision which provides a minimum and a maximum penalty for the failure to observe the provisions of the Act.

I need not elaborate this theme; I'm sure the minister is quite aware of the difficulty which is involved in the enforcement of any such law as this, and I'm not going to argue that particular aspect of it. But I want to tell the minister, and I want to say to the government, what was expressed in the caucus of our party: that you cannot always make progress simply by piecemeal legislation when it happens to suit the government for its purposes to implement—that there must be a much more considered approach to the problem.

Everyone knows that in the case of an accident upon the highway—involving death, personal injury or property damage—that in all likelihood the greatest monetary problem that's going to arise is in the civil losses which will follow.

I express my reservation to my colleague, the member for Sarnia (Mr. Bullbrook), and to any other of the lawyers who were in the assembly, that I do not profess for a moment to practice at the negligence bar of the Province of Ontario, and I'm not an expert in that field. I have a limited knowledge about it. But I did take the trouble to look at what I believe to be the four latest cases that were available to me about the confusion which exists within the courts in Ontario, in Canada, and in the United Kingdom on the question of whether or not the failure to wear a seatbelt is or is not a factor to be considered in determining whether or not the person who has omitted to wear the seatbelt is guilty or liable for the contributory negligence, or unable to collect additional damages because of the contributory negligence of failing to wear the seatbelt.

I want only very briefly to read into the record, if I may, the four head notes. I don't intend to make any extended comment about them. I think the four head notes to these four cases illustrate the confusion in the courts and the difficulty which exists in the area of civil liability.

I draw again to the minister's attention that it is the Highway Traffic Act which imposes the vicarious liability on the owner of a motor vehicle for acts done by the driver of that vehicle driving with his consent. I recognize that there are provisions to relieve that responsibility in this particular bill, but the Highway Traffic Act touches upon two areas: the civil negligence aspects of motor vehicle travel and the offence nature of motor vehicle accident travel, and the offences which are prescribed by the Highway Traffic Act as being liable to punishment.

The first case I want to refer to is one in our courts where Mr. Justice Osler, in a decision made in September, 1971, in the case of Jackson and Millar, dealing with what could be called a joyride by two boys, one of whom had borrowed his father's car with permission. The passenger in the front seat of the car was injured, and Mr. Justice Osler went into this question of negligence with respect to the wearing of a seatbelt at some length because he didn't know whether the case would go to a higher court. To my knowledge it has not gone to a higher court. The head note simply says:

> Where the injury to the plaintiff passenger results from being thrown out of the vehicle while it is spinning and coming in contact with the pavement, and where he was not wearing a seatbelt, the availability of which he was aware, but instead was leaning against the door of the vehicle in a slouched position, he should be found 10 per cent to blame for his own injuries.

That was in 1971 in the High Court of Justice in Ontario.

In England, in February, 1973, again the decision of a particular single judge, the case of Pasternak vs. Poulton:

> The plaintiff was given a lift by the defendant in his car late at night after a party. The plaintiff did not know the defendant well, although she had been a passenger in the rear seat of the car earlier in the evening. The car was fitted with seatbelts. The plaintiff got into the front passenger seat. The defendant, who was

driving, did not wear a seatbelt himself nor did he tell the plaintiff that there was a seatbelt for her. In consequence, she did not put the seatbelt on nor did she take steps to find out whether there was one to put on. As a result of the defendant's negligent driving the car collided with a lamp post, the windscreen was shattered and the plaintiff suffered severe injuries to her face.

In an action by the plaintiff for negligence, the defendant alleged that she had been guilty of contributory negligence by failing to wear the seatbelt. At the trial, expert evidence was given that a statistical examination of car accidents had shown that the risk of injury was substantially reduced if a seatbelt was worn. The plaintiff did not own a car herself but was familiar with the use of seatbelts, and stated in evidence that she would, as a matter of general practice, wear a seatbelt if she saw the driver wearing such a belt, but stressed that in a strange car she thought one had to be told how to use them.

It was held by that judge that the plaintiff ought reasonably to have foreseen the possibility of the car being involved in an accident and of her suffering injury as a result. She could easily have found out whether the car had seatbelts and therefore ought to have known that a seatbelt was available. On the evidence, and in view of the fact that at the date of the accident it was generally accepted by road users a sensible practice for the occupants of cars to wear seatbelts, the plaintiff, acting reasonably, ought to have foreseen the possibility that by wearing a seatbelt she would suffer no, or certainly less, injury if the car were involved in an accident.

It followed that she had been guilty of contributory negligence in failing to do so. The failure of the plaintiff to wear a seatbelt had caused or materially contributed to the injuries she had suffered. The defendant, however, had been negligent not only in the manner in which he had driven and controlled the car, but also in his failure either to demonstrate the need to wear a safety belt by wearing one himself, or by at least pointing out the existence of the seatbelt and explaining that it was for her use. In all the circumstance, the plaintiff bore only a very small share of the blame for her injuries which would be assessed at five per cent.

The third case is quite simple. It took place in Nova Scotia, and it was held, in the case of Beaver vs. Crow in May, 1974, that:

> The failure by the driver and the passenger in a motor vehicle to use available seatbelts amounts to contributory negligence if it results in an injury that would not otherwise have occurred or would not otherwise have been as severe. The burden of proving the causal connection between plaintiff's failure to use seatbelts and plaintiff's injuries is on the defendant. The driver of the vehicle is not, however, negligent in failing to advise the passenger to use the seatbelt.

Hon. members can readily see that the judge in that court failed to follow the previous case to which I have referred.

The latest case which I know of is another case in England. In the case of Froom and Others vs. Butcher, decided in June, 1974, and reported this year:

> The plaintiff was driving a car when he collided with another car driven by the defendant. The collision was caused by the defendant's negligence. At the time of the accident, the plaintiff was not wearing the seatbelt which was fitted to the driver's seat of his car because he did not like to do so, and because he had seen many accidents and had known of cases where drivers were not able to get out of their vehicle when a crash occurred. The plaintiff's injuries in consequence of the collision were more severe than they would have been if he had been wearing a seatbelt.
>
> In an action by the plaintiff for damages, the defendant contended that the plaintiff had been guilty of contributory negligence in failing to wear a seatbelt and that his damages should be reduced accordingly. It was held in that case that it was open to the court to take note of the controversy between those who recommended the use of seatbelts and those who did not.

[10:00]

> Although the dominant view was that belts should be worn, there were clearly two bodies of opinion among sensible people. It could not, therefore, be said that a person who, acting on an opinion firmly and honestly held and shared by many other sensible people, chose to drive without a seatbelt was guilty of negligence in the sense that he was doing something that no reasonable person would do. The plaintiff had not, therefore, been guilty of contributory negligence.

Whether the quotations which I have used from the headnotes of those cases in themselves will illustrate for the House the confusion which exists in the courts with respect to the question of whether the wearing or not wearing of a seatbelt constitutes contributory negligence I believe it is of the essence of the kind of legislation which is in front of us this evening.

I say to the minister, it is not possible by a mere amendment of the Highway Traffic Act, on the basis of the information which is available to him, to suggest that this is the answer to the problem of whether or not seatbelts are a safety measure; it is based only upon statistical information.

As everyone knows, regardless of the emotional feelings of members who have spoken about the issue, in any individual case—which is not a statistic for statistical purposes—it may very well be that the wearing of the seatbelts causes injuries which would otherwise not have been caused. Let us not suggest for one single moment that some statistical weight of evidence from other jurisdictions of necessity makes this a bill which we should all pass with maximum unanimity and with a feeling that we have made a great contribution to safety upon the highways. That is not so.

What we are saying in this assembly—and I take it to be the sense of the assembly that the bill will pass—is two or three things, some of which I discount. The first one is it is now fashionable to be concerned about deaths and injuries and the cost of deaths and injuries and property damage on the highway. Where those fashions come from, everyone knows. They come out of the ether. Sometimes they are important and at other times they are not important. I dismiss the fashionable argument as being of no significance.

The second element which has been introduced is statistical information from other jurisdictions about which we, in this assembly, know very little. Every time we endeavour to introduce statistical information, for example, on the question of a government-operated insurance scheme, we are told there is no comparison which can be made between driving conditions in Manitoba, driving conditions in Saskatchewan or driving conditions in British Columbia. Therefore we cannot transfer the experience in those jurisdictions to the experience here. Now we are told that because of the experience in Australia and because of certain other information, without any in-depth study that I know of, we must therefore accept as conclusive the statistical evidence available.

I consider that also to be a specious argument. I think it is of some probative value in some instances but I certainly don't think it is conclusive or, that in any given individual car accident which may occur, it is going to be of any assistance to the person who is unable to get out of the seat of the car because he is wearing a seatbelt.

I do, however, believe that it is possible now for this government to devise a scheme of overall conclusive safety features for highway driving of which the wearing of seatbelts may be one aspect. It may very well be that such a safety code could be devised which, by its cumulative effect, would reduce deaths upon the highway, personal injuries on the highway and property damage on the highway, and might even incidentally, so long as there is a private car insurance scheme in the Province of Ontario, reduce the premiums that people pay for that insurance.

But let us be realistic about what the bill is about. Let us not kid ourselves that it is a bill which is dictated by some kind of an emotional response. I am inclined to think that I will do what most people do. I will probably wear a seatbelt more often than I would have done before, I may even think about wearing it continuously; but there will obviously be occasions when I get into a car and don't wear one, just as the minister will get into a car and not wear one.

I am saying to the minister let's always be realistic about our legislation; let's not think that this particular amendment to the Highway Traffic Act, at this particular point in time in the Province of Ontario, is anything but another element in an unending search for something called safe driving upon the highways. I am inclined to believe, and I perhaps drive more carefully than I did at one time, that in fact if people obeyed most of the rules and regulations which are prescribed under the Highway Traffic Act of the Province of Ontario, in all of their aspects with respect to driving, that in fact there would be significantly fewer accidents.

I am not absolutely certain that the contribution of this particular bill will of necessity, by itself, do anything other than perhaps influence to a small degree the number of deaths and serious injuries which do occur from time to time because of motor vehicular traffic. But I do think that this minister should be able to extract from the current atmosphere of concern about traffic on the highways, the need for a comprehensive educational programme—backed up by laws and regulations, backed up by adequate safety

inspections, backed up by any number of other areas of concern about safety about which I am not knowledgeable—to make certain there is such a code that will reduce the accident toll on our highways.

I would trust that his friend the Attorney General or the Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations (Mr. Handleman) will, during the course of their ruminations about what should be done about the law of the Province of Ontario, look at the state of the civil law, as I have tried to expound it from these four cases, and realize that the passage of this bill does not solve in any way the confusion which exists now, and will continue to exist, in the civil cases which arise in the courts as a result of negligence on the highways.

Let's be reasonable; let's simply say that on balance, at this particular point in time, we consider this is a positive step. But only on balance, that there must be an ongoing method by which you monitor what happens on the highway and that we not annually be presented with this statistical information, which is always horrendous, without some explanatory information as to what conclusions the ministry draws from those statistics to see whether or not we can't, step by step, perhaps at this point in time and within the life of this particular Parliament, fashion a code of safety for transportation on the highway which will be a model rather than to engage in a self-congratulatory step by the government, by suggesting that this bill is in any way other than another minor step toward that goal which we all would hope could be achieved.

Mr. Haggerty: I rise to support the principle of Bill 27, an Act to amend the Highway Traffic Act, but with some reservations. The amendment basically requires the use of seatbelts in motor vehicles being driven on our highways. I can recall the Throne Speech debate of 1974 had indicated the government was to introduce legislation to make seatbelts mandatory.

Quoting from my own speech at that time, I said:

> The question of mandatory use of seatbelts has not been well received by Ontario motorists. The old saying speed kills, promoted by safety crusaders, is well substantiated by the recent drop in traffic fatalities in the United States. Speed limits were reduced as a fuel-saving measure in the oil crisis that hit the United States and there was a noticeable decrease in the total number of accidents. The government of Ontario should give consideration to reducing the speed limits on our highways in Ontario.

The government is proposing changes in the Act to reduce the speed limits on our highways to 55 mph. I can accept this change. I think it's a good programme to reduce the speed limits to 55 mph.

Hon. Mr. Snow: It's not 55.

Mr. B. Newman: It's 60 and 50.

Mr. Haggerty: Then perhaps it should be 55 mph to keep it consistent with drivers in our neighbouring province and the United States. I happen to represent an area that is close to the American border and perhaps 55 mph would be more appropriate.

Mr. Samis: Down east it is 70 mph across the border.

Mr. Haggerty: They fly down there, don't they?

Mr. Samis: They move fast down there.

Mr. Haggerty: How many accidents do they have down there?

Mr. Samis: They are adventurous drivers.

Mr. Haggerty: The direction the government should be following is the prevention of automobile collisions before an injury occurs. Better design and safety on our highways are needed now.

The member for Riverdale (Mr. Renwick) mentioned too that improvements are required in highway design. I am sure the minister travels the Queen Elizabeth Way as much as I do and he knows some of the conditions that exist there today, particularly at night. Driving from Toronto to Fort Erie one notices oncoming traffic. The way the guideposts are in between the two sections of the highway and the continuous flickering of the lights of oncoming traffic are enough to drive somebody up the wall.

I don't know if he has that problem or not, but it has been brought to my attention by many motorists that this does cause difficulties driving at night. I notice in the motor vehicle collision facts in 1974 that during the driving period between 4 p.m. and 9 p.m. traffic accidents and injuries were about twice as much as in the morning period from 7 a.m. to 9 a.m. Maybe this does have some bearing on the number of accidents in the evening, caused, perhaps, by improper headlights.

Maybe the design is not right. I notice in the vehicle I drive I can't see far enough

ahead of me to come to a complete stop, if I am driving at 60 mph, unless I have my bright lights on. I understand there are lights manufactured in Europe that provide additional safety because of their particular design. When you have you low-beam light on, it does not reflect into an oncoming car. What is the name of that?

Mr. B. Newman: Halogen.

Mr. Haggerty: I guess that's the name of the bulb I am trying to think of. I don't know if you've given any consideration to this type of improvement in driving conditions in Ontario.

[10:15]

Perhaps I could cite more. I can well recall when the Minister of Energy brought in a bill here, saying he was going to do this to conserve energy, I asked him to reduce the horsepower or the cubic displacement of the engines of cars. I don't have to tell the minister that you can look out and see some of these sport cars, small as they are, that have about 450 cu in. engines in them. That is ridiculous. I think the minister should be given some directions in this regard to reduce the horsepower of engines in automobiles. If you're going to reduce the speed, you don't need that big an engine. Also, you'd be conserving gasoline and energy.

Mr. Speaker: Will the member get back to the principle of the bill, please?

Mr. Haggerty: The principle of the bill is to reduce accidents on our highways.

Hon. Mr. Welch: The principle of the bill is to buckle up.

Mr. Samis: It's to make people wear seatbelts.

Mr. Speaker: The bill deals specifically with seatbelts.

Mr. Haggerty: Seatbelts; that's right. All I'm saying is that I do have some reservations about the bill. I did support the legislation that brought in safety helmets for motorcyclists. Quoting again from "Motor Vehicle Collision Facts" — and perhaps I should read it into the record:

> The number of motorcyclists killed and injured continued to increase in 1974, with the exception of motorcycle passengers killed, which decreased 18.8 per cent. While the number of motorcycle drivers killed increased 2.4 per cent, injuries to motorcycle drivers were up 24.3 per cent and injuries to motorcycle passengers increased 13.6 per cent.

Hon. Mr. Snow: There are no seatbelts on motorcycles.

Mr. Samis: It's helmets that are required on motorcycles.

Mr. Haggerty: But the point I raise is that I supported the bill for safety helmets, which this report indicates have not reduced the number of fatal injuries to persons driving motorcycles.

Mr. Speaker: I must remind the member that you're not required to use seatbelts on motorcycles, nor helmets in cars.

Mr. Samis: The member for Lake Nipigon (Mr. Stokes) is doing a great job in the Speaker's chair.

Mr. Haggerty: I am glad the Speaker has listened to me, anyway, because the other speakers before me went all over the bill—

Mr. Ruston: Good point. Right on.

Mr. Samis: Mention seatbelts.

Mr. Haggerty: Mention seatbelts? I suppose I can come back to seatbelts. I don't see any consideration in this bill about having a uniform type of seatbelt.

Mr. Samis: Hurray!

Mr. Haggerty: There's nothing in here that says this. In particular, it has been brought to my attention that a person bought a 1974 car and both seatbelts wouldn't buckle up; to get replacement clips he has to buy the whole complete unit, which amounts to about $170, whereas if a replacement kit was available, it would cost about $2 for a little plastic clip. I think that's something the minister should give consideration to.

The other consideration, when we are talking about seatbelts is that many cars today have four seatbelts, and yet there are many cars that will carry three passengers in the front seat and three in the back seat. What do they do with the other two passengers for whom seatbelts are not made available? Has the minister given any consideration to that?

Hon. Mr. Snow: The number is in the bill.

An hon. member: They don't need them.

Mr. Haggerty: As one member says, they don't need them. Perhaps they don't.

The other matter I'm concerned about relates to school buses that are exempt under the bill. I feel that if there is any place that needs seatbelts, it is school buses, because many of them are a small type of a van that should have them in there. I feel that if anyone rode one of those school buses, they'd find you're not in your seat half the time because the motion of the bus accelerating, stopping and going, almost puts that youngster out of the seat. I've been told that perhaps in a matter of a very few years there are going to be more youngsters who are going to have back problems because of this type of transportation. The minister's squinting his eye. Perhaps he'll see in future years that this is what's going to take place.

Mr. Edighoffer: He is waking up.

Mr. Haggerty: I believe that seatbelts should be made mandatory in school buses.

The other matter concerning seatbelts is that there are persons driving motor vehicles who have difficulties with shoulder belts and find some discomfort with them. I think consideration should be given to maybe a whole new design for seatbelts, because I find that there is much discomfort with them. I do use seatbelts and I find that sometimes being tied to that seat for perhaps almost two hours of driving can cause some discomfort.

I think most of all that as we look at the motor vehicle collision facts in 1974—and the report has been discussed by a number of previous speakers—that whether you have a seatbelt on or not, it is not going to reduce the number of collisions or accidents—and I make reference to the problem of alcohol. I don't think our present point system has been successful in the Province of Ontario. I think there should be some changes. Those persons who want to violate the law in that particular instance should be the ones who should be paying the shot.

There is nothing in the bill to indicate that if you are a good driver you're going to have a reduced insurance premium. That raises another question when you talk about insurance. I'm just wondering this and concerned. If a person is not wearing his seatbelt, does his insurance become void?

I can't get any direction from the minister. I don't know whether he is asleep or not. Oh, he's awake now. Is that what you're nodding your head at me for, Mr. Speaker? To get his attention? All right.

But I think these are the things that should be done. I think there should be better highways designed for safety and better designs in automobiles for safety. I think these are the points that I want to raise. I do support the bill in principle, but as I said, with certain reservations. It is questionable whether the bill, with mandatory enforcement of seatbelts, is going to reduce the number of accidents—and I think only time will tell.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Durham East.

Mr. Samis: The mobile member from the Oshawa region.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The member for Durham East has the floor.

Mr. Moffatt: Mr. Speaker, I think every person in this House throughout the debate has given at least some support, and in some cases a great deal of support, to the idea that seatbelts in the event of a motor vehicle collision will significantly reduce the kind of injuries and fatalities and so on. I happen to support that particular idea.

In listening to the member for Yorkview (Mr. Young)—in whom I have a great deal of faith and who has pursued this kind of legislation for a number of years—I find it intriguing that in the legislation which has been pushed for by that particular member, as soon as we get a scrap from the table of the government which seems to go some way toward the solution of the problem of seatbelts, everybody assumes that the entire package of legislation is going to go the full way and the problems are going to be solved.

I've listened to members from the opposite side today talk about the great step forward of introducing mandatory seatbelts. Quite honestly, I don't think that the bill does all of the things that it's given credit for doing.

I hear people talk about the passive restraint systems in the same way as we used to hear the foes of seatbelts talk about seatbelts. There is the argument about, "You get caught in your car and drown; and you could burn to death." Now air bags are being talked about in the same way.

I think that until we are ready in this province to deal with the system of protecting the occupants of automobiles by proper construction and proper safety measures we will not have achieved anything.

The interesting thing is that the programme which we had last year, the "Buckle up" publicity programme, has obvi-

ously worked, because the members in the back-benches obviously all looked at that booklet and they obviously have all read it and believe it, because the votes have now come together. If that's success, then I guess that's success.

Mr. Wildman: They're still confessing they don't do anything unless they're forced to.

Mr. Moffatt: I don't think half a law at any time really solves the problem. I happen to be one of the people who for a number of years has worn a seatbelt, and I don't think that really solves the entire problem. What I'd like to see is the minister deal in an effective fashion with creating passive restraint legislation in this province. The problem, of course, is that the automobile manufacturers, who have constantly opposed seatbelts and now are opposing passive restraint systems—

Hon. Mr. Snow: Oh no, come on, where did you get that idea?

Mr. Swart: Believe him, he's a spokesman for the automobile industry.

Mr. Moffatt: The automobile industry is now willing to go part way and accept the seatbelts as being a little bit of a problem but we're willing to live with it. They're certainly not willing to live with the idea of having similar dashboards in every particular automobile because the air bag has to fit. We are not willing to deal with the addition of a credenza attachment to the back seats or to the front seats. In every case where substantial experimental work has been done—at Cornell, at UCLA, and in Sweden and in Germany—with regard to experimental cars, if you look carefully, Mr. Speaker, at any of those automobile experiments you won't find seatbelts being used as the restraint system. That's for an obvious reason, because if we wish to go to the position where we will have safety in an automobile we do not go the seatbelt route. It's an interim measure at best. I really fail to see why such a great deal of credit is being given to this particular legislation. Once the Globe and Mail endorses legislation it obviously becomes acceptable, and I don't particularly think that's the best criterion.

I'd like to know what particular merit there is in not bringing along legislation at the same time which will affect school buses? What particular sense is there to say that in this province students in school will ride a bus for 14 years without seatbelts or some other restraint system? I don't happen to think seatbelts work in school buses. It has to be a passive restraint system; there is no other effective way. If you are going to play games with students for 14 years and then expect them to become seatbelt wearers I suggest that is folly, because it just will not happen. We cannot educate people in that fashion. Do you wish me to adjourn?

Mr. Speaker: If this is a convenient place for you to break.

Mr. Moffatt: One place is as convenient as the other.

Mr. Moffatt moved the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to.

Hon. Mr. Welch: Mr. Speaker, before moving the adjournment of the House, tomorrow the House does not sit but there will be ample committee work.

On Thursday, we will go into committee of supply to consider the estimates of the Minister of Natural Resources (Mr. Bernier) to be followed by those of the Provincial Secretary for Resources Development (Mr. Irvine).

Hon. Mr. Welch moved the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to.

The House adjourned at 10:30 p.m.

CONTENTS

Tuesday, November 25, 1975

Highway Traffic Amendment Act, Mr. Snow, on second reading 951

Motion to adjourn, Mr. Welch, agreed to 974

SPEAKERS IN THIS ISSUE

Bain, R. (Timiskaming NDP)
Bullbrook, J. E. (Sarnia L)
Bryden, M. (Beaches-Woodbine NDP)
Deans, I. (Wentworth NDP)
Edighoffer, H. (Perth L)
Ferrier, W. (Cochrane South NDP)
Foulds, J. F. (Port Arthur NDP)
Good, E. R. (Waterloo North L)
Gregory, M. E. C. (Mississauga East PC)
Grossman, L. (St. Andrew-St. Patrick PC)
Haggerty, R. (Erie L)
Henderson, Hon. L. C. Minister without Portfolio (Lambton PC)
Hodgson, W. (York North PC)
Jones, T. (Mississauga North PC)
Kennedy, R. D. (Mississauga South PC)
Moffatt, D. (Durham East NDP)
Newman, B. (Windsor-Walkerville L)
Renwick, J. A. (Riverdale NDP)
Roy, A. J. (Ottawa East L)
Ruston, R. F. (Essex North L)
Samis, G. (Cornwall NDP)
Snow, Hon. J. W. Transportation and Communications (Oakville PC)
Swart, M. (Welland NDP)
Welch, Hon. R. Culture and Recreation (Brock PC)
Wildman, B. (Algoma NDP)
Wiseman, D. J. (Lanark PC)
Yakabuski, P. J. (Renfrew South PC)
Young, F. (Yorkview NDP)

No. 25

Ontario

Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT — DAILY EDITION

First Session of the Thirtieth Legislature

Thursday, November 27, 1975

Afternoon Session

Speaker: Honourable Russell Daniel Rowe
Clerk: Roderick Lewis, QC

THE QUEEN'S PRINTER
PARLIAMENT BUILDINGS, TORONTO
1975

10

CONTENTS

A list of the speakers taking part in the debates in this issue of Hansard appears, in alphabetical order, at the back of this issue.

Daily contents of proceedings also appears at the back of this issue. Reference to a cumulative index of previous issues can be obtained by calling the Hansard Reporting Service indexing staff. Phone 965-2159.

Hansard subscription price is $15.00 per session, from: Sessional Subscription Service, MGS, 9th Floor, Ferguson Block, Parliament Bldgs., Toronto, M7A 1N3. Phone 965-2238.

LEGISLATURE OF ONTARIO

The House met at 2 p.m.

Prayers.

Mr. Speaker: We are always pleased to welcome distinguished guests to our Legislature. This afternoon in the Speaker's gallery we're pleased to have with us Mrs. Ila Roy, an MP from West Bengal in India. We welcome her here.

Mr. Jones: In the west gallery are students from a school that bears a name of tradition in this House. I would ask the members to join me in welcoming 35 grade 12 students, accompanied by Mr. Sands, from Thomas L. Kennedy Secondary School in the new riding of Mississauga North.

Mr. G. I. Miller: I would like to introduce to you, Mr. Speaker, and to the House 98 students from the Port Dover Composite School under the direction of Mr. Black and I would like you to welcome them here today. They're in the east gallery.

Mr. Speaker: Statements by the ministry.

ANTI-INFLATION PROGRAMME

Hon. Mr. McKeough: I thought I might just make some informal comments on yesterday's meetings of the Ministers of Finance. There were also present Ministers of Labour, some Ministers of Consumer and Commercial Affairs, Ministers of Housing and ministers responsible for the public service. There were six agenda items. I might just mention each one of them and make a brief comment, and I think it may open the way for some questions at the appropriate time. The chairman of the Anti-Inflation Board was present.

There was no discussion on the legislation, which is now, I guess, about to go to the third reading stage in the House of Commons. We urged on the chairman, recognizing his problems, the need to get started, to make benchmark decisions which I think would be of help to a great number of other disputes, or potential disputes, on the salary and wage side.

He also indicated to us that they were commencing to monitor prices. There was some discussion on that score as well, with some provinces holding the view that with significant price changes not only should notice be given, but perhaps they should be sent to the board before they were implemented. The government and the board, as I saw it, undertook to take that point under consideration.

There was considerable discussion about the need for flexibility as opposed to getting on with it, and I am not just sure what the approach is. In fairness to the board, and I do make that point, I gather that the board to some extent is unable to proceed as quickly as it might like, because it is waiting for the regulations, which in turn are waiting for the passage of the bill. So if there is, in the media this morning, criticism on my part of the board, it should be tempered by the fact that I understood the position that they were in, although it wasn't entirely clear to us, to be quite frank, as to how far the board can go without the regulations.

There was considerable discussion on professional fees and incomes, and I would sense that the conclusion of the government of Canada would be that all provinces will do their best to ensure that the various billing practices of the professions are in fact frozen, and remain as is. I think we suggested also that in lieu of surtaxing, all professionals should be required to file—not just those of the large firms or in the upper quartile of the various professions in terms of income—and the government undertook to take that under consideration.

The third agenda item was pricing in the government sector. I can only report that there was a very, what I would call, bureaucratic discussion. It was agreed that the officials would take a less bureaucratic look at that whole subject and report back to another meeting, to see if they couldn't find a more reasonable approach which would result in agreement by all 11 governments—which is something which obviously is important, but which has a great number of variations in its approach.

Mr. Nixon: What's a bureaucratic discussion? Nothing can be done?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: No; I think not at all. I think the bureaucrats and perhaps to some extent the politicians became bogged down in the details rather than the general thinking. We are talking about fiscal powers of government, which in many instances—in all instances, supposedly—are outside of guidelines. But as to where that breakpoint is, I think they attempted to define it too closely, which raised a whole set of questions which perhaps aren't all that important.

There was discussion on marketing boards. I believe my colleague, the Minister of Agriculture and Food (Mr. W. Newman), will have something to say about the position taken by Ontario, and I think agreed to by the government of Canada.

Discussion on rent controls was simply that there had been a meeting of the Ministers of Housing the previous day, and that all provinces have some sort of rent controls. Mr. Basford expressed the view that it was too bad there wasn't a greater uniformity of approach but, so be it, they were either in place or going into place.

There was a discussion over the model agreement and the model agreement was only available under section 4(3) and not under section 4(4). The discussion wasn't as conclusive as it might have been and the position of the provinces wasn't as conclusive as it might have been because the 4(4) agreement wasn't available and because the regulations were not available.

I think the view of most provinces, and the view which I expressed after the discussion yesterday, was that we would prefer to opt in under 4(3) but that although the life of the programme totally—assuming the legislation is passed by the Parliament of Canada—will be three years, we would prefer to have the right after 18 months to opt from 4(3) to 4(4).

Mr. Lewis: That is called the shifting of ground carefully.

Mr. Renwick: In a very informal way.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: No, I don't think there was any shifting of ground whatsoever.

Mr. Lewis: If there hadn't been, you would have had a written statement.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The hon. minister is making a statement.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Mr. Macdonald undertook to take that view of the provinces under consideration and to discuss it with his colleagues.

There was some discussion about provincial nominations to the board from the public sector and that was laid over.

No doubt there will be questions on those various points but I thought perhaps it was best by way of statement to give a general outline of what had gone on yesterday.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. Minister of Housing.

Mr. Nixon: Now, let's hear it. The Minister of Revenue (Mr. Meen) comes after you, so be careful.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. Minister of Housing has a statement.

Mr. Roy: We are with you. Give it to them. I am with you.

Mr. Nixon: Will the real John Rhodes please stand up?

Mr. MacDonald: That is the first acknowledgement of a non-statement we have ever seen.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. Can we get on please? The Minister of Agriculture and Food.

POSITION OF MARKETING BOARDS IN ANTI-INFLATION PROGRAMME

Hon. W. Newman: In relation to the Treasurer's statement yesterday regarding the meeting that was held in Ottawa, which I attended, as hon. members are aware the Province of Ontario presented its views on several matters relating to the federal anti-inflation programme to a special federal-provincial meeting of finance ministers held in Ottawa yesterday.

The question of whether marketing boards should be placed under the purview of the Anti-Inflation Board came in for discussion and I would like at this time to inform the House of the precise position the government of Ontario presented and which was subsequently endorsed by the federal Minister of Finance, Mr. Macdonald.

We agreed yesterday with the federal government that in general principle the spirit of the guidelines should apply to marketing boards. In the case of national marketing plans, the federal Farm Products Marketing Council will be responsible for ensuring that national marketing agencies—at present for eggs and turkeys—follow the spirit of the guidelines.

In the case of provincial marketing plans, the Farm Products Marketing Board and the Ontario Milk Commission will be responsible for ensuring that provincial marketing boards follow the spirit of the guidelines. Price appeals heard by both the Ontario Farm Products Marketing Board and the Milk Commission of Ontario will take into account the spirit of the anti-inflation guidelines. Written reasons on all pricing appeal decisions rendered by these two provincial bodies will be sent to the Anti-Inflation Board.

Initially, the federal guidelines provided only for cost pass-through in allowing for increases in prices. What this means is that the price of a commodity could not increase except to the extent of an increase in input costs. I pointed out to Mr. Macdonald that, while this principle was acceptable in general terms, it could not be applied inflexibly. The reason for this is that it may be necessary in certain circumstances to increase prices by more than increased input costs in order to assure continuity of food supplies to our people. Mr. Macdonald accepted my position on this matter.

Mr. Nixon: He didn't know what it was because you came down on both sides.

Mr. Renwick: He didn't understand it.

Mr. Foulds: Even the minister himself didn't understand it.

Hon. W. Newman: Oh, I understood what I was saying all right. Additionally, I will be inviting the Anti-Inflation Board to Ontario to meet with me, the Farm Products Marketing Board and the Ontario Milk Commission, to clarify our views, to discuss the various pricing formulas and cost inputs used by the marketing boards, and to discuss any other administrative details.

[2:15]

Mr. Lewis: You've certainly changed your position since the Ontario Federation of Agriculture speech.

Hon. W. Newman: No, I haven't a bit. If you would just listen.

Mr. Nixon: Yes, you did.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Mr. Lewis: You've backed right off.

Hon. W. Newman: We in Ontario have nothing to hide regarding our marketing boards, and I want the Anti-Inflation Board to know this.

Mr. Renwick: This is change-of-policy day.

Hon. W. Newman: We want our marketing boards to operate within the spirit of the guidelines, without adversely affecting the long-term supply situation of any much-needed agricultural commodity.

Mr. Lewis: Boy, have you shifted ground. It's like a revolving door. First the shifting sands of the Treasury—

HOME BUYER GRANT

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: Mr. Speaker—

Mr. Nixon: The Minister of Revenue (Mr. Meen) should go first this time.

Mr. Lewis: This will be enough of these silly statements.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: —I want to rise on a point of personal privilege regarding—

Mr. MacDonald: Misquoted?

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: —a headline in the Toronto Star of Nov. 26.

Mr. Lewis: What about the Globe and the Sun?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: I feel that the headline grossly distorted the remarks I made in Ottawa and the story that was under the headline.

Mr. Deans: So what? That happens every day.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: I want to make it very clear to the members of this House and others that I have always, and do presently, support wholeheartedly the purpose of the programme as it relates to the first-time home buyer grant.

Mr. Nixon: Even though it's "a gross error" and "utterly silly"?

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: In the course of the interview that I was conducting, in being talked to by reporters in Ottawa, my comments were that I felt that if the programme was to be continued, indeed there should be a ceiling on the price of the homes to which the grant would apply.

Mr. MacDonald: We suggested that 10 months ago.

Mr. Nixon: That doesn't sound like the minister.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: My comment was that I felt the figures we had showed there were homes at a very high price that were eligible for this grant, and that if it was to continue I would prefer to see a ceiling on the prices.

Mr. Roy: Did you use the word "silly"?

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: Mr. Speaker, to say that the programme has been a failure, of course, would be totally untrue.

Mr. Nixon: It is much too successful.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: The total number of grants has been 31,679. Of those units, 26,176 were in the price range of up to $50,000, 82.6 per cent of the total number of grants. In the $50,000 to $75,000 area — 5,144 units; 16.3 per cent. From $75,000 to $100,000 — 279 units; 0.9 per cent. In $100,000 and over—0.2 per cent. Regional distribution of the 80 high-priced units shows Metro with 16, Mississauga 52 and other parts of the province 12.

My remarks—and I do wish to emphasize this—were not at all to be critical of the programme, which has been a success and an excellent programme, but were simply to state—as I did at that time and was correctly reported in the paper as saying—that I felt it was silly to be giving grants to people building $100,000 homes.

Mr. Roy: There you go arguing.

Mr. Nixon: Does the Minister of Revenue (Mr. Meen) feel better now?

ROLE OF PARLIAMENTARY ASSISTANTS

Mr. Speaker: Just before we call the next order, I would like to say that on Monday, Nov. 4, I informed the House that I had requested the chairman of the committee on the fourth and fifth reports of the Ontario Commission on the Legislature to consider the question of parliamentary assistants' participation in the question period. I am informed by the chairman of the committee that its initial consideration is that for the time being the present practice be continued.

Mr. Renwick: That's very daring.

Mr. Speaker: The committee intends to make fuller recommendations on the question period, including this matter of participation by the parliamentary assistants, in the near future.

Oral questions.

ANTI-INFLATION PROGRAMME

Mr. Lewis: A question first to the provincial Treasurer, if I may.

Mr. Roy: The member for Renfrew South (Mr. Yakabuski) won again.

Mr. Lewis: Is the provincial Treasurer saying that if some of the regulations are not palatable to Ontario under the memorandum of agreement when it emerges, or under the guidelines when they are passed; and if the benchmark decisions are not what he would consider acceptable, and if Mr. Macdonald doesn't accept the Treasurer's 18-month formula, is he then prepared to consider opting in under—forgive the shorthand —4(4) rather than 4(3)?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Mr. Speaker, I didn't keep track of all those ifs—

Mr. Shore: There were only three.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: —all of which added up to a very hypothetical question.

Mr. Lewis: You framed them.

Mr. Shore: Give a hypothetical answer.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: I think we have always said that we obviously weren't into the 4(3) approach until we'd signed it; and we've always kept that option open.

We saw the agreement yesterday, but we have not yet seen the regulations—so I think the question at this moment has to be hypothetical. But I would certainly agree completely with the position of the government of Canada, in that they would like all 10 provincial governments to come in under 4(3).

Quebec is going a different route entirely for its own purposes. I think it's fair to say at this moment that only one province as of yesterday, and whether they stick to this remains to be seen, will be going under 4(4). There may be others, but Mr. Macdonald—and I can understand this—was obviously very disappointed that even one province other than Quebec, was going to go the 4(4) route. He felt very keenly, as we feel very keenly, that if the programme is to work in both the public and the private sector there has to be a uniform approach across Canada.

Mr. Lewis: If I may, a supplementary: Since uniformity is now clearly broken and there are many provinces with strong reservations, the Treasurer sounds as though he's hedging rather dramatically from the very strong position he took at the outset and that Ontario may, in fact, join in another way?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: If the Leader of the Opposition thinks that words of mine today indicate that I'm hedging dramatically—

Mr. Lewis: Yes, compared to what he has said.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: —he is wrong.

Mr. Nixon: Supplementary: Since the Minister of Agriculture and Food (Mr. W. Newman) has just informed the House that the application of the anti-inflation position in Ottawa toward marketing boards is going to be applied by provincial boards, would the minister not now at least give further consideration to the involvement of Ontario through the section 4, subsection (4) alternative, particularly in view of the fact that the continuing teachers' strike, as well as other problems in this province, would certainly be assisted by a provincial implementation procedure?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Mr. Speaker, I don't accept the premise of that. I don't think for one minute that they would. If there was a provincial board now in place, I don't know how, in any kind of conscience, the provincial board could render a decision on a dispute from Ontario which was placed before it without lengthy consultation with other provinces operating their own systems and the AIB itself.

Mr. Nixon: How about the Milk Marketing Board or—

Hon. Mr. McKeough: I do not think that it would assist.

Mr. Nixon: —the Egg Marketing Board? They're going to be provincial.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Obviously, where there is a provincial regulatory agency in place, of which we, as I understand it, really have two, the Milk Commission, the Farm Products Marketing Board—

Mr. Nixon: You have the Education Relations Commission.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Oh, that's not the same at all.

Mr. Nixon: It has all the power.

Hon. Mr. Davis: It doesn't. It's not a regulatory body.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Where there is a provincial agency in place, a regulatory agency—for that matter that's also true of the OEB—then the federal government feels, and I would agree it makes some sense to use that regulatory approach. There is no regulatory approach in place in terms of teachers' salaries.

Mr. Shore: Supplementary: Could I ask the Treasurer how he reconciles the fact that two weeks ago he said they were going to opt in, and now he's stating he's keeping his options open?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Obviously we have not opted in until we have signed the agreement.

Mr. Lewis: Oh, come now.

Mr. Nixon: You said you were, at the top of your lungs in this House—at the top of your lungs.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. Does the hon. minister have a further reply?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: I find it a little incredible that a party over there would buy a complete pig in a poke, and say they'll sign in and give somebody a blank cheque.

Mr. Nixon: That is what you did—you want only federal control.

Mr. Lewis: Only you would have the audacity to say that—only you.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Obviously, until the Province of Ontario puts its signature on the dotted line we haven't opted in.

Mr. Roy: When you are in trouble you start challenging us. You give it away.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: There is still the option of not doing so.

Mr. Speaker: Order.

HOME BUYER GRANT

Mr. Lewis: May I ask the Premier, now that the Minister of Housing (Mr. Rhodes) has expressed publicly his repentance for statements misinterpreted by the media—as they always are—can the Premier indicate if he intends to extend the home buyer grant

beyond Dec. 31, or has he now categorically decided against it? Does he intend to modify its terms between now and the end of the application of the grant?

Hon. Mr. Davis: I'm sure, as the Leader of the Opposition has observed, there is nothing on the order paper which indicates the government would be introducing legislation to extend it. I think it would be fair to assume that we will not. The programme itself, as the Minister of Housing has pointed out, has been singularly successful in terms of the housing industry.

Mr. Nixon: It's an embarrassing success.

Hon. Mr. Davis: I would only say to the leader of the third party that he may consider it embarrassingly successful.

Mr. Nixon: You have given away $75 million.

Hon. Mr. Davis: If that is the case, I am delighted. The fact is the programme has worked and it has worked very well. The housing industry has been delighted with it, as have the recipients. I'm surprised he isn't urging us to extend it, as that would be rather consistent with his inconsistent approach to these things.

Mr. Roy: Don't be silly.

Mr. Nixon: I think it was fraught with gross errors and utterly silly in all its aspects. That's what the Minister of Housing said.

Hon. Mr. Davis: As for altering the programme for the next roughly four weeks because there was concern expressed by the minister, and we knew there would be, about some situations perhaps where people didn't actually need the $1,500 or $2,500—there has been 0.2 per cent over the $100,000 figure. The problem the government faced was to determine, shall we say, ceiling amounts in various parts of the province. The Leader of the Opposition would know that a ceiling amount on a house in Scarborough could be quite different from the ceiling amount on a house in Chatham or even in Brampton.

Mr. Lewis: Why choose Chatham? That's not the best comparison.

Mr. Reid: Not for the Leader of the Opposition.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Then I will use Scarborough or what have you.

When it comes to administering the programme itself, in order to expedite it, etc. we did run the risk that 0.2 per cent of the total of people probably had no need of the grant, or no incentive in their case was necessary from the funding of the programme. But when one takes 0.2 per cent out of the 100, I have to say I think it has been without question very successful, but it is highly unlikely the programme will be extended beyond the end of this year.

PAPERWORKERS' STRIKE

Mr. Lewis: A question, if I may, for the Minister of Labour: Can the minister clear up the apparent confusion which exists about what commitments, if any, or what undertakings, if any, she made to the various municipal officials who met over the prolonged strike in the woods industry? How did some of them emerge with a clear public impression that a commitment to compulsory arbitration had been provided by the minister?

Hon. B. Stephenson: I reported on Tuesday of our meeting with the mayors of the 11 municipalities in which there are paper plants presently on strike. I reported exactly the commitment which we have made to the mayors. We received their petition and advised them that this was one of the alternatives which might be considered and that it would in fact be seriously considered as one of the alternatives. But I did not promise them that it was one of the things that we were going to do within the next week.

Yesterday afternoon in Ottawa I received a telephone call from a newspaper in Toronto wanting to know when I had telephoned Mayor Foucault in Espanola to tell him the cabinet was considering enacting legislation within the next week, which was the report that came across the Canadian Press wire and through the radio system apparently in northern Ontario. I informed that reporter that I had not talked to Mayor Foucault except on Tuesday morning in the presence of all the other mayors, and that is a fact.

This morning Mayor Foucault telephoned me and informed me that he hadn't made the statement either. He has now laid the blame upon a newspaper reporter in Sudbury who probably must have been in his cups when he made the statement, because Mayor Foucault swears that he was very careful to announce to the press in northern Ontario precisely his understanding of what I had

said, which was the understanding of the Leader of the Opposition of what I had said.

Mr. Lewis: Why do you always attack northern Ontario? What's wrong with you?

I have a supplementary, if I may. Has the minister appointed at any time the equivalent of a fact-finder under the amendments which we provided for the Ontario Labour Relations Act in this Legislature to deal with a situation exactly of this kind? If that initiative has at no point been taken by the ministry, why would she consider compulsory arbitration rather than ordering the companies back to the bargaining table to make a good-faith offer?

Hon. B. Stephenson: As I suggested, this was one route which might be considered along with several other alternatives. We made no commitment to the resolution which was presented by the mayors. We simply said this was one route which could be considered. There were others which we were considering and one which we were pursuing.

Mr. Deans: What were the others?

Mr. Lewis: Can the minister answer the question?

Hon. B. Stephenson: Yes, the alternative we are pursuing at the moment is getting them back to the bargaining table.

Mr. R. S. Smith: Supplementary: The minister indicated in her first answer that there had been a commitment made—but she didn't say what it was. I would like to ask what the commitment is to the mayors? I would also like to add that most of the press up there are sober, as are most of the mayors.

Hon. B. Stephenson: Mr. Speaker, if I might say, it was not my personal suggestion that the reporter had been in his cups. As a matter of fact, the elected member for northern Ontario suggested that that must have been his fate when he made the statement.

Mr. Lewis: Who? Mr. Foucault?

Mr. Nixon: Which hon. member from northern Ontario?

Hon. Mr. Stephenson: The hon. member for northern Ontario.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. Could we get to the answer of the first question?

Mr. Lewis: Who does the minister mean—Mayor Foucault?

Hon. B. Stephenson: Mr. Foucault suggested it.

Mr. Lewis: He is a Liberal—what does the minister expect?

Hon. B. Stephenson: I'm sorry I did not inquire of him his politics. I apologize for that omission. The next time I shall be sure to, thank you.

If I might respond to the question posed by my hon. colleague, the commitment that we made to the 11 mayors was that we would seriously look at their resolution and their position and that it would be considered in the light of the other alternatives which we were considering at the moment.

Mr. Wildman: Is the fact-finder appointed?

Hon. B. Stephenson: The fact-finder—that question I should answer. May I please answer it now? The fact-finder has, in fact, in one case been appointed—and has reported verbally only.

Mr. R. S. Smith: What are the other alternatives the minister is looking at? That's part of my supplementary question.

Hon. B. Stephenson: I think the best alternative would be to get both parties back to the bargaining table to try to resolve the impasse at which they seem to be right at the moment.

Mr. R. S. Smith: We don't have a strike any longer; we have a walkout.

Mr. Swart: As one of the techniques of getting the companies back to the bargaining table, will the minister inform them that their cutting rights may be in jeopardy if they do not come back to the bargaining table and make a reasonable offer?

Hon. B. Stephenson: Mr. Speaker, since I have no authority over their cutting rights, I am not likely, personally, to use that mechanism. That is one which might be considered, I suppose; but I have not considered it at all.

MISSISSAUGA INQUIRY

Mr. Nixon: I would like to put a question to the Attorney General. Now that the divisional court has ruled that Judge Stortini was not in contempt when he wrote to the Corporation of the town of Mississauga recommending that further investigation would be warranted, will the Attorney General give further consideration himself to an investigation under the Public Inquiries Act into these

matters in the Mississauga area and the former municipalities?

Hon. Mr. McMurtry: Mr. Speaker, perhaps it would assist my friend if I were to read to him and the House a letter that I wrote to the corporation of the city of Mississauga in reply to a letter that was delivered to me on Tuesday of this week in which the corporation made the same request.

Mr. Speaker: If it's a very brief letter it will be permitted; if it's long, perhaps the hon. minister might summarize it.

Hon. Mr. McMurtry: My friend and his colleagues have been asking—

Mr. Nixon: Perhaps we can revert to statements.

Mr. Speaker: Unless we revert to statements.

Mr. Lewis: Let us revert to statements.

Mr. Speaker: Is it a lengthy answer which would be of importance?

Hon. Mr. McMurtry: It's an answer of 1½ pages.

An hon. member: That's not long.

Mr. Speaker: We will revert to statements momentarily. We'll keep track of the time. The hon. minister.

Hon. Mr. McMurtry: The letter is of today's date, to the corporation of the city of Mississauga.

Dear Sirs:

Following the passage of council's resolution 218, lengthy investigation was conducted by the Ontario Provincial Police into the allegations on which council's resolution was predicated solely to determine whether any breach of the Criminal Code has been committed. The Crown attorney concluded, after reviewing comprehensive police reports, that no charge was warranted in relation to any allegation made.

On July 4, 1975, copies of the police reports were delivered to Mr. Noel Bates, inquiry counsel, at which time Mr. Bates was informed that this ministry had serious reservations concerning the legality of council's resolution.

Notwithstanding this ministry's views of the legality of council's resolution, the inquiry counsel pressed from the outset for extraordinary powers under Part 3 of the Public Inquiries Act.

However, he failed to provide any evidence to indicate such extended authority would be warranted or beneficial to the inquiry in any way, although he was advised on numerous occasions that his application would require such support.

I have no desire to, or intention of interfering with the powers and prerogatives of municipal council where such rights are exercised according to law. It would appear abundantly clear from a reading of section 240, and the divisional court decision in this matter, that any contemplated resolution should particularize each allegation to be investigated in the manner set out in the judgement.

This observation would apply, of course, to the allegations contained in Judge Stortini's letter to you of Nov. 6, 1975. I would assure you that in the event an inquiry is validly called by the municipality and an application for Part 3 powers, based on firm and specific grounds, is requested, it will be dealt with on the merits, if such powers are available in a judicial inquiry insituted under section 240 of the Municipal Act. Yours truly.

I might say there are some serious doubts as to whether such powers are available and my view at the moment is that they are not. But in completing my reply to my friend's answer I would indicate that if there are brought to our attention any allegations and the particulars of any allegations which would warrant any investigation by this ministry, we would be pleased to receive such information.

To date, we simply have not received any such information which would warrant our investigating the matter further or calling for a public inquiry.

Mr. Speaker: We will add three minutes to the question period.

Mr. Nixon: Supplementary: Since the burden of the letter read to us by the Attorney General leaves it with the council of Mississauga to proceed under the provisions in the sections of the Municipal Act, wouldn't the Attorney General agree that he bears an overall responsibility, under the Public Inquiries Act, to dispel the uncertainties that have grown up around the allegations and counter-allegations, the courts suits and counter-suits, all of it underlined by the letter from Judge Stortini indicating that he believes there should be a public inquiry? Would the minister not agree that the only way to settle this is to appoint a judge to inquire on the basis of the Public Inquiries Act?

Hon. Mr. McMurtry: As I indicated, Mr. Speaker, in my letter, all the allegations referred to were investigated completely by the law enforcement agencies of this department of this province. There simply, at this point, is no evidence to warrant such an investigation.

The letter from Judge Stortini to the Mississauga council, according to an affidavit of Judge Stortini's own counsel, was written at the request of the mayor of Mississauga and I repeat, Mr. Speaker, if any specific allegations that have not been investigated are brought to our attention, we will certainly entertain any such request. But it's my considered view that it's not my responsibility as the Attorney General of this province to use public funds to go on a fishing expedition for the mayor of Mississauga.

Mr. Roy: Taking it, as the Attorney General says, that your investigation and review of the evidence did not disclose any breaches of the Criminal Code, what about breaches under the Municipal Act and what about conflicts of interest which may well have existed? Is this type of evidence not supportive of an investigation, as is suggested by Judge Stortini?

Hon. Mr. McMurtry: I know of no such evidence of breaches of any provincial statutes.

Mr. Lewis: I have a supplementary—probably a slightly peripheral question: What was the implication of your observation that the letter from Judge Stortini had been written at the request of the mayor? Was the implication that Judge Stortini would not otherwise have requested a further inquiry; that somehow he was influenced by the mayor's request?

Hon. Mr. McMurtry: The implication would be that it was the view of the mayor of Mississauga, and not the view of Judge Stortini, that a further investigation was warranted.

Mr. Nixon: But surely, if you will permit Mr. Speaker, as a supplementary, I think arising directly from the answer made by the Attorney General: Wouldn't the Attorney General agree that the letter from Judge Stortini was in response to a request from the mayor that, having had what they considered to be a legal, public injuriy under the Municipal Act and having spent many thousands of dollars on it, the least they should have from the judge is a report of his findings that any suggestion that the mayor had dictated to the judge what his findings should be is thoroughly incorrect and irresponsible.

Hon. Mr. McMurtry: Mr. Speaker, I'm sure my friend has available to him a copy of this letter. It is clear on the face of it that it is not a summary of any such findings. We would be very interested in any such findings that were allegedly made by His Honour Judge Stortini.

Mr. Nixon: Why doesn't the Attorney General call the judge and ask him?

Hon. Mr. McMurtry: But there was no such report whatsoever. Again we are left completely in the dark as to what, if any, allegations should be investigated.

Mr. Nixon: To say that it is the mayor's opinion is wrong.

EDUCATION RELATIONS COMMISSION

Mr. Nixon: A question of the Minister of Education: Has he taken steps to bring the Education Relations Commission up to its full strength of five, since evidently he agrees with their contention they should be holding public hearings as to whether the strike is endangering the education process of the students?

Hon. Mr. Wells: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I have under consideration some names for appointment to that commission.

Mr. Nixon: Since the strike seems to be becoming a bit of a fiasco, would he not think it is something he should take under more than just consideration and bring that commission up to full strength; if he agrees with them that they shonld be holding public hearings as to whether they ought to recommend to the government that the strike be brought to an end?

Hon. Mr. Wells: Mr. Speaker, I would point out to my friend that the Education Relations Commission can operate fully with three people. They constitute a quorum and they can carry out all the powers the Act gives to them.

Mr. Nixon: They are part-time commissioners.

AID TO THIRD WORLD

Mr. Nixon: I would also like to ask the Premier if he is going to present a report to us from the former Deputy Minister of Agri-

culture and Food, Dick Hilliard, who has been travelling the world to ascertain whether the government ought to make matching grants to certain church organizations, which have requested this approach from this province and other provinces in order to assist in relief to the third world?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I think that question might be properly directed to the Minister of Agriculture and Food (Mr. W. Newman).

Mr. Nixon: Might I just put a supplementary to the Premier, based on his answer, that I believe it is a matter of government policy, that it is not a matter of agricultural policy.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. Did the member have a question?

Mr. Nixon: In fact would he not agree that since the report was commissioned by the government, not the Ministry of Agriculture and Food, that we could at least get the information from the Premier?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I would be quite delighted, then, to reply to the leader of the Liberal Party of this province that I shall, sometime later today, speak to the Minister of Agriculture and Food, get from him the most recent information from Mr. Hilliard and then reply to the question from the leader of the Liberal Party tomorrow afternoon.

Mr. Nixon: That's better. All right.

Hon. Mr. Davis: All I was trying to do was to expedite the information for the hon. member. If he doesn't want it this afternoon, then I will get it for him tomorrow afternoon.

Mr. Nixon: I would put a question to the Minister of Agriculture—

Hon. Mr. Davis: I will get it for him tomorrow .

Mr. Nixon: —that since this matter was sloughed off by the Premier when it was—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. This is a debating type question. If the hon. member wishes to ask a question of information, fine.

Hon. Mr. Davis: I will get it for him.

Mr. Nixon: All right. What has the Minister of Agriculture and Food to report on this matter of high policy?

Hon. W. Newman: Mr. Speaker, I wasn't listening to the total question.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Mr. Roy: Is he sloughing it off or not?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. This sort of questioning and cross-questioning is wasting time. Does the hon. member have a question now?

Mr. Nixon: Not only this form of questioning but this form of answering. I have no more questions at this time.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. Your point of order?

Mr. Lewis: I wanted to follow that question, can I ask—

Interjections.

Mr. Speaker: If you wish to ask a question directly, all right.

Mr. Lewis: I would like to know how much money the government has wasted on all of that travel.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

ARNPRIOR HYDRO PROJECT

Hon. Mr. Timbrell: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for Renfrew South (Mr. Yakabuski) asked a question earlier this week regarding union hiring practices at the Ontario Hydro project in Arnprior.

I can now inform him and the House that before starting the Arnprior Hydro project a pre-job discussion was held with representatives of various international unions whose members will be employed on the project. As a result of this meeting, the International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers designated Local 586 Ottawa as the appropriate influencing union local for the site. In a normal course of action Local 586 of the IBEW at Ottawa would refer men from the Pembroke area. However, if not one was available then workers from Ottawa would be sent.

Apparently this is what has happened. As of Oct. 31, only four electricians were on the job. The major electrical contract in Arnprior will commence in 1976. With regard to the employment of electrical workers, any contractor coming on site will be required to live by the terms of its own collective agreement, if one has been signed in the area, or to apply those conditions established by Ontario Hydro, which represents the local influencing rate in the area.

[2:45]

PORT ARTHUR CLINIC STRIKE

Mr. Foulds: A question of the Minister of Labour: Has the minister received a telegram from Local 368 of the Service Employees' Union and can she inform me what her ministry or government is going to do in the next few days, in a concrete way, to settle the dispute at the Port Arthur clinic?

Hon. B. Stephenson: I received a copy of that telegram just before I came to the House today. I have read it and I have not decided what I am going to do about it yet.

Mr. Foulds: Supplementary: Does the minister feel that the appointment of a fact-finder or a disputes advisory committee, under the amendments that we passed in July, would be advisable in this case in achieving a settlement and in circumventing the obstructionism of one of the negotiators for the Port Arthur clinic?

Hon. B. Stephenson: Mr. Speaker, it is certainly one of the routes available, yes.

Mr. Foulds: A final supplementary if I may.

Mr. Speaker: Yes, all right, a final supplementary.

Mr. Good: If you haven't got the answers how can you ask a supplementary?

Mr. Speaker: Make it very quick. If we have very short questions and very short answers it expedites the matter. We will let the member ask another supplementary.

Mr. Foulds: Does the minister feel that either of those steps would be a fruitful route to take in the next few days?

Hon. B. Stephenson: I would have to say, perhaps either one of them might be a fruitful route.

METRIC ROAD SIGNS

Mr. Worton: I have a question of the Minister of Transportation and Communications: When the highway signs are being changed to accommodate the reduced speed limits, will the minister give consideration to adopting signs in kilometres as well as the present system of miles per hour?

Hon. Mr. Snow: I had given consideration to this possibility and decided against making the overall change to kilometres at this time, because officially it is at least two years or more before Canada goes metric on the highways. We have made the decision to change the signs as inexpensively as possible by attaching a type of decal to the existing signs, which can be done without removing the signs, and then when the metric change-over becomes official we will change the signs at that time.

Mr. Worton: Supplementary: Would the minister not think it would be an opportune time to start educating the people on this route that we will be taking in two years' time?

Mr. Roy: And save some money in the process.

Hon. Mr. Snow: Yes, I have also thought about this. We now have a few signs on the highways showing distances to the next town or city in kilometres as an educational programme. I believe some of the auto companies are now coming out with, shall we say, bilingual speedometers that show the speed in both kilometres and miles per hour.

Mr. MacDonald: Bilingual?

Hon. Mr. Snow: I couldn't think of a better word at the moment.

Mr. Reid: What's that—French and German?

Hon. Mr. Snow: There's another slight problem. When we do go to the metric system on the freeways, I anticipate that the speed will probably be 100 kilometres per hour and that does not coincide exactly with 60 miles per hour. So, if we started putting signs up at 100 kilometres per hour when the regulation says 60 miles per hour, there could be a legal difficulty there, because I believe 100 kilometres works out to something like 61 miles.

Mr. Lewis: That's a deterrent.

SALARY INCREASES BY EDUCATION BOARDS

Hon. Mr. Wells: Mr. Speaker, the Leader of the Opposition asked me the other day about the salaries for supervisory personnel in the Northumberland-Newcastle Board of Education. I checked on this matter. The increases that were granted were done after the teacher salary contract had been settled on Oct. 9, and were calculated on a predetermined formula which the board has always had and which it uses automatically. The increases for these supervisory categories were

worked out and were enacted by the board by resolution on Oct. 23. They worked out a $7,500 increase for the director, $6,500 for the superintendent, $6,000 for area superintendents and $5,810 for the superintendent of business. These revised salaries, however, after the resolution passed by the board, have been sent to the Anti-Inflation Board in Ottawa for review by that board and the board is presently waiting the ruling of the Anti-Inflation Board.

COW-CALF PROGRAMME

Mr. MacDonald: A question of the Minister of Agriculture and Food with regard to the government's cow-calf income insurance programme: Now that the market price indicates a prospective shortfall of nearly 20 cents as compared with the forecasted 10 cents from your guarantee of 51 cents, will the minister indicate whether this shortfall is likely to result in an increase in premiums next year? Secondly, would the minister give assurances now that any increase in premiums or any other change in the programme will be the result of meaningful consultation and/or negotiation with the appropriate farm organization rather than unilateral action by the government?

Hon. W. Newman: Mr. Speaker, I have met with the OBIA—the Ontario Beef Improvement Association—and we have already discussed this very matter. As a matter of fact, I met with them last week. We anticipated when the markets first came on we could have the average price as low as 30 cents. I said it was somewhere around 33; I think it is going to be closer to 32. We set the premium at $5 a share and I can assure the member we have to look at the cost factors and the input cost factors before any decisions can be made next year. I am quite prepared to discuss it with the OBIA or any other group that wants to discuss it with me.

Mr. MacDonald: Supplementary: What the minister is in effect saying is that there may well be a premium increase next year and therefore I repeat my second question. Is the minister suggesting then that the appropriate organization to discuss this with is the OBIA?

Hon. W. Newman: I didn't say that. Now, let's get it straight! The Ontario Beef Improvement Association is a representative of the beef industry.

Mr. MacDonald: Did the minister negotiate with them in the first instance?

Hon. W. Newman: Just a minute, let me finish. There are other organizations too in this province and I recognize them all and they all do a very fine job. There are a lot of members in the Ontario Federation of Agriculture who are beef producers. There are a lot of members of the Christian Farmers Federation who are beef producers. I am aware that there are a lot of people involved and I can assure the member that before that price was reached last year there was a lot of discussion. We are talking now about an overall average price of somewhere between 32 and 33 cents.

Coming back to the member's next question on what the premium will be next year, I would hope—but not until I have consultation with other groups—that we could keep the premium within reasonable bounds. The member is asking me to take a unilateral decision now on next year without consultation.

Mr. MacDonald: No! I have specifically asked for assurance that there will be consultation with the appropriate farm organizations.

Hon. W. Newman: I am quite prepared to have consultation with the various farm groups involved.

Interjections.

Mr. McKessock: A supplementary on the cow-calf stabilization programme in Ontario: Could the minister explain to the House how the 50-cent ceiling in Ontario is equal to the BC 77 cents—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I didn't hear that question asked. The hon. member for Rainy River I think had a supplementary.

Interjections.

Mr. Reid: Mr. Speaker, the same question—

Mr. MacDonald: Answer the question, but we may have to revert to statements.

Hon. W. Newman: I am prepared to answer that question, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Actually, neither the original question or the answer had anything to do with the supplementary. If you want to ask that question later, okay. The member for Grey wishes to ask a new question.

Mr. McKessock: Would the minister explain to the House how the cow-calf stabilization programme in Ontario with its 50-cent ceiling is equal to 77 cents in BC, a statement which he made at the OFA convention on Tuesday night?

Mr. Lewis: He also said that marketing boards wouldn't come under guidelines.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Hon. W. Newman: I did not! I said—

Mr. Lewis: Nobody understood that speech.

Hon. W. Newman: Nobody understood it?

Mr. Nixon: Tell us the story about the eagle.

Hon. W. Newman: I will tell the member something. The farmers of this province understood that statement—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Hon. W. Newman: —and that's what's important.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Mr. MacDonald: They understood that speech and you will hear about it before you are finished.

Mr. Speaker: Order. We are wasting the time of the question period. Does the hon. minister have an answer to that question?

Mr. Good: Maybe the member for Middlesex (Mr. Eaton) should have got this portfolio.

Hon. W. Newman: Mr. Speaker, I will be glad to answer that question but to be quite honest with you, it's at least five pages long and if you—

Mr. Reid: You're not trying to be funny?

Hon. W. Newman: I am not being funny and don't make fun about it because let me tell you—

Mr. Nixon: Fifty cents is equal to 77 cents?

Mr. Reid: If he keeps that up he'll be Treasurer.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Mr. Lewis: It was a great explanation.

Hon. W. Newman: Mr. Speaker, it was a very complicated formula to work out. I will be glad to send the hon. member a copy of it because I know that the opposition is already researching it out. Quite obviously if they've researched it out they know it's correct.

Interjections.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

GREENING DONALD STRIKE

Mr. Deans: I have a question of the Minister of Labour. Does the Minister of Labour have any information available with regard to involvement by the ministry in the Greening Donald strike situation in Hamilton? They've been on strike for seven months and it would be helpful to find out if the ministry knows anything about it or is prepared to take any action to try and bring about an end to the situation. And does the minister feel—

Mr. Speaker: I think the question has been asked. Does the hon. minister have an answer?

Mr. Deans: And does the minister feel there might be some indication of interference from outside of the country, from Germany in particular, in the negotiations that are currently taking place?

Hon. B. Stephenson: In answer to the last question, Mr. Speaker, I have no such information. In answer to the first question, the ministry has been involved from time to time, although the time of our last active involvement in mediation was at the beginning of October. There has been no request from either side for a further continuation of mediation since that time, to my knowledge.

Mr. Deans: Supplementary question: In the report given to the minister, is there any indication of whether there is any feeling on the part of the person reporting to the ministry about the attitude of the company vis-à-vis good-faith bargaining?

Hon. B. Stephenson: I have no such report.

Mr. Deans: One final supplementary—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I think we'll get on, we're short of time. The member for Armourdale.

PAVING OF SPADINA EXTENSION

Mr. Givens: To the Minister of Transportation and Communications: When will the minister approve the application of Metro to pave the Spadina ditch from Lawrence to Eglinton, now that they have submitted all the relevant data to him?

Hon. Mr. Snow: Very soon, Mr. Speaker.

ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT ACT

Mrs. Gigantes: A question to the Minister of the Environment: When does the government intend to proclaim the Environmental Assessment Act? And will the minister consider, as a matter of priority, asking for a review of the McCaul-Orde St. switching station by Ontario Hydro?

Hon. Mr. Kerr: We hope to proclaim the Environmental Assessment Act by the end of this year, Mr. Speaker, just as soon as the regulations are ready. The regulations are being compiled at the present time, and as the hon. member will appreciate, this involves other ministries as well as other agencies; but hopefully it will be proclaimed, certainly by the new year.

On the second point, I was under the impression—and I'm just going by newspaper reports, possibly this should be directed to the Minister of Energy (Mr. Timbrell)—but I was under the impression that Hydro had pretty well indicated they would abandon that site.

Mr. Good: Supplementary, Mr. Speaker: Arising out of the minister's reply that the regulations will be ready by Christmas, has he acceded to the request of the PMLC that they be consulted in the drafting of the regulations? And if so, has he also acceded to the request of the environmental groups to have input into the regulations of the Environmental Assessment Act?

Hon. Mr. Kerr: As far as PMLC is concerned, I hope to appear before them a week from tomorrow, at which time there will be a review of the regulations that are available to date. I wasn't aware that certain environmental groups were anxious to have some say in the proclaiming of the regulations.

Mrs. Gigantes: Is the minister not aware of a request by the city of Toronto council that the government provide funding for an outside investigation of this switching station? This was dated Oct. 8. Is the minister not aware that the government has not yet seen fit to reply to that request?

Hon. Mr. Kerr: That request, I would assume, would either go to Hydro or to the Minister of Energy. I'm not aware of it.

[3:00]

CREDIT RULES FOR WOMEN

Mr. Mancini: I have a question of the Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations, who has now become the champion of women's rights. I would like to ask the minister what measures he proposes to take in order to ensure that the companies abide by his new guidelines to provide equality in credit arrangements for women?

Hon. Mr. Handleman: Mr. Speaker, in my statement to the House at the time I introduced the guidelines a few days ago I made it quite clear that these were entered into voluntarily by the companies and organizations named and that we would be monitoring to ascertain whether or not there were any violations of them. We also added that if there were consistent violations, we would not hesitate to use the legislative option.

Mr. Mancini: Supplementary, Mr. Speaker. I would like to know why the minister is now so confident that the companies—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. Is there a question?

Mr. Roy: Sure.

Mr. Nixon: He would like to know why.

Mr. Mancini: This is a question, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: This is not a debating period. If it's a question of further information, fine.

Mr. Mancini: Yes. I would like to know why the minister is now so confident that the companies will enforce equality for women—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. That is not a proper question, as the hon. member well knows. It's a debating type of question.

Mrs. Campbell: It is?

Interjections.

Mr. Mancini: I would like to know—

Mr. Speaker: Does the hon. member have a genuine supplementary for information, not for debate?

Mr. Roy: Yes.

Mr. Givens: Very sincere.

Mr. Mancini: Would the minister tell me why he believes the companies will now be compliant in enforcing equality for women in credit ratings when they have not been before?

Mr. Roy: Right.

Hon. Mr. Handleman: Mr. Speaker, there was nothing to comply with before. There are now guidelines to comply with.

Interjections.

Mrs. Sandeman: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: This will be the final supplementary.

Mr. Mancini: The champion of women's rights.

Mrs. Sandeman: Is the minister prepared to put a deadline on the time during which he will watch the companies to see if they are going to comply?

Hon. Mr. Handleman: I am sure the hon. member would not want me to put a deadline on in case there weren't any complaints in that time. We will monitor it on a permanent basis and if the time comes that we feel there's necessity for legislation, we will not hesitate to bring it in.

PROVISION OF SOCIAL SERVICES

Mr. McClellan: I have a question for the Minister of Community and Social Services. My understanding is that the next federal-provincial welfare ministers conference will be held in January to review the proposed federal Social Services Act. I want to ask the minister whether Ontario has developed its position statement for this conference respecting federal-provincial arrangements for the provision of social services and whether the minister will undertake to table the position statement either now or as soon as it becomes available?

Hon. Mr. Taylor: I think the member should realize that these are negotiations which are going on and that they cover the whole field of income security, as well as the delivery system of social services, the social programme. As far as the provincial posture is concerned we have been meeting, as members know, over a period of years with the federal government in regard to the renegotiation of the Canada Assistance Plan.

We are currently developing, hopefully, a more formal posture in terms of our relationship vis-à-vis the federal government in regard to the whole field. That position, hopefully including the philosophy of the Conservative Party, will be implicit in the posture we adopt. I don't expect there will be any formal paper for tabling.

AID FOR EGG PRODUCERS

Mr. Gaunt: Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the Minister of Agriculture and Food: What action is the minister proposing to take to assist the egg producers in the province in view of the CDA report showing increased pullet placements in Quebec while our producers are operating at 62 per cent of quota and have been attempting to hold the line in this regard?

Hon. W. Newman: Mr. Speaker, as far as the producers of the Province of Ontario are concerned—there's been a lot of comment in the news media lately about it—I have asked for an extension of our present agreement with Ottawa for six months. I've asked for a special committee to be set up to look at the allocations to the egg producers of the Province of Ontario, which is now set at 38.1 per cent. I've asked them to have another look at this overall programme to see what can be done to help the egg producers of the Province of Ontario.

Mr. Gaunt: Supplementary: If the placement figures as reported are correct, would this not constitute a violation of the CEMA agreement?

Hon. W. Newman: There is a possibility there are violations of the agreement under CEMA. The power of seizure is granted to the provincial agencies in Ontario.

Mr. Gaunt: That is here in Ontario?

Hon. W. Newman: Here in Ontario. But they have to have approval of the Farm Products Marketing Board before they can do it. I have asked the Farm Products Marketing Board to make a thorough investigation of the allegations that were made last week in the Toronto news media against certain board members who were over quota on hens.

There were a lot of factors involved in this situation. For instance, hens up to 24 weeks of age and under are not included in the overall count. When they get to 24 weeks of age and are at their potential laying age, the actual count takes place. As a result of the controversy, the Farm Products Marketing Board is looking into the whole matter now and I expect a report back in the very near future.

SALARY INCREASES BY EDUCATION BOARDS

Hon. Mr. Wells: I answered a question a few minutes ago about the Northumberland-Newcastle Board of Education and I forgot one very important part to the answer. Pending the review by the Anti-Inflation Board of these increased salaries, the officials are stay-

ing at the 1974-1975 salaries until they get the results of the AIB review of the new salary schedule.

Mr. Speaker: The oral question period has expired.

POSITION OF MARKETING BOARDS IN ANTI-INFLATION PROGRAMME

Mr. Lewis: On a point of order, if I may: Earlier in the question period the Minister of Agriculture and Food indicated his statement today that the marketing boards would be under the guidelines did not conflict with what he had said to the Ontario Federation of Agriculture on Tuesday last. Again later in the question period he denied he had indicated the contrary to them.

On page 18 of the minister's speech to the Ontario Federation of Agriculture there is the following paragraph:

> And as for the mutterings from the Anti-Inflation Board about bringing marketing boards under the overall federal wages and price guidelines, I say no, most emphatically no.

Hon. W. Newman: The hon. member rose on a point of order or a point of privilege or whatever he rose on—

Mr. Lewis: On a point of order.

Hon. W. Newman: I think it's only fair that I have a chance to answer. He should have listened to my statement today. I said initially the federal guidelines provided only—and maybe he doesn't understand this so I'll go over it very slowly—provided only for cost pass-through in allowing for increases in prices. What this means is that the price of a commodity could not increase except to the extent of an increase in input cost. I pointed out to Mr. Macdonald that, while this principle was acceptable in general terms, it could not be applied inflexibly. The reason for this is that it may be necessary in certain circumstances to increase prices by more than the increased input cost in order to assure the continuity of food supplies. Mr. Macdonald accepted my position, and that was one of the major points I made yesterday.

Mr. Shore: Did he understand it?

Hon. Mr. Newman: There are extenuating circumstances, sometimes, in which the farmer needs some protection.

Mr. Nixon: The minister sounds like Mackenzie King.

Mr. Breithaupt: Changes if necessary, but not necessarily changes.

Mr. Speaker: Petitions.

Presenting reports.

Hon. Mr. Parrott presented the annual report of the University of Waterloo for the year ending April 30, 1975.

Mr. Speaker: Motions.

Introduction of bills.

MOTORIZED SNOW VEHICLES AMENDMENT ACT

Hon. Mr. Snow moved first reading of bill intituled, An Act to amend the Motorized Snow Vehicles Act, 1974.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Hon. Mr. Snow: Mr. Speaker, the Motorized Vehicles Act at the present time prohibits the operation of a motorized snow vehicle in certain circumstances on a serviced roadway, which is defined so as to include the shoulder as well as that portion of the highway normally used by motor vehicle traffic.

Since there are a number of locations throughout the province where the shoulder is so wide that it is not ploughed for its full width this bill amends the definition so as to include only the ploughed portion of the shoulder, as well as that portion of the highway used for motor vehicles. There are one or two minor housekeeping sections to the bill.

AUTOMOBILE INSURANCE RATE CONTROL BOARD ACT

Mr. Swart moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to establish the Automobile Insurance Rate Control Board.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Mr. Swart: Mr. Speaker, the purpose of the bill is to freeze automobile insurance rates effective Nov. 15, 1975. The bill also establishes an automobile insurance rate control board which would have the power to approve and fix rates and to conduct public hearings dealing with rate changes. It is very much a companion bill to compulsory seatbelt use and lower speed limits.

LABOUR RELATIONS AMENDMENT ACT

Mr. Haggerty moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to amend the Labour Relations Act.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Mr. Haggerty: Mr. Speaker, the concern of the community over the inconvenience of an impasse in a collective bargaining process is at a level which requires serious attention by this Legislature.

The purpose of the bill is to provide a mechanism whereby the minister can order parties to a strike or lockout to end the strike or lockout for a period of 60 days during which time the parties try to reach a settlement.

Hon. Mr. Welch: Mr. Speaker, before the orders of the day, I wish to table answers to questions 5, 6, 7 and 8 standing on the order paper. (See Appendix, page 1028)

Mr. Speaker: Orders of the day.

Clerk of the House: The seventh order, House in committee of supply.

[3:15]

ESTIMATES, MINISTRY OF NATURAL RESOURCES

Mr. Chairman: Does the minister have an opening statement?

Hon. Mr. Bernier: Yes, I have an opening statement and I have to admit to you and to the members of the House that it is a rather lengthy one. I felt that with a number of new members in the Legislature it would be an excellent opportunity to review in detail many of the programmes and the goals and responsibilities of the Ministry of Natural Resources.

At the outset, I must compliment you, sir, on your elevation to chairman of the committee of the whole. I think it is becoming to your experience in this particular House. I hope you would not be totally muzzled by your position as chairman, because I have to admit that in the past we've benefited from your active debate, your active participation, in the debates on my particular ministry.

Your knowledge, certainly of the problems as they relate to northern Ontario, is well received—

Mr. Laughren: Careful, Jack.

Mr. Lewis: Of whom are you speaking? Mr. Chairman, on a point of order, get him back to the estimates.

Hon. Mr. Bernier: No, it's not a point of order. He hasn't got a point of order. I wish you would bestow on your illustrious leader some of the information you have.

Mr. Lewis: That's what I was afraid of. Get him back—

Mr. Nixon: He's only being provocative. He's not bestowing—

Hon. Mr. Bernier: You forced me into it; you did it to me. Anyway, Mr. Chairman, my congratulations on your elevation.

This year my ministry will be asking for a total budget of $211,270,000.

Mr. Nixon: Ten per cent down next year.

Hon. Mr. Bernier: As I said in my brief opening remarks, I would like to review the goals and the responsibilities of the Ministry of Natural Resources.

I think I should point out the official statement of the ministry's goal is as follows: To provide opportunities for outdoor recreation and resource development for the continuous social and economic benefit of the people of Ontario and to administer, protect and conserve public lands and waters.

Mr. Chairman: Can we have some order in the chamber, please, for a very important ministry.

Hon. Mr. Bernier: That is the goal of Ministry of Natural Resources.

This means that my ministry is concerned primarily with the management of 90 per cent of this province which is composed of non-urban, non-agricultural lands and waters. Much of this area is in the north but quite a bit of it is in the south too.

Mr. Chairman: Order, please. There is far too much noise in the chamber; will you keep your voices down?

Hon. Mr. Bernier: Also, our programmes induce many private landowners to manage their properties in ways which contribute to our goal. The ministry performs a principle role of co-ordination between all the agencies involved in the management of public lands. The ministry's programmes are concerned with the best use of Ontario's physical resources of land, water, trees, fish, animals and minerals for recreational and resource product purposes.

As a result, we have a major responsibility for sustaining a supply of renewable resources, and for using and managing the land, water and mineral resources so as to minimize negative environmental effects.

Before getting into the main portion of this statement, I would like to share with my colleagues in the Legislature the sense of loss we feel in the Ministry of Natural Resources after the recent passing of two men who made major contributions to what is now the Ministry of Natural Resources:

I refer to Harold Rickaby who was Deputy Minister of Mines when he retired in 1960, a post he held very capably for some 22 years. A geologist originally, he was a pioneer in the mapping of the mineral development areas in the province and later promoted geophysical exploration. He did much to build a healthy mining programme in this province.

Frank MacDougal, who was known to many of the members of this Legislature, was Deputy Minister of the Department of Lands and Forests when he retired in 1966, after serving in that position for 25 full years. Among the many ways he left his mark was as an enthusiast of flying; not only as a pilot himself but also as a key supporter of the provincial air service with its high reputation in forest fire control as well as resource surveys. He made the lands and forests side of my ministry the able professional group that it is, and the image of the outdoorsman who was called the "Flying Deputy Minister" of course will remain with us for a long time.

In this statement, I plan to lay particular emphasis on two important areas—the forest regeneration programme and the mining safety programme, the latter recommended in the ministry submission earlier this year to the royal commission on the health and safety of miners.

I will deal with the forest regeneration programme first. I think copies of my remarks were made available to the various members.

Mr. Riddell: Are you going to read them all?

Hon. Mr. Bernier: Yes, I am going to put them all on the record.

Mr. Ferrier: Can't we take them as read?

Hon. Mr. Bernier: I think it is important, I really do. This is the first opportunity I have had in this new Parliament, as I said earlier, to outline to the members just what we do in the Ministry of Natural Resources.

Mr. Nixon: Oh yes, well that's all right. You only have 10 hours to go.

Hon. Mr. Bernier: It's a good record. It's a positive one. It's one we are proud of, and one we will continue to expand upon.

The objective of my ministry's forest management programme is to protect and manage forest resources to produce economic and social benefits for all the people of the province. Efficient allocation and use of forest resources will provide employment and public income from corporate taxes and other Crown charges. Provincial expenditures will ensure adequate forest resources for meeting future industry and recreation needs, and also provide jobs directly in our ministry's forestry and recreation programmes.

The forest management process is a complex one. It requires not only long-term planning, but also large capital investments with long-term payoffs. It is important to recognize that forests are renewable resources only when the trees harvested are replaced. This is the central thrust of our forest management programme.

Currently, industry in Ontario is using about 510,000,000 cu ft of roundwood a year from Crown land by agreement with the ministry; plus an additional 180,000,000 cu ft from private land. New mills and mill expansions completed or proposed over the next two to three years will increase this total of roundwood consumption to 850,000,000 cu ft per year by 1978. These new developments will mean an additional annual capacity of 1,000,000,000 bd ft of lumber, 1,000,000 tons of pulp, and over 400,000,000 sq ft of particle board. They represent an estimated capital investment of more than $700 million and will directly provide 7,000 new jobs. When added to the existing 75,000 forest industry jobs, this represents a significant contribution to the Ontario economy, particularly in the north, as I said earlier.

With present utilization standards, the total roundwood demand in Ontario will require 100 per cent of the softwood and about 70 per cent of the hardwood annual allowable cut. Consequently, our forest management efforts must be greatly intensified.

An up-to-date forest resource inventory is prerequisite to forest management planning. In the 1974-1975 forest resources inventory programme, the ministry flew 26,378 sq mis. of aerial photography, mostly covering an area west of Lake Nipigon and north of Lake Superior, the hon. chairman's area. This photography is being used to facilitate field work and to prepare forest-stand maps. We

intend to accelerate the inventory programme in 1975-1976 to almost double last year's programme. Because of the long-term nature of forestry, it is important to have sound forest management plans to control operations, ensure continuity, and build up background knowledge of biological processes, even on small areas.

Last year the government decided to review Crown timber resources revenues. A task force was set up under the joint direction of the Ministry of Treasury, Economics and Intergovernmental Affairs and my ministry. We asked for a revenue system to be developed which would be more responsive to changes in forest company profits so that government revenues would rise with increasing profits and decline, of course, with decreasing profits of the companies. The task force report has recently been submitted to the provincial Treasurer (Mr. McKeough) and myself. We will be considering the recommendations immediately.

New logging techniques and transportation methods have had a marked effect on the forest products industry, and hence on scaling practices—or wood measurement, as some call it. Efforts were made in the ministry to upgrade and maintain standards, to increase efficiency and to reduce unit scaling costs. Since 1968-1969, the introduction of new scaling methods has permitted the ministry to reduce the number of staff employed in timber measurement. While it is difficult to pinpoint actual dollar savings to individual changes in technique, the net scaling costs per 100 cu ft have been reduced from 20 cents in 1968-1969 to 17 cents in 1973-1974. This is a substantial reduction in relation to wood costs and inflation.

Silviculture can be compared to agriculture. It is simply the planting, growing, tending and harvesting of forest crops. Silviculture includes: Seed collection and processing; the growth of nursery and container stock; genetic improvements; planting, seeding, and modified harvest cutting to ensure regeneration and the treatment of established stands to ensure survival and growth. Silviculture involves the assessment of areas regenerated, naturally and artificially, to determine survival, stocking and growth of desired species. Because of the unique problems encountered, it has also involved the ministry in the development of specialized equipment.

Before 1953, northern Ontario had a large, under-utilized, mature forest. Artificial regeneration was thought to be unnecessary in that region. However, in 1953 studies showed that natural regeneration was inadequate and a start was made with artificial regeneration on 11,000 acres. Between 1953 and 1974, some 1,900,000 acres have been artificially regenerated.

I would now like to talk in more detail about the ministry's silviculture programme, as developed under the—

Mr. R. S. Smith: Considering the need, that is a very poor record.

Hon. Mr. Bernier: It is an excellent record and we will go into detail on that in a few minutes.

Mr. Haggerty: That's simple.

Mr. R. S. Smith: Don't go into detail or we will be here until Christmas.

Mr. Chairman: Order please.

Hon. Mr. Bernier: I would now like to talk in more detail about the ministry's silviculture programme, as developed under the "Forest Production Policy Options for Ontario, April, 1972." This planning document, prepared by the division of forests, presented a series of options designed to meet environmental needs and sustain the forest industry at various alternative production levels for the year 2020 and beyond. Because silviculture practices carried out this year will produce the wood supplies for the year 2020, the question was: What would Ontario need then?

We decided to provide for an annual harvest, after 2020, of 910,000,000 cu ft—50 per cent more than the volume required by industry in 1972. I think that's a tremendous goal when you look at that—50 per cent more in the year 2020 than we have—

Mr. R. S. Smith: That is 50 years away.

Hon. Mr. Bernier: I know, but this is the complexity and the difficulty in the task of dealing with the silviculture programme—

Mr. R. S. Smith: What have you been doing for the last 50 years?

Mr. Haggerty: Going backwards?

Hon. Mr. Bernier: We put dollars in the ground today and really won't reap the benefits for 50 years. But that is the kind of long-term planning we do in this particular programme and I want to make a very strong point on that.

Mr. R. S. Smith: You're talking about your future programme, but what about the past, because it was a mess?

Hon. Mr. Bernier: It is straightened out now and we are on the right track.

Ministry staff then prepared a 10-year implementation schedule to double the 1972 silviculture effort. This time period is required because of the increased programme and the sequential nature of the silviculture operations.

To support this doubling of the regeneration and tending work during the 10-year period, other improvements must be made. The seed plant capacity at Angus has been increased from about 40,000 bushels of cones to 80,000 bushels—or in metric terms about 15,000 to 30,000 hectolitres.

To improve survival and growth of some of our important conifers on the more difficult sites, the percentage of transplant stock being grown has increased from 22 per cent in 1973-1974 to 39 per cent in 1975-1976. This improved stock is just now becoming available from the nurseries.

Silviculture is largely labour-intensive, but where possible we are attempting to mechanize. A machine developed by the ministry and now known as the Ontario tree planter is being field-tested and several units should be ready for the first operational trials by next year. This rugged machine is designed to operate in the rougher terrain of the north.

A multi-row nursery stock-lifter, to mechanize lifting in the nursery, was field-tested this summer and should be in use next spring. We are co-operating with the Imperial Tobacco Co. to convert a cigarette machine to produce paper containers for growing tubelings. As can be seen, development and improvements of existing equipment is a continuing process.

To promote this policy of increased regeneration, additional money was allocated to the silviculture budget: $2.2 million in 1973-1974; $1.5 million in 1974-1975; and a proposed $3.4 million in 1975-1976, for a total of $7.1 million extra in the first three years, not including inflation allowances.

This money covers salaries, capital expenditures, transportation, services, supplies and support. Increases in permanent staff are necessary to plan and implement the increasing field programme. A total of 98 new staff have been added in the first three years: 50 in 1973-1974, 32 in 1974-1975, and 16 have been taken on this year.

This silviculture policy has been in effect for only two full years and initial assessment indicates we are meeting our overall targets closely. In fact, because of increased direct seeding of jackpine, after the fires last year in the Dryden area, we exceeded our planned regeneration target in 1974-1975.

One additional point: Because of accelerated industrial expansion and increased wood requirements of industry, the forest production policy is being re-examined and the staff of the division of forests plans to complete this revision by March, 1976. There is little doubt that increased efforts in regeneration and the other components of our forest management programme will be required.

Because of the interest shown in forest regeneration by several members, I wish to re-emphasize that the present policy is to increase the area regenerated artificially from 154,000 acres in 1973-1974 to 296,000 acres in 1982-1983. This, together with areas that regenerate naturally, and available mature forest supplies, will sustain an industry, from the year 2020, that uses 910 million cubic feet of roundwood a year.

The 10-year programme was initiated in 1973-1974, and the first two years were close to schedule. In the first year, 1973-1974, the goal was to regenerate 153,689 acres. We completed 145,278 acres. The deficit was about 8,500 acres. Then, in the following year, 1974-1975, the goal was 150,408 acres and 150,604 acres were regenerated—right on target. In addition, about 25,000 more acres were aerially seeded with jackpine, following the fires last summer in the Dryden area. Therefore, the overall total for 1974-1975 was 175,604 acres regenerated, which easily made up the small deficit of the previous year. This year, 1975-1976, the target is to regenerate about 183,000 acres, and I am confident that figure will be met.

It is true there is a gap between the amount of area requiring regeneration and the amount that is being regenerated. In 1974, this difference was about 170,000 acres. I repeat, however, that our 10-year programme is designed to reduce this gap.

Funds spent on the silvicultural aspects of our work programme alone represent about 60 per cent of the division of forests' budget—$11.9 million in 1973-1974, $13.6 million in 1974-1975, and, we estimate, about $20.5 million in 1975-1976.

In December, 1974, my ministry published the report, "Survival and Growth of Tree Plantations on Crown Lands in Ontario." This shows the survival and growth, by species and regions, of nursery stock and tubed seedlings five years after planting. For the major species used in the boreal forest—black spruce, white

spruce, and jackpine—the survival rate is between 61 per cent and 74 per cent, which will provide adequately stocked stands. For container stock, though, which represents about 10 per cent of planted stock, the survival rate for spruce is about 33 per cent, and for jackpine 55 per cent. The reasons for this have been investigated and both growing and planting techniques have been modified. The area planted with container stock will not be expanded until better survival is obtained. We are not satisfied that the 33 per cent is high enough to be in our container stock programme.

One of the primary objectives in the 10-year forest regeneration programme is to expand the use of techniques other than the planting of nursery stock. This is essential because of accelerating costs, as well as the need to regenerate sites where planting is not successful.

The major expansions are planned in seeding and modified cutting. One of the methods available to secure regeneration on certain sites is by modifying the cutting techniques. This includes strip cutting, shelterwood systems, and leaving groups of trees.

Strip cutting was being done on a small experimental basis of about 1,000 acres a year in black spruce stands in the north during the 1960s. The technique is being further developed and expanded as quickly as possible. It requires an accelerated road programme and, of course, better planning of logging operations. Modified cutting techniques are now being used more extensively in the white pine, hard maple, and yellow birch stands farther south. Plans are to increase modified cutting from 22,000 acres in 1973-1974 to 65,000 acres in 1982-1983. By that date, our annual regeneration target will reach 296,000 acres.

A sound silviculture programme requires forest tending as well as regeneration. Tending involves release of trees from competition, weeding, thinning, pruning, and sometimes fertilization and cultivation. Tending promotes better survival, growth, and the quality of the forest trees. It is proposed to increase forest tending from about 69,000 acres in 1973-1974 to 179,000 acres in 1982-1983.

Mr. Haggerty: It sounds like paperwork.

Hon. Mr. Bernier: It is. We have a great future in the forest industry in this province and we intend to make sure it continues. This is why the efforts are being expanded today.

Mr. R. S. Smith: Doesn't look so good right now.

Hon. Mr. Bernier: Well, we'll have it on the rails pretty soon. I can assure you.

Mr. R. S. Smith: Is that a commitment?

Hon. Mr. Bernier: That's a personal commitment, yes.

Mr. R. S. Smith: Oh, over the head of the Minister of Labour (B. Stephenson).

Hon. Mr. Bernier: Well, I'll be co-operating with her very closely.

Mr. R. S. Smith: Now we know where the power is over there.

Hon. Mr. Bernier: The significant expansion of the forest industry in Ontario has many advantages, but increased costs also come with it. All the forest management programmes of inventory, access roads, forest management planning, wood measurement, and especially silviculture, must be increased.

In summary then, we have a vigorous forest management programme. We are further strengthening our activities in the forest resource inventory, forest management planning, and silvicultural operations—especially regeneration—and we will ensure that a fair return is made to Ontario for these valuable renewable resources. My ministry will continue to review and revise our activities and efforts to keep pace with the rapidly changing demands for all uses of our forested lands.

Still on the subject of forest management, the Ministry of Natural Resources and the Ministry of Treasury, Economics and Intergovernmental Affairs have jointly developed a programme of tax reductions on privately owned forest land. The purpose of this managed forest tax reduction programme is to encourage proper management of such land and to ensure its fullest productivity. Qualifying forest owners will receive grants equal to 50 per cent of the 1973, 1974 and 1975 municipal anl school taxes levied on their forest property. Notice of this programme has been widely advertised in the province and applications are being processed at the present time.

I would like now, Mr. Chairman, to turn to our mining programme. As I said in my opening remarks, I will deal with aspects of mine safety.

As part of the Division of Mines programme, my ministry holds the responsibility for the regulation and inspection of mining operations and processes in the province.

As an outgrowth of the discussions during last year's estimates, the government of Ontario on Sept. 10, 1974, set up the royal commission on the health and safety of miners.

Mr. Chairman, I feel it can be reasonably said that we did not fully recognize or assess a number of important changes in the field of health and safety of mine workers over the past few years. One of the changes has been labour's growing awareness of health and safety measures.

Mr. Martel: They have known all along. You have just not allowed them in.

Hon. Mr. Bernier: They are in now.

Mr. Martel: Don't give me that nonsense. Don't try to paint labour into a corner.

Hon. Mr. Bernier: Wait a minute. I'll repeat what I said.

Mr. Martel: I listened to what you said. None of the changes have been labour's.

Hon. Mr. Bernier: It's a fact, and you know it's a fact, it's only in the last few years that labour's become keenly aware and interested.

Mr. Martel: They wanted in a long time ago. It was you through the mining act who wouldn't allow them in.

Mr. Chairman: Would the member for Sudbury East come to order? He'll have an opportunity to speak later on.

Hon. Mr. Bernier: I'll repeat that, Mr. Chairman, for the benefit of the member. One of the changes has been labour's growing awareness for health and safety measures.

Mr. Martel: It's a bare-faced lie.

Mr. Chairman: The member will have to withdraw that remark.

Mr. Martel: No, Mr. Chairman, you will have to—

Mr. Chairman: That isn't permitted in this chamber. No member can accuse another member of telling a bare-faced lie.

Mr. Martel: Mr. Chairman, with the greatest of respect, the statement is a deliberate deception. If I am allowed to explain the position I will.

Mr. Chairman: It is not debatable; you will have to withdraw that.

Mr. Martel: Mr. Chairman, the minister's states one of the changes has been linked to growing awareness—

Mr. Chairman: I am sorry; will the member come to order? It is not debatable; you cannot accuse another member of lying in this chamber.

Mr. Martel: Mr. Chairman, I withdraw the statement but I will explain my position later on this afternoon.

Hon. Mr. Bernier: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Another has been the result of the advance of medical knowledge and awareness coupled with vastly improved techniques for measuring health and safety levels. I am sure the member will agree with me on that.

Health and safety are not negotiable issues. Therefore, in my ministry's brief to the royal commission, which received wide acclaim right across this province in the mining communities of this province—

Mr. Laughren: Stop it.

Hon. Mr. Bernier: —we recommended that approaches be examined so that miners and managers would work together, with our engineers assisting them, to ensure a greater common responsiveness to health and safety problems. I am happy to report excellent progress in this particular area.

Another change that should be mentioned is that the miners themselves and their families across Ontario have become much more concerned than in the past about health and safety problems in their working environment. We have earnestly tried to do a good job of protecting our mine workers.

Mr. Laughren: Stop it. This is getting sick.

Mr. Martel: That is why I made the remark.

Hon. Mr. Bernier: But far too often the miners are not consulted and we have now changed that situation. Any non-privileged information that the government has is now made available to miners and will be published and actively disseminated.

Mr. Laughren: What is privileged?

Hon. Mr. Bernier: My engineers will require that any information in the hands of mining companies will be promptly communicated and explained to the individual miners involved.

Mr. Martel: What about information in your ministry?

Hon. Mr. Bernier: It is available to the public and I have made this very clear.

Mr. Laughren: You decide what is privileged, though.

Hon. Mr. Bernier: Any information we have in regard to the health and safety of miners is available to them; that's a point of fact.

All of these points were fully documented in the extensive brief presented by the Ministry of Natural Resources on June 4, 1975, to the royal commission. On that occasion, I believe we dealt frankly with our programmes —our record, our failures; and we admit we have failures—

Mr. Ferrier: A lot of them.

Hon. Mr. Bernier: —and our successes. From 1957 through to 1973, the total accident frequency rate per million man-hours worked in Ontario mining was 38.4. In trucking and carting, it was 57.6; in construction, it was 59.4; in foundries, 79.2; and logging, 93.4.

Mr. Laughren: Does that include industrial diseases? No, it doesn't.

Hon. Mr. Bernier: Of course, there are always factors which introduce insidious long-term effects on health in the mining industry. We have taken steps to improve our—

Mr. Laughren: But not action, have you?

Hon. Mr. Bernier: —capability to recognize and respond to these hazards quickly. We are seeking out new and more effective equipment and methods to control such hazards.

One of the steps we have taken is to upgrade and to strengthen the mines engineering branch. This is the branch in my ministry which carries out the inspection of working conditions and gets all sides to observe safety and health standards.

Realizing the vital importance of this role, the Management Board approved nine more positions in this branch. The first move, in a staff reorganization, was to appoint three chief engineers and to base them in Sudbury. These are the provincial experts in mining, electrical and mechanical equipment and ventilation respectively. Instead of working from our main office in Toronto, they are operating in the heart of our mining country. These chief engineers develop procedures for enforcement of standards and guidelines. They also audit the field engineers' performance in ensuring that the standards and guidelines are met.

To further firm up the mines engineering branch, recruiting is going on to fill some of the key positions. We are going after the best qualified people available so that our impact will be more effective at all levels of the industry.

[3:45]

In still another change, the branch is putting greater emphasis on engineering the hazards out of the industrial processes before they are actually used in mining operations. That is, before a new operation goes into production, the plans are brought to the ministry and are very carefully examined before any cement is poured or any construction starts. So we have firsthand knowledge of what they are trying to do and we can give them the best advice possible.

However, I would like to emphasize the point that substantial improvement will only be possible through greater co-operation among all those involved in the mining industry. I state categorically that a greater co-ordinated effort by both management and labour is vital if the record of safety and health in Ontario mines is to improve. It has to be a two-way street.

Mr. Laughren: Labour has tried.

Mr. Ferrier: Labour has tried.

Hon. Mr. Bernier: It has to be a two-way street.

Mr. Laughren: It is not labour's fault that it has not been a two-way street.

Hon. Mr. Bernier: Well, the mining industry has done a job too, and don't discount that.

Mr. Martel: On the miners.

Mr. Laughren: They sure have.

Hon. Mr. Bernier: Yes they have. Just don't wipe it off. They have been around a long time and you just can't wipe out the thousands and the thousands of dollars and man-hours that the industry itself have put into it.

Mr. Warner: And the deaths.

Hon. Mr. Bernier: Just the Mine Accident Prevention Association alone, you know; the effort they put in there long before labour was involved, as concerned as they are today. I appreciate labour's involvement—

Mr. Ferrier: It was done only because they have been forced to.

Mr. Laughren: Despite the Mining Act.

Hon. Mr. Bernier: I think labour's involvement is great and it's got to be that way. And we will encourage it and we will assist them to be part of it.

Among the reforms we recommended to the royal commission were, first, a new mining code for Ontario to promote greater worker response and involvement related to health and safety in mines. And, secondly, the establishment of a special committee to prepare amendments to the Mining Act.

We have set up this committee. Its membership was announced on Sept. 15 and includes persons from the ranks of labour and management. We want miners themselves to have a say in whatever changes come about in the Mining Act. I think that particular committee has sat now on three or four occasions. They are moving ahead. They have had some confrontations, which is expected when you get both sides at the table—

Mr. Ferrier: Is Wadge a member of that committee?

Hon. Mr. Bernier: —but I am hopeful that under the chairmanship of C. M. Barrett, who is very knowledgeable, that we will be able to come to this Legislature with an Act that is properly prepared, that is properly gone over by both sides—by government, by the industry and by labour. I can remember a few years ago when I came to this Legislature when they were revising the Mining Act.

Mr. Martel: I remember well. I remember well and you beggars wouldn't move.

Mr. Ferrier: As soon as a proposal was made the minister looked down at Wadge to see if he would give his permission.

Hon. Mr. Bernier. The agonizing hours that were spent and the debates that lasted for long hours into the evening.

Mr. Martel: Right.

Hon. Mr. Bernier: But we are going to do away with that kind of confrontation. We are at the table and we are doing it in an entirely different method.

Mr. Martel: You could have done it then, but this government wouldn't.

Hon. Mr. Bernier: Well, that was the minister of the day, and he is not with us any more. But the new, enlightened ministers you have here now are taking this new approach.

Interjections.

Hon. Mr. Bernier: Is it time for commercials?

Mr. Laughren: The Minister of Labour (B. Stephenson) calls it the new accord.

Hon. Mr. Bernier: New accord.

Mr. Laughren: Would you call it that as well?

Hon. Mr. Bernier: Yes.

Mr. Laughren: Would you?

Hon. Mr. Bernier: Oh yes, we do.

Mr. Gaunt: You have got a lot of stuff there. Is it a filibuster?

Hon. Mr. Bernier: Further, and this is important, Mr. Chairman, we intend this committee that we have established now, or some other similar body, to become a permanent participant in our administration of mine health and safety in this particular province. We want an ongoing committee established that will give us the benefit of their advice.

Mr. Martel: You might adopt my bill.

Hon. Mr. Bernier: Oh well, certainly. If we get some good advice, we will always accept it. We are not that proud. We have a job to do. We want to be responsible, and we think we are being responsible.

I say again that our emphasis cannot be on negative regulation by external agencies. We have been committed to self-regulation by those in the industry.

Mr. Laughren: That is an irresponsible statement. What do you mean by negative?

Hon. Mr. Bernier: Well, there has been a negative approach by some groups on many occasions.

Mr. Laughren: What groups? What outside groups?

Hon. Mr. Bernier: Maybe industry and maybe labour—I'm not singling out one; but both sides.

Mr. Laughren: You call that an outside agent?

Hon. Mr. Bernier: This is the only effective way to improve the record.

I would like to turn to other activities in the field of mining. During the past summer, the geological branch staff did 33 geological surveys, one geophysical survey and two geochemical surveys. In addition, aggregate resource studies were done in 24 townships and mineral deposit studies were un-

dertaken throughout the province. In all, 10,000 square miles were covered by geoscience surveys led by 31 permanent staff, assisted during the field season by 114 casual staff.

Earlier this year, eastern Ontario was added to the designated areas included under the mineral exploration assistance programme—better know as the MEAP programme. This programme to support the search for productive mineral deposits and to boost the provincial economy has already had results in the earlier designated areas. Our reports indicate that 51 per cent of the wages paid to date under the MEAP agreements in other parts of the province went to local residents, and 64 per cent of the supplies for programmes under the agreement were purchased locally.

To date, 241 technical reports have been submitted for completed exploration work. At two properties, ore located under MEAP was mined, and at three others, mineralization of near economic size and grade was found.

Another programme for mineral discovery is our participation with the federal government in an aerial reconnaissance survey of the province for potential uranium resource areas, and 1975-1976 will be the first of a five-year joint programme.

An inventory of Ontario's zinc industry is currently being carried out by the division of mines in a joint federal-provincial project. Although the zinc mining industry in the province produces about 10 per cent of the free world zinc—about as much as that produced by the United States—only 22 per cent of that zinc is refined to the metal stage in Ontario. Before it can be decided what can be done by government to encourage further zinc processing in the province, a thorough understanding of the industry, including its resource base, must be reached. In a similar case, a uranium survey of Ontario was carried out at the end of 1974 and is now being updated.

My ministry has recently provided a $300,000 grant to the Royal Ontario Museum to establish a geochronological laboratory. This will be the most sophisticated age-dating equipment for rocks available, and it's the first facility of its kind in our country. I can tell you, gentlemen, any of you who are involved in the mining industry or may have heard of this particular announcement, we're most pleased, because it's something that no other jurisdiction has in Canada and it's being very well received to assist us in our exploration programme.

As my colleagues are aware, Mr. Chairman, last spring we announced the adoption of the amethyst as Ontario's official mineral emblem. I am particularly pleased that the Chairman, of course, supported us wholeheartedly in that endeavour.

Mr. Laughren: It was his idea. What do you mean, supported it?

Hon. Mr. Bernier: We question that.

Mr. Laughren: I know you question that, but it was his idea. Give him credit for it.

Hon. Mr. Bernier: Everybody gets in the act when it's a good thing.

Mr. Laughren: After he did.

Hon. Mr. Bernier: Another area I'd like to turn to now is forest fire control. During 1974, the province experienced the most severe forest fire season in 50 years. Extended drought conditions in late June and July in northwestern Ontario resulted in 1,622 fires burning 1.3 million acres. Although the fire control system was severely tested by these outbreaks, it functioned well. We were able to learn from this experience and had moved to further improve our fire control system when this past season arrived.

The 1975 forest fire season in Ontario can best be described as both abnormal and unique. A total of 3,138 fires occurred, the all-time reord for the greatest number of fire starts in any one year. To provide some comparisons, the total was nearly 1,500 fires more than the previous summer, and the average per year for the previous decade had only been about 1,409 fires.

Now, gentlemen, here is the good news: Despite the abnormally high number of fires, the total area burned last summer was held at the relatively low level of 40,000 acres. Compare that to the year before, to 1.3 million acres, and you can see the tremendous job the staff of the ministry did. This is an average of less than 13 acres per fire—a most commendable achievement indeed. I take my hat off to all those, both on the regular staff and of course our thousands of casual staff, principally the native people of this province whom we are so pleased to have on our fire-fighting work force.

Mr. Laughren: If you could take mining out of your ministry it would be a good ministry.

Mr. Martel: These are good people. That is a good department.

Hon. Mr. Bernier: To make other interesting comparisons, the 1975 total of 40,000 acres compares with the previous 10-year average of 159,000 acres. Compared to the burn during the 1974 season, this year's total was 30 times less. So we had a great year when it comes to forest fires—not by number, but by acreage.

The major reasons for this favourable situation are worth reporting. First, the weather helped a great deal. Days on which conditions favoured fires were interspersed with days having high relative humidities and low winds. Second, the intense experience of 1974 brought internal reviews and recommendations for improvements in the fire suppression system. Our people were ready. Third, we made more effective use of aircraft this year by combining the traditional float-equipped ministry aircraft, our tracker fire attack fleet and the helitack system employing leased helicopters.

And finally, although there were other contributing factors I haven't the time to mention, one major reason was the high level of training and skills our field fire staff brought to the task. I am extremely proud to say that the ministry staff showed their ability to perform efficiently under stress, and much of the credit for limiting the acreage burned is due to their ability, their experience and their effort.

Mr. Martel: Hope you remember that when they ask for a pay raise.

Hon. Mr. Bernier: We view forest fire control as a priority matter. My ministry's recent commitment in the northern areas to allow the forest industry to expand—and that's, sir, north of Armstrong and north of Red Lake—meant that we had to intensify our fire-control measures on an additional 20,000 square miles.

Mr. Ferrier: Did you get any flak from Darcy in that?

Hon. Mr. Bernier: Yes, we did, I will have to admit.

Twelve additional specialists and $1.8 million were made available to provide for this increased protection—this is because of the tremendous development occuring in the Kimberly-Clark operations, and the plans of the Reed Paper company to develop a new mill in the Ear Falls-Red Lake area—we felt we had to move in and protect those resources. Up till now we were not concentrating any large effort on it, but we now have special helicopters and aircraft based at Pickle Lake and Red Lake.

Turning to other field service programmes, 35 water control and engineering projects are scheduled this year at a total cost of $1.3 million; 20 are recreational projects; eight are for flood and erosion control; and seven provide ministry facilities such as docks and dams and so on. These projects are scattered across the province with three each located in the southwestern and north central regions, four each in the northwestern, northern, northeastern and eastern regions, six in the Algonquin region, and seven in the central region.

In the area of resource access, slighty more than $3 million will be spent in maintaining 5,000 miles of forest access roads, logging access roads, agreement roads and other roads in the province this year. And, an additional 210 miles of forest and logging access roads will be constructed this year to help the harvesting and managing of our forests on Crown lands.

Approximately $5 million will be spent by the Northern Ontario Resources Transportation Committee this year to build new roads and upgrade others for use as transportation routes for the exploration and extraction of the province's resources. Of this amount, almost $4 million will be spent on projects wholly financed by the committee, while $1.3 million will be used to assist the mining and the forest industries in building roads on a cost-sharing basis.

Mr. Chairman, I am sorry the member for Huron-Bruce (Mr. Gaunt) is not here because I just want to comment briefly on conservation authorities. I believe he will have some comment to make when we get into that particular vote.

In the conservation authorities programme the emphasis has been on water management. Potential hazards such as the May, 1974, flood of the Grand River have always been recognized. I am pleased to assure the members that the recomendations of the royal commission report on the Grand River flood are being acted upon. For example, additional funds were approved for both flood-plain land acquisition in Cambridge-Galt and for the Guelph dam in the current year.

The provincial flood-plain mapping programme to pinpoint vulnerable areas is being accelerated with grants in excess of $1 million earmarked for that purpose. Approximately $2 million annually is spent for the acquisition of flood-plain lands to ensure that they are retained as open space where floods would cause minimal damage.

Because of a reduction in the federal government's support of the water survey programme, new funding is being allocated to ensure the continued collection of information by stream-gauging stations. About one-third of our grants help in the capital construction of conservation area facilities. Local municipalities cover operating costs.

[4:00]

About 30 years ago this government brought in a farsighted and far-reaching piece of legislation called the Conservation Authorities Act. Through the combined efforts of local people, municipalities and the province, an outstanding programme of watershed management and conservation has been developed.

Conservation authorities, made up primarily of municipally appointed local people, provide Ontario with a much safer and more enjoyable environment. This government is fully committed to this work, and I am pleased to point out that since the conservation authorities programme became associated with my ministry in 1972, we have seen a significant increase in funding.

In 1971 the budget for the conservation authorities was $12.8 million. This year the budget is $32.3 million, or 2½ times the level of 1971.

Mr. Ferrier: Darcy will be coming down hard on that one.

Hon. Mr. Bernier: Great budget; very encouraging estimates.

I know that my cabinet colleagues, as well as many other members, share my enthusiasm for this very important programme. The conservation authorities have a foremost part to play, in conjunction with the Ministry of Natural Resources, in water management in this province. We intend to see this excellent contribution to our quality of life vigorously continued and strengthened.

The cottage lot programme: I would like to turn now to a new initiative in the provision of summer cottage lots on public lands. Perhaps no other programme operated by my ministry so exemplifies the life styles of Ontarians.

"The cottage," or as they say in the great riding of Kenora, "the camp," is a tradition which has benefited the people of Ontario for generations. This form of recreation, at its best, combines physical well-being with a respect for nature.

In the past few years, a number of factors have been combined to bring home the need for a fresh, hard look at our cottage lot programme. These are such factors as our growing population, the increased prosperity and the leisure time of a broader segment of our people, demands on our lake resources by people from less fortunate provinces and states neighbouring Ontario, changes in the public perception of the cottaging experience, and the growing knowledge among scientists of the complex nature of lakes and their limits in sustaining heavy and varied use.

In response, my ministry has initiated a number of changes in the cottage lot programme. Lots will be leased for an initial period of 30 years, with the right of renewal by the lessee for two further periods of 10 years each. In the case of new lots, only residents of Ontario will be eligible to apply in the first year. Other Canadians become eligible in the second year, and if any one of those lots is not taken up, then resident of other countries may apply in the third year.

Mr. Martel: Why don't you follow the select committee report?

Hon. Mr. Bernier: This is an excellent one.

Mr. Martel: No. The select committee recommended no sale plan or lease other than to landed immigrants or Canadians.

Hon. Mr. Bernier: We've had very few non-Canadians able to pick up summer cottage lots, because—

Interjection.

Hon. Mr. Bernier: Non-Canadians? No. This is Crown land I'm speaking of.

Those following other recreational pursuits such as fishing, canoeing, camping, and so on also deserve a fair share of enjoyment on our lakes, so we have provided a lake planning method which will consider these other requirements, and also allow for a total package of uses within the capacity of a lake to sustain them.

We hope to provide some 400 lots this year and up to 800 lots in each of the next two years. During this three-year period, a thorough evaluation of the programme will be made. Of course it will be realized that most of the lots mentioned will be provided in northern Ontario. In the south—of course, we all realize this—with much less Crown land, only a limited number of lots may be made available. The requirements for the remaining public lakeshore for other ministry programmes will restrict the number of lots that we can afford to offer to the public.

In 1972, the ministry initiated a programme to rehabilitate pits and quarries on Crown

lands. The programme has steadily progressed resulting in a number of completed projects this year. As I'm sure the members are aware, when we take aggregate from Crown lands we get a royalty. I think it's 17 cents a yard. That is taken into consideration so that we have this particular budget to rehabilitate those exhausted pits on Crown lands. In 1972, 28 pits were rehabilitated, in 1973 41 were dealt with and last year, 51 pits were rehabilitated.

Mr. Ferrier: How many in the north?

Hon. Mr. Bernier: They are practically all in the north.

Mr. Moffatt: All or practically all?

Hon. Mr. Bernier: I would say 95 per cent or maybe 98 per cent of them. That's north of the French River.

At no increase in funding, a total of 70 pits are scheduled for makeovers this particular year. In the programme to date we have concentrated on pits located on Crown land along the travelled highways of the province. Gradually these eyesores of the past are being eliminated.

In 1974, my ministry embarked on a test project in the northwest region to control the indiscriminate use and abuse of highway rights of way, gravel pits, public boat launching areas and backroads by overnight campers. This was done by restricting camping within a half mile of travelled roads, providing basic facilities at designated camp sites and educating the public through highway signs and advertising in the press and radio.

Because of demands made by the severe fire situation in northern Ontario in 1974, the Crown land camping project was only partially implemented. In the past summer, however, the project was continued with improved information to the public.

Mr. Nixon: A lot of tourists service their holding tanks in those projects or whatever you call it.

Hon. Mr. Bernier: Yes, we are well aware of that. Right now, we are assessing the results of this approach to solving a serious environmental problem. Last year we followed with public meetings throughout the entire test area. The test area consists of that area from Ignace to the Manitoba border and from west of Atikokan to Fort Frances, where we have literally hundreds of designated areas. The signing designates the sites of provincial parks, private camp grounds and designated areas established by the Crown. We have just completed a complete round of public hearings on this particular, again to get the reaction of the local residents.

Mr. Nixon: Do they like it?

Hon. Mr. Bernier: I would have to say to you that there is some concern about the number of non-residents using these particular areas at no cost. In fact many have said to me they leave their home on a Friday night and, by the time they get to a designated site some way off in the wilderness areas or northwestern Ontario, they find it loaded with people from Manitoba or the United States. Here again they are using Crown lands at no cost. What is coming out of the meetings is a desire to have licence fee charged to those out-of-province campers, with no charge to residents themselves.

Mr. Nixon: These designated areas would then have to be patrolled and serviced.

Hon. Mr. Bernier: They are now. On the provincial parks programme: the major effort of our park planning activity over the past years was a development of comprehensive recreation policy proposals. These policies will be open to pubic review during the regional public participation meetings being conducted as part of the ministry's strategic land-use planning programme. The master planning programme which a few years ago consisted of only four or five parks now covers almost 40 provincial parks whose master plans are in various stages of completion. One of these plans is for our largest park, Polar Bear Primitive Park.

Last year a provincial parks council, consisting of 20 members who represent a broad geographic and interest spectrum, was appointed. The council advises the government through the Ministry of Natural Resources on matters of policy planning and development of Ontario's provincial parks in relation to the changing needs of the public. The council will be focusing its attention on three particular areas this year: Hunting and fishing in provincial parks; near-urban parks; and the parks classification system. Public meetings have been held where people from all walks of life presented their views about provincial parks and Crown land recreation.

Also the council will be looking closely at the Algonquin Park master plan and its implementation. The work of the council during the coming years will focus largely on revisions to the 1967 parks classification system. The council will also evaluate the historic, wilderness and recreational qualities of our

rivers systems and in southern Ontario it will review potential nature reserves.

Another advisory group, the Ontario Trails Council, was set up this past September. It will make recommendations for the future planning and development of the province's recreational trails programme. The 17 members of the council represent various recreational organizations, farmers and conservation concerns which come from various parts of this province.

The trails council held its first formal meeting in Toronto early this month. Among the things the group will review is the snowmobile trails programme implemented last year for the first time, with nearly 6,500 miles of trails being groomed and managed by private clubs and the Ministry of Natural Resources. Because the new season is now upon us, that programme is to continue this winter on an interim basis but the trails council's recommendations are expected to have an impact on plans for the 1976-1977 season.

Now to CORTS, the Canada-Ontario Rideau-Trent-Severn agreement. This agreement, as I'm sure many members are aware, calls for the co-ordinated planning and development of a 425-mile-long land and water recreational corridor between Ottawa and Georgian Bay. It was signed on Feb. 20, 1975, by the federal and Ontario governments.

Under the agreement an advisory committee—and I think we're dining with them this evening—and an agreement board have been established. The advisory committee is to advise the ministers on work programmes proposed for the corridor, public opinion, and how best to attain the objectives set out in the agreement. The advisory board will recommend to the ministers a plan for the acquisition, development and control of lands and facilities within the corridor.

Commercial fish and fur: Ontario stands first among all provinces and territories in the production of wild fur and in total value of its fur crop to trappers. Ontario's 12,000 trappers share $8 million annually from this resource, which could be increased by approximately 100 per cent and still be perpetuated year after year. A major portion of this fur is exported, increasing the national value of this product tremendously.

In addition to managing the fur-bearing animals, my staff is striving to increase the number working in the fur industry. At the same time, the staff is actively participating in provincial, national and international efforts to find and institute more humane trapping methods. We are also conducting an extensive education programme for trappers to help them become better informed on technological developments, to upgrade the value of their furs and to carry on trapping in the most humane way.

Commercial fishing provided full or part-time employment for about 2,200 people in Ontario last year. An equal number were engaged in commercial baitfish harvesting. The landed value of food fish was about $9.5 million.

To strengthen this important industry my ministry, in co-operation with the federal Department of the Environment, conducts a variety of projects. In the past year and with the assistance of Ontario Hydro, a prototype eel-ladder was installed at the Robert Saunders dam at Cornwall to facilitate the passage of eels over this impediment to their upstream migration. These edible fish, of course, are not to be confused with the predacious sea lamprey.

The programme of freight equalization assistance to fishermen in northwestern Ontario continued to produce benefits, and $75,000 was paid to fishermen in respect to shipments of about 1.06 million lb of fish.

Sport fisheries: The recognition of sport fisheries as a vital but fragile component of our province's natural resources continues to grow. The emergence of a new public awareness and concern has helped us to launch a number of new projects important to the management of fish stocks and to the rebuilding of others.

I advised the Legislature last year of our expansion of fish hatchery facilities at Dorion, near Thunder Bay, and at Bath, near Kingston. We are increasing our capability for management and for rebuilding stocks of fish in the Great Lakes.

As you know, we have worked closely with the Great Lakes Fishery Commission since it was established by international convention in the late 1950s. Sea lamprey control, a major task of that commission, has now been generally achieved throughout the Great Lakes. We now must work closely, through the commission, with other fisheries agencies on the US side and with the federal government in rebuilding the stocks decimated by the sea lamprey.

[4:15]

At the same time, more and more people are recognizing that healthy fish communities are the best indicators of good water quality.

Our fisheries staff work closely with their counterparts in the Ministry of the Environment, and with the Great Lakes part of the International Joint Commission in their water quality management programmes.

Sea lamprey control, effective water quality management and carefully regulated harvest, collectively can return to the people of Ontario several million pounds of fish and several million recreational days. Our new intiative in fisheries management is designed to make this happen.

For the past few months and during the current year, our staff have been working jointly with our federal colleagues in the fisheries and marine service to develop a single strategic plan for fisheries in Ontario. We look forward to the possibility of federal support and participation in our Ontario fisheries programme.

In more specific terms, we plan to:

1. Increase our management capability on Lake Superior, Lake Erie, Lake St. Clair and Lake Ontario, and also on Lake Simcoe, Lake Nipissing and Lake of the Woods, in addition to the Kawarthas and Algonquin region lakes.

2. Begin a fishersies extension programme.

3. Improve our capacity to monitor contaminants in fish.

4. Improve our flow of information and data as a basis for greater public participation in our decision making.

Members will recall that over the years there have been many requests from members, individuals and organizations for more conservation officers. I am pleased to report that the ministry was given permission to hire 25 additional conservation officers to be located in the districts where the greatest needs or shortages exist. These new conservation officers, along with those presently on staff, are primarily involved in fish and wildlife enforcement activities. However, conservation officers were also in the provincial parks during the past season to deal—

Mr. Ferrier: You are being criticized.

Hon. Mr. Bernier: Yes, we have a problem there. We admit it is a serious one.

Mr. Ferrier: You should be doing fish and wildlife work first, rather than in the parks.

Hon. Mr. Bernier: They can do both jobs.

Mr. Ferrier: Oh, yes.

Hon. Mr. Bernier: The parks are only open for a short period of time and they have the enforcement training that we need at that particular time.

As I point out here, conservation officers were also in our provincial parks during the past season to deal with the serious problems of rowdyism and vandalism my ministry has encountered at some of our parks. The officers have also spent some time, as required, in enforcement aspects related to land management and forestry.

Hunting and fishing seasons and limits are set on game species to allow optimum harvest, while keeping populations at levels recommended by scientific management. Much concern has been expressed about moose populations in recent years.

Mr. Nixon: Moose?

Hon. Mr. Bernier: Moose, big moose.

Mr. Nixon: I thought it was goose.

Hon. Mr. Bernier: After an extensive review of moose management problems over a year and a half, including nine public meetings across northern Ontario, a number of significant measures are being implemented.

In 1975, moose seasons opened later and will close earlier in many areas. The moose seasons that have been introduced are based on a new system of wildlife management units which will provide us with the flexibility to implement management programmes that better recognize local problems.

Also, the cost of the non-resident moose licence was increased from $125 to $175. Of course, added to that, if hunters were successful, was a $15 trophy fee—making the total cost to a non-resident $190.

There are a number of miscellaneous programmes, Mr. Chairman.

The Junior Ranger programme provides 17-year-olds with an outdoor experience and appreciation of our natural resources. Both boys and girls are employed in activities which include environmental clean-up, timber thinning, cutting out portages, provincial park maintenance, campsite development and improvement, and the use of firefighting equipment.

In 1974, four Junior Ranger camps were reconstructed and this year the number of camps for girls was increased from seven to 18. I must say that we had a tremendous response from the young ladies of this province to join that particular programme.

This year, too, the daily pay for the Junior Rangers was increased to $10 from last year's $5, to attract a full complement.

Mr. Ferrier: That was a good move.

Hon. Mr. Bernier: Yes it was; and strongly supported by all members of this House.

We were short of male applicants last year, but this year there were plenty. And this year's total of 1,618 Junior Rangers included 456 girls.

On March 3 of this year, Elizabeth Rhodes was appointed women's co-ordinator in our ministry. In the same month a policy directive was issued by the deputy minister conveying to all staff the commitment of the Ministry of Natural Resources to the Equal Opportunities Programme for Women in Ontario. Since then an advisory committee has been set up and under its guidance, Mrs. Rhodes has begun her work. Assisted by project officers, she visited 18 Junior Ranger camps where girls were located. This fall, she held 10 career development workshops for ministry staff in Elliot Lake, Dorset, Thunder Bay and Toronto, and four more are scheduled during the winter.

Mrs. Rhodes will also be visiting universities and community colleges in future months to recruit appropriate job candidates for the ministry. She will encourage a new consciousness within our ministry about equal opportunities for women employees.

We have about 700 women in our total work force in the ministry which is about 4,000 total—700 women.

Mr. Mancini: How is their credit rating?

Hon. Mr. Bernier: Excellent. They are all the best—the finest of girls.

The northern affairs branch continued to be an important support service for government agencies doing business in northern Ontario.

Mr. Nixon: That used to be a separate department. Remember those good old days?

Hon. Mr. Bernier: That was under the former administration.

Mr. Nixon: Oh, yes. You resurrect that before each election, the northern affairs department.

Hon. Mr. Bernier: During 1974-1975, northern affairs officers handled 164,851 transactions and distributed 159,000 copies of publications for various government agencies, provided a backup communications system during the Dryden fires and completed such special assignments as a survey of power sources in 1,000 small communities for the Ministry of Energy.

This year, the northern affairs branch is stepping up its programme of services delively for 50 satellite office locations manned on a volunteer basis and for Indian reserves. In this connection, an experiment conducted this year in delivering government services to native people in the remote north is worth mentioning. During June 10, 11 and 12, the northern affairs branch, through its Timmins office, co-ordinated a northern task force of 18 provincial and federal government representatives. The group visited Winisk on Hudson Bay, Attawapiskat, Fort Albany and Kashechewan on James Bay.

The visits were in response to a request from Grand Council Treaty No. 9 and the native chiefs of the bands visited have expressed their pleasure for this service. Northern affairs is reviewing the results in the light of possible future trips to remote settlements in the province.

Finally I would like to report on the ministry reorganization plan which I outlined to the members last year. The reorganization has been implemented except for some planned changes in the mines engineering branch, the conservation authorities branch and the information branch.

Our new district and regional system is proving most effective in responding to local needs and in co-ordinating our many field activities and services. We are currently reviewing how even more of our activities can be decentralized from Queen's Park to the district level so that still better services can be provided to the people of the Province of Ontario, particularly in the north.

Mr. R. S. Smith: Not the regional level.

Hon. Mr. Bernier: This concludes my opening statement. Although, as I said in my opening few words, it is longer than usual, I hope it will provide—

Mr. Nixon: Did Paul write it for you?

Hon. Mr. Bernier: —the new members at least with a brief review of the varied programmes that we have in the Ministry of Natural Resources. The details, of course, can be gone into as we go through each particular vote. I think you will have to agree that it's a very extensive programme. It is one that affects the daily lives of each and every one of us in this province.

Mr. Chairman: The hon. minister having completed his brief statement, we will now recognize then hon. member for Cochrane South.

Mr. Ferrier: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. This will be the fourth occasion that it has been my honour and privilege to lead off on the Ministry of Natural Resources estimates for the New Democratic Party and this will be my swan song in this capacity as my colleague from Sudbury East (Mr. Martel) will be assuming these responsibilities from here on.

Mr. Nixon: Oh, that's a step backward.

Mr. Martel: Thanks, Bob. I agree with it though.

Mr. Ferrier: I note that the minister made quite a long statement about the forest industry in northern Ontario during the first part of this speech. Having worked with some of his ministry officials in my region, I was aware of the increased activity as far as silviculture was concerned and the move to increase that operation and the hope to increase the woods and woods product industry.

In my part of the province almost all of the wood is allotted and being utilized. A few years ago the hon. member for Cochrane North (Mr. Brunelle), when he was Minister of Lands and Forests, described poplar as a weed species. Now of course, with new technology, we have wafer board and poplar plywood in great demand; all the poplar that is possibly available is being coveted and is being used.

I think we are happy there has been this commitment to the silvicultural programme in this province by the minister and his staff. We've called on it from this side of the House for a long time and have supported every possible move in this direction your ministry has moved in. I hope that to some extent it's been useful in your negotiations with the Management Board.

Having said that, I express a great concern from this party and from the people of northern Ontario about the situation which now persists in northern Ontario as far as the forest industry is concerned. We have experienced for well over four months now the shutdown of a number of our pulp and paper mills and, in conjunction with that, some of our sawmills have been shut down because the chips cannot be utilized in the pulp and paper mills. We have a number of bush workers who are out of work and the whole industry, to a large extent, is at a standstill.

What really concerns me is that this government has not moved in long before this and exerted pressure on the industry which, I feel, is responsible for this strike dragging on so long by its failure to bargain in any meaningful or sensible way. The ministry and the government have not moved in and have allowed this situation to go on for an inordinate length of time.

I feel that if the government had exerted pressure on the companies to get to the bargaining table and to negotiate in a meaningful sense this impasse could have been settled some time ago.

The last time the Abitibi workers came to Toronto they reduced their claim from $2 to $1.25. The company walked out to consider this arrangement but didn't even make a counter offer; it sent a messenger saying "We're not interested in negotiating."

What the company put forward was, I think, an eight per cent increase—six per cent in wages and two per cent in production based on the 1974 production schedule. But 1974 was the year when the pulp and paper industry, particularly Abitibi, went to a seven-days-a-week operation; their production was at an all-time high and there is no way they can ever reach that kind of production level again. What they were offering, in fact, was six per cent.

I think, to his credit, at least the federal Minister of Labour is saying that these companies are not offering a reasonable offer compared to what other industries have proposed and settled with their workers. He is intervening to talk to the presidents of some of these companies.

[4:30]

I think you'd had too much of a cosy relationship with the management of these big companies. You've been afraid to step in and lay a heavy hand on them and tell them to get to the bargaining table and to negotiate in a meaningful sense. I think this shows that the government's concern for northern Ontario is less than it ever has been. As I have said, it is not only the workers in the pulp and paper industry who are affected by the attempt by the pulp and paper companies to break the new Canadian union, and not to bargain in a meaningful sense and in a good faith sense but we have also seen sawmills shut down in our areas, woodworkers not out cutting in the woods and transportation workers no longer working.

Then there is the general way that the economy of the northeast has been suffering as a result and I suppose that of parts of the south as well. This has meant a loss to our provincial economy; it has meant a loss in taxation revenue to this government, it has meant unemployment insurance to those who are not directly affected and it has meant hardship, particularly to some of the families

of the strikers, and the government has shown no concern at all about helping in hardship cases. It's affecting our balance of payments as far as the provincial economy is concerned and perhaps it may have some effect on the value of the Canadian dollar.

I think we have to take a good look at the forest products industry and more particularly, as a result, the pulp and paper industry since they are utilizing our resource for their operations. How is it, when world production of pulp and paper in 1974 was 22,555,620 tons of newsprint in the free world and when world demand in those same countries was 22,953,820 tons, that such huge inventories have been accumulated by the pulp and paper companies and their customers so that there is no impending shortage or hardship experienced by the users? I believe the government should move in with a royal commission or some form of inquiry, a minister's advisory committee, to get to the bottom of this situation. We are not producing up to our capacity.

There are some new production facilities coming on stream in the world, but there is not that much that I can see to be of real significance. According to Newsprint Data, 1974; Statistics of World Demand and Supply, put out by the Canadian Pulp and Paper Association, world demand from 1970 to 1974 has exceeded world production. Therefore one asks how the inventories built up to the extent that they have. I suppose there may be other sources of supply from some of the overseas countries.

I see in today's Globe and Mail that the International Chemical Federation, based in Geneva, which represents the workers in Europe, Sweden and England, has said that in no way will it permit its workers to have the mills over there increase their capacity to ship any newsprint to Canada to prolong this strike and to hurt the workers in this country. They are also talking to the transportation workers in the European countries.

I think that what Henry Lorrain said is true, that Abitibi Paper Co. Ltd. of Toronto has programmed the union into striking because it wants to reduce inventories or maintain price stability. The workers are caught in this corporate sector. He was also critical or reports that the Minister of Labour (B. Stephenson) is considering a request from the mayors of 11 Ontario municipalities to legislate the paperworkers back to their jobs.

I repudiate wholeheartedly the stand taken by those mayors and reeves who would solve this situation by compulsory arbitration. The workers have fought a valiant battle and their morale is still high even though they have been out so long. I think this obsequious behaviour of the northern mayors coming down here to lay a heavy hand on the working people of their own communities is deplorable. There is no way if that kind of legislation is brought into this House that I or the members of this party will vote against those workers.

Mr. Martel: You might tell industry to sit down and negotiate seeing they are using our natural resources.

Mr. Ferrier: That's the point and you haven't done it. I am surprised that this minister hasn't shown some more leadership within the cabinet to shove the Premier (Mr. Davis) and to give some leadership to the Minister of Labour to do this.

Mr. Laughren: You're supposed to be the guardian of our resources, you know.

Hon. Mr. Bernier: I have been involved right along.

Mr. Laughren: Pardon?

Hon. Mr. Bernier: This minister is involved, with the Minister of Labour.

Mr. Chairman: Order, please. The hon. member for Cochrane South has the floor.

Hon. Mr. Bernier: I am closer to the situation than you guys are.

Mr. Martel: That is what I am afraid of.

Mr. Ferrier: Why are our workers and our industries in Ontario in jeopardy? Are we involved in this international corporate game, since the companies, according to my understanding, are not making any real effort to bargain? They continue to hold these vast limits and in some parts of the province are begging for larger limits, and they set their own terms for the small operators who sell to them. Should we be reviewing our whole policy of allocating limits, perhaps going so far as to consider cancelling limits and either going to a system of volume agreements or demanding a minimum utilization and production from those limits every year? Or should we consider setting up a crown corporation, similar to the Algonquin Park Forest Authority, to supervise all the cutting in this province? Should we consider a policy of taking some of the functions of ownership from the companies as advocated by the Swedish economist Adler-Karlsson under the concept of functional socialism?

Mr. Nixon: And by the NDP.

Mr. Ferrier: I just happen to think we cannot permit companies to play their games at the public's expense when they refuse to bargain with their unions in a meaningful way. Especially when they are utilizing our resources and we have been stepping up our silvicultural programmes and our ways to help them and accommodate them in a sense to the degree we have, I don't think we can let them get away with that kind of irresponsible behaviour.

It is not just one company, it's the whole bunch of them working together in the Canadian Pulp and Paper Association, I think they are called. Because one wouldn't negotiate, none of them would negotiate. They have just prolonged this strike and they have tried to break the workers and to destroy significantly some of our northern communities and our northern economy.

Little has been said by this government. Would that you would at least have said as much as John Munro has said. We must know the reasons why the strike has gone on for so long, and we must take steps to implement methods to avert such long-term effects to our economy, particularly in the north, as this kind of strike has precipitated. That it why a royal commission or a select committee of this Legislature or a special advisory committee is necessary.

I suggest, with this boom-bust economy which has been inflicted on northern Ontario through the woods product industry and through the mining industry—

Mr. Martel: The robber barons.

Mr. Ferrier: —we have to take steps and find ways and means of getting around this. Because our communities are being affected. We rush in with a few jobs. We'll run it for seven full days of operation a week for a year and then we'll shut down for five months and the companies are entirely happy that they are shut down. The economy is greatly dislocated by this kind of uncontrolled and unplanned way of operating.

And I think, as I said before, that we must set limits of production—minimum limits—and we must see that the companies live up to them. It's perhaps interference in the free market, but in terms of the way our economy has been affected and our north exploited, it's long overdue that we did move in and set the goals and the objectives and the requirements. The companies that are going to use our resources are going to have to meet those requirements, or we'll get some other companies to do it.

Mr. Laughren: In a free kind of what?

Mr. Martel: Free market—free to do what they want.

Mr. Ferrier: Now, last year in May there was a hard-fought, protracted debate on the whole question of mining safety, and on the need for greatly-improved inspection and enforcement of safety and health standards in the mines.

The NDP has been fighting this for years in this Legislature, but only with limited acceptance from the government. The situation came to a head with the very critical situation that developed at Elliot Lake where the incidence of silicosis and lung cancer is disproportionately high. My leader, with the able assistance of the three members from the Sudbury basin and myself, presented the facts so forcefully and effectively before the legislative committee that after my leader's speech over the supper hour, the minister and his officials agreed to set up a royal commission to deal with the subject of the health and safety practices of the mines of this province.

The minister said earlier this afternoon that the miners and their families were not as concerned with their own health and safety some years ago as they are today. That's poppycock, because the miners and their families have always been concerned about their safety, and the miners and their families in my area for years have seen how the effects of working in the gold mines in the silica dust have lessened their capacity to live and to work and to produce. They've had all kinds of lung illnesses. Men have died prematurely from these, they've been crippled with back problems—

Mr. Laughren: Where was the minister?

Mr. Ferrier: —they have not been able to hear because of the high noise levels and no protective means were brought in until sometime in the Sixties. They've been concerned. It's their life that has been either lessened in length or greatly restricted—

Mr. Martel: But we produce.

Mr. Ferrier: —but production went on.

Mr. Martel: As always.

Mr. Ferrier: As a result, the Ham commission was appointed after the debate, as the minister has said, and has been holding hearings across the province at which a great deal of alarming disclosures kept coming out with a real degree of repetition.

Despite their protestations to the contrary, there is no doubt about it—

Interjections.

Mr. Ferrier: —that this PC government, during its years in office, has failed miserably to protect the miners of this province.

Mr. Martel: You guys hid the facts.

Interjection.

Mr. Chairman: Order please. The hon. member for Cochrane South has the floor.

Hon. Mr. Bernier: The miners got the miners' bill of rights; you stole it right out of our brief.

Mr. Chairman: Order!

Mr. Ferrier: In fact, the old Ministry of Mines and the present mines branch of this ministry have allowed themselves to be the handmaids of the mining industry and have let them get away with murder. The industry has flourished at the expense of the health and well-being of their workers.

Mr. Martel: They all go to church every Sunday, too.

Mr. Ferrier: Lynn Williams, director, district 6, United Steelworkers of America, before the royal commission, said:

> We wonder what society must do to get the owners of the means of production to recognize that while it may be cheaper to kill workers and replace them than to make jobs safe, it is far more civilized to prevent industrial death than to take it for granted.

We in this province have been taking it for granted.

[4:45]

In a recent speech to a ventilation conference in Schumacher, the director of the mines engineering branch made some significant comments. According to my recollection of that speech, he said that now the branch means business and will be making a serious effort to adopt and enforce more stringent laws and regulations in the mining field than ever before. He talked about the committee the minister referred to today in his speech. He stated that a new day had dawned in the field of mining health and safety. He pointed to the 1974 estimates debate of this ministry, making particular reference to the period May 16 to 24, 1974. New pressures were applied and a new commitment was forced upon this government to take the health and welfare of workers in the mining industry with some seriousness.

Mr. Martel: The owners sure never worried about it.

Mr. Ferrier: Previously the mining companies only did what they had to do, and successive PC governments put little pressure upon them. Consequently they did what they liked. Chest diseases are common, hearing loss is frequent, disabling injuries are prevalent, personal hardship is inflicted by an uncaring industry whose ability to pressure governments to their own advantage is second to none.

In that speech Mr. McCrodan gave, he more or less said we mean business and if pressure wasn't exerted on the industry before it will be now. It conveyed to me the impression that the mining industry really didn't care. It only did what was forced upon them, and the government did little forcing. And I thought that was a shocking thing. We've known that all along. But it is a moral outrage that the mining industry have perpetrated this kind of action upon the workers of this province.

In a recent Globe and Mail news story dealing with what went on at the Ontario Federation of Labour convention in Kitchener, these comments are recorded:

> Jean Beaudry, staff representative of the United Steelworkers of Ontario and a member of the Ontario government's commission now probing mine safety, said the 35 days of public hearings by the commission have demonstrated the callousness on the part of industry with respect to the health and safety of workers.
>
> Mr. Beaudry said that it is important to give workers the right and authority to do their own monitoring of the work environment rather than leaving that to provincial inspectors.
>
> The steel union representative charged there has been a massive coverup by the mining industry of accidents and impairment to health as a result of working conditions and working environment.
>
> He said there had not been one tangible position taken by the Ontario government to protect workers. As a result of this kind of predicament the Ontario Federation of Labour has urged the Ontario government to make it mandatory for companies to establish joint health safety committees and to give workers the right to strike where operations are unsafe.

Mr. Laughren: You talk about credibility—it was gone a long time ago.

Mr. Martel: This ministry has no credibility.

Mr. Chairman: Order.

Mr. Ferrier: This is one of the statements made by one of the advisers to your royal commission. He has listened to the presentation, 35 days of it, and these are the conclusions that he is coming to.

Hon. Mr. Bernier: There is more than one man on the committee. You should get the other side of the report.

Mr. Martel: We know what they would report. We have had 32 years of it.

Mr. Ferrier: We have had enough of the side of the mining industry to know they can't be trusted.

Hon. Mr. Bernier: I will wait till the commissioner reports.

Mr. Ferrier: We have seen the way that they have treated their workers over the years. Mr. Chairman, I think Mr. McCrodan was right when he implied that the debates of May of a year ago were a watershed as far as the health and safety of mine workers are concerned. The royal commission has been set up and presumably will make a number of good and valuable recommendations. As the minister said in his speech, there is a committee within his ministry studying the appropriate sections of the Mining Act, hopefully to strengthen them as far as safer working conditions are concerned.

I remember some of those committee meetings—in 1971 I think it was—when, as my colleague from Sudbury East likes to call him, the White Knight was Minister of Mines. We would put forward a lot of the suggestions for amendments—

Mr. Laughren: A tarnished white knight.

Mr. Ferrier: He would look at this man Wadge, who was with International Nickel at that time, and one or two of the other mining industry representatives and they would shake their heads and maybe grunt a few words out, and the amendments were always lost.

I remember one amendment in which we wanted to give the—

Mr. Laughren: Things change.

Mr. Ferrier: —union the right to inspect a death site before things were changed. They delayed it for about 20 minutes while they went out to get the former member, I think for Nickel Belt—or he held off the vote—so that they could defeat that kind of amendment.

Mr. Martel: The minister was there.

Mr. Ferrier: I am convinced that these changes have come about because the leader of the NDP and several others of us have forcefully hammered away on behalf of our constituents to move this government from its callous indifference to reasonable concern. This is one of the battles in which I have been happy to be involved. Only the NDP has led the attack and persisted in it year after year. We shall continue to fight but we can take some real satisfaction that we have forced some changes in the government's direction. Because of this, the incentive to continue to work for a change is that much greater.

A lot will depend on the degree of enforcement of the Mining Act, once it is revised. As I have said before, the government has been very lax in its enforcement in past years.

The mines engineering branch has a lot for which to answer. Can we really trust this branch to carry out the mandate that is being forced upon it? I suggest to you, Mr. Chairman, that my comments in times past are still valid; that this responsibility should be transferred to the Ministry of Labour where all other safety procedures are investigated and enforced.

Mr. Laughren: I remember that bill changing.

Mr. Ferrier: Do you know, Mr. Chairman, that all construction of buildings—refineries smelters, shafts—on a mining property come under the jurisdiction of the mines engineering branch? What expertise in construction safety does a mining engineer possess? Surely this work should come under those trained in the construction safety branch of the Ministry of Labour.

Again I say change the jurisdiction to the Ministry of Labour; cut down the excessive dependence on mining engineers formerly from middle management of the mining industry and appoint some qualified miners—

Hon. Mr. Bernier: How can you honestly make a statement like that?

Mr. Ferrier: —which I gather you may now be prepared to do—even though last year you scoffed at me when I made the proposals to the minister.

Hon. Mr. Bernier: I am shocked at that statement.

Mr. Ferrier: You scoffed at me; you looked down your nose at good qualified miners; you will not appoint them, apparently, to positions of inspection and responsibility.

Hon. Mr. Bernier: You don't comprehend the problem. No comprehension at all.

Mr. Ferrier: They are just as concerned—more so—with the welfare of the workers. They know, because they have worked in those places a great deal of time, what the dangers are and what steps should be taken, and they can find out when they are not being taken.

It is about time you had a conversion on that score and you appointed some of the miners themselves.

The—I won't say that. We should change—

Mr. Martel: Give it to him; lay it on him! Give it to him, don't worry about it.

Mr. Ruston: Careful now, Bill.

Mr. Shore: Put it on the record, Bill.

Mr. Ferrier: I have got enough here to keep things going.

Mr. Nixon: This is just like those old long sermons; they never end.

Mr. Ferrier: You should change the inspection to the Ministry of Labour, and bring in a number of new people to do the work because the workers do not trust the mines engineering branch's record in the past.

Certainly, the workers of the Munro mine in Matheson and the Reeves mine of Canadian Johns-Manville have no reason to trust you. For the record's sake, the mill used at Reeves was the same mill used at Munro. And so much concerned is Johns-Manville for the well-being of miners that they are to or have dismantled the mill to send it to Mexico to process asebstos fibre there.

This infamous mill has seen men working in it in conditions where the fibre count per cubic centimetre has been the highest that workers anywhere in North America have had to work in, according to statistics from your own mines engineering branch which my leader released during the election.

Mr. Martel: And that shows your corporate concern.

Mr. Ferrier: And the concern of the mines engineering branch that you wouldn't take steps to improve the situation. From what I can ascertain, cases of chest conditions—

Hon. Mr. Bernier: Entirely wrong again.

Mr. Ferrier: —are just beginning to be noticeable in a few men. I hope that the dire prospects do not materialize for those workers, but I have some real fears that they will. I have real concern for the future of the Munro and Reeves workers. I cannot help but wonder at Johns-Manville going to put that mill in operation, or allowing another company to do it, in Mexico to jeopardize the health of Mexicans.

Mr. Laughren: Corporate management.

Mr. Ferrier: It seems as though that company is without a conscience. When they get caught out as grossly negligent in one jurisdiction they sell the mill to another company in another country to carry out callously infamous practices against workers whose government does not provide adequate laws to protect their workers' health. It is a kind of murder, the kind of lack of morality in that kind of a situation is beyond me.

I say, Mr. Chairman, that the mines inspection branch and the environmental health branch for years allowed workers to continue to work in unsafe conditions in dust levels very much above any reasonable, tolerable level. These civil servants, supported by the government, allowed those workers to jeopardize their health and their future seriously without warning them or forcing the company to clean up.

How can workers trust a branch which has been so indifferent to them? Had it not been for the NDP and our leader these workers might still be working in those conditions.

Johns-Manville are in the process of opening a talc operation on a property adjacent to its now closed asbestos mine in Reeves township. I understand talc miners can develop a lung disease called talcosis from talc dust. Before that mine comes into production, I want some assurance as do the people of this province, that safe working levels for talc will be set and rigidly enforced by this government. We cannot tolerate Johns-Manville's callous disregard for workers to continue in any way in this province.

Following a meeting with a delegation of Steelworkers from Timmins and the head office of district 6 and myself, the minister requested Johns-Manville to meet with him to explain their reasons for closing the Reeves mine. They refused to meet with the minister but W. L. VanDerbeek, senior vice-president of the company in Denver, Colo. wrote to the minister on June 16, 1975, to explain their reasons for shutting the mine. He didn't feel

he had to come and see the minister—he'd send him a letter.

Hon. Mr. Bernier: You are wrong again.

Mr. Ferrier: You get up and refute it in your response.

Hon. Mr. Bernier: Well, I will. On a point of order, Mr. Chairman. The member has a little bit of information.

Mr. Martel: What is your point of order?

Hon. Mr. Bernier: His research is absolutely terrible. He has not followed up and he is standing up in this Legislature saying that's as far as we went. Well, you are wrong, because we met with the Johns-Manville people. We met with the officials and went over all the details. I've been sitting in this Legislature for three or four weeks waiting for you to ask me a question, and you never have. That's the kind of concern that you have, but now you'll make a big show of it back home.

Mr. Ferrier: I don't need to make my show back home. The people back there know my concern for the miners of that area.

Hon. Mr. Bernier: We are as responsible as you are. Don't ever kid yourself. Every bit as responsible.

Mr. Laughren: You and Leo Del Villano?

Mr. Ferrier: You and Leo Del Villano are probably on the same wavelength.

[5:00]

Mr. Martel: Too much concern about all that dust.

Mr. Ferrier: In that letter that he wrote—when I asked the question in July, you hadn't seen them, so this guy wrote to you on June 16 and he said that in the milling operation they could not meet the two fibres per cc limit and felt five per cc is reasonable in these operations. He wrote in that letter to you, which was sent to all the members:

> In view of these circumstances we feel there was no technology available to us which would enable us to achieve the standards being considered by the government of Ontario.

Mr. Laughren: That was a lie.

Mr. Ferrier: "We therefore had no alternative but to close down the Reeves mines."

Maybe you didn't read the letter that was sent to you, I don't know. It is interesting to note the decision was made in Denver in the USA and the vice-president—Was it the vice-president who came up to see you or did he send some of his Canadian flunkies to see you?

Hon. Mr. Bernier: The vice-president.

Mr. Ferrier: Well, we will leave that subject and we will go on to—

Mr. Martel: One calls it blackmail. "We won't do it or we will move out."

Mr. Laughren: Good riddance to Johns-Manville.

Mr. Ferrier: Johns-Manville is the most irresponsible company that I have ever heard of.

An hon. member: That ever walked on four legs.

Mr. Ferrier: A year ago the government passed amendments to the mines profit tax. It was an effort to increase the mining taxation and get a better return for the people of the province who own the resources being exploited. Despite the fact that the industry has continued to complain about this increase in taxes and groups in our communities like the Timmins-Porcupine Chamber of Commerce and other Tories in those areas have tried to plead the mining industries' cause to restore their favoured position, at least this government has given no indication of reversing its position.

I would hope that it would not reverse its position since some pretty favourable tax concessions and write-offs still persist. With all the benefits they still have, the mining industry wants to get an even better ride on the taxpayers' back than they now have. They want to go back to the good old days. In September, Richard Gwyn of the Toronto Star wrote an article entitled: "Governments Ponder the Future of Mining." He wrote:

> . . . the core of the issue was captured in an exchange during the mines ministers' conference here last week between Manitoba Mines Minister Sydney Green, and Alfred Powis, president of Noranda Mines—

Mr. Martel: Oh, here is my favourite friend.

Mr. Ferrier: —to continue:

> —and president of the Mining Associations of Canada. Powis called for "a continuation of the traditional role of the private sector," and warned that "given the present political climate, we haven't a hope in hell of realizing the opportunities outlined in

this study," (the three-fold expansion of the mining industry by the year 2000, forecast by the federal-provincial policy review).

Replied Green: "Business makes its decisions on the basis of the best interests of its shareholders. This I understand. Business in turn must realize that government must make its decisions on the basis of the best interests of its own shareholders."

Mining industry shareholders—at least until some recent taxes—have done well. The records for the shareholders of governments is less clear. Some examples:

Increased processing in Canada of the raw products of mines has been a constant refrain for the past two decades. In fact the opposite has happened: The proportions of mineral exports (iron ore excluded) refined or fabricated in Canada has dropped, from 80 per cent in 1950 to less than 50 per cent today.

The major benefit new mines bring, other than tax revenues, is new jobs. Yet existing mines already are short of labour. (the underground turnover commonly exceeds 100 per cent a year) and to close the gap the mining association has proposed hiring foreign workers on contract.

The mining industry, it goes without saying, has a better case than those two examples indicate: It accounts for six per cent of the gross national product, pumps out some $5 billion worth of exports and brings some reality to the government's vague goal of decentralizing population—to sites as remote as the Nanisivik lead-zinc mine on Baffin Island.

What isn't known—and a measure of the immaturity of public policy—are the true costs of all those benefits. The federal-provincial policy review has yet to produce a single concrete policy decision. It has produced one action that may prove as useful: The first study, to be done at Queen's University, into both the benefits of mining (taxes, jobs, exports) and its costs (everything from government services to new mining communities to the effects of increased competition for scarce labour and capital). An attempt to learn, in other words, how much the shareholders of governments pay, compared to how much the shareholders of mines earn.

This party reaffirms the necessity to obtain an adequate return for the taxpayers of this province from the mining industry. To provide services to our northern people and secondary industry we must have money. Adequate mining taxes will provide that money.

I remind the chamber of commerce types with whom the minister gets along so well—who want government services and facilities in our communities in the north—that their support of the mining companies for lower taxation is one sure way of not getting adequate services or economic development. Too many so-called free enterprisers want their cake and eat it too.

We must have adequate taxation on our mining industry. We must also see greater public involvement and ownership in the natural resource sector in the future, to provide the resources necessary for proper northern development.

I have raised many times the issue of setting up a Crown corporation similar to the one in Quebec, known as Soquem, to carry out exploration and development work either by themselves or in conjunction with the private mining industry. It is working reasonably well in Quebec and it can work as well here.

The minister announced that he was considering this kind of approach a year or so ago. In fact on Dec. 13, 1974, I asked the minister what had happened to his proposal set forward at the Man and Resources conference in March, 1974. He said that this matter is being thoroughly discussed within his ministry and was to go forward to the Resources Development Policy Field.

What has happened since then to that proposal? Has it gone through the Resources Development Policy Field? And are you going to move to implement such a policy soon? We'll wait with bated breath for the minister's response on that. I had hoped that in his statement he would have made some reference to it. Apparently he doesn't give it very high priority in the future.

I remember in that select committee's report the companies were expecting this kind of thing—they were expecting a greater public involvement in the future. Syd Green has moved to do that in Manitoba.

Hon. Mr. Bernier: That's the biggest joke in Manitoba—the Manitoba Development Corp.

Mr. Martel: What about your announcement, Leo?

Mr. Ferrier: What have you been doing other than giving handouts and a kind of socialism for the rich? That's about the only commitment to socialism that that govern-

ment has—to pass money out to the rich that already have it, and to keep them rich.

Mr. Laughren: Socialism for the rich, free enterprise for the poor.

Mr. Ferrier: Each year we are interested in the minister's action in granting exemptions to companies under, I think it's section 115 of the Mining Act, as far as processing ores in Canada is concerned. I hope that the minister will provide us with this information again this year. If he didn't bring it here, would he bring it for 8 o'clock tonight if it's possible? I'm sure that you realized we were going to ask this. Perhaps he will answer the question as to how he has been able to use this section of the Act to provide additional processing of mineral concentrates in Ontario.

In addition, is any serious attempt being made by the minister or his officials to use the refined metals we now have in northern Ontario to try to develop some kind of fabricating industry around these metals? I remember Allan Lawrence, when he was Minister of Mines and had those three northern Ontario conferences that he had. The next step that the government would be devoting its attention to was to move into the fabricating stage to develop a much more viable secondary industry resource based in northern Ontario.

Mr. Martel: It's a long step.

Mr. Ferrier: I haven't seen very much action taking place in that. Maybe the minister can set me right on that too.

Hon. Mr. Bernier: Where are you from? Where do you live?

Mr. Young: Don't try too hard.

Mr. Ferrier: We're having increases in the processing and the refining and we'll get that fertilizer plant. I hear also that—

Interjection.

Hon. Mr. Bernier: It has finally dawned.

Mr. Ferrier: —that up in Rene Brunelle's riding you're going to get some potash out of there, maybe. But what else have you got? Where's your copper tubing manufacturing complement in the north, or—

Mr. Martel: Nickel-plating.

Mr. Ferrier: —or nickel-plating or any of these kind of things? What progress have you made in that? I'll be happy to be set right on that.

Another matter of concern to us in the northeast is the present status of the lignite deposits at Onakawana.

Mr. Haggerty: Hydro says it's low grade.

Mr. Ferrier: There was the big pledge on behalf of the Premier (Mr. Davis) in his 1971 election campaign in the northeast that they probably were going to go ahead with these lignite deposits. That was his one commitment to us in the northeast in that campaign.

We know that there have been reports tabled in this House and an agreement has been entered into with the Manalta Coal Co. on an exploration agreement. We in the NDP believe that any development of those deposits to produce electricity should be done by the public sector, not the private sector. The minister has stated that studies had suggested that the Onakawan lignite will be more expensive than nuclear-generated electricity but about the same cost as fossil fuel power. I even read your old speeches and debates.

In view of the economic benefits that will accrue to the northeast, to towns like Cochrane and possibly Smooth Rock Falls, as well as being able to provide additional electricity at a competitive cost and to lessen our commitment to the nuclear programme, I believe that we should be coming to some decisions soon as to the development of those lignite deposits.

In conjunction with the development of the territory north of Cochrane, I wish again to bring to the minister's attention the need to proceed to develop the Pierre Lake area into a provincial park as you have stated you would do some time in the future, again reading your speeches. I have not had the pleasure of viewing the site, although I understand that the minister has personally camped on the beach. Is my research right or is my research wrong?

Mr. Martel: With who, Bill?

Mr. Ferrier: I am informed that is is a beautiful site—I don't know if I am referring to the minister camping there or not. It's an outstanding site for a provincial park. They tell me that there's a beautiful sandy beach there.

Mr. Martel: There was.

Mr. Ferrier: Concern has been expressed to me by the Iroquois Falls council that there is abuse by people of the area through indiscriminate spreading of garbage, over-

fishing and poaching. They feel that the time has come to develop this site into a provincial park before it is destroyed by people who do not respect the environment and the fishing laws as they should.

[5:15]

I understand from the minister's statement of last year that one of the major factors in developing the Pierre Lake park is the choice of the route for the road between Moosonee and Highway 11 or something like that.

In this regard, a brief was prepared by the Cochrane Board of Trade and, I believe, presented to the minister. It read something like this:

> The northern entrance: Travelling is easterly from Cochrane for approximately 20 miles over secondary Highways 574 and 652 which is surface-treated and intersects the north-south Abitibi Paper Co. gravel road at a point approximately 22 miles north of Iroquois Falls.
>
> From the intersection of secondary Highway 652 and the Abitibi company gravel road, the Abitibi road also runs east to the Quebec border at LaReine, and from there to LaSarre, Val d'Or, Montreal, and northern New York State. The Abitibi Paper Co., by an agreement with the Ministry of Natural Resources, are to improve the gravel road to acceptable standards. This connecting road would provide additional traffic and tourists, and serve as a circle route.
>
> This area is the most attractive in northern Ontario, comparable to the Nipissing-Trout Lake-French River system and Muskoka.

So it has got to be pretty good eh, Dick?

> The Ministry of Natural Resources already have land reserved for a provincial park in the area of these lakes. The Little Abitibi Lake and River system offers the best fishing in Ontario. To date this whole area has been reserved for the high-income groups of southern Ontario and the US, who can afford flying into the area for hunting and fishing. Even today all that is required to provide all-weather access to Pierre Lake and the chain of lakes is the placing of gravel on only 3½ miles of clay road. This small project, together with the approval of the Abitibi Paper Co. to use their access road, would make this excellent fishing, hunting and camping area available to all residents and taxpayers of this area, and attract thousands of tourists to our district. The completion of a trail for motorized snow vehicles from Cochrane to Moosonee in the spring will also attract many . . .

So they went on record as being very much in favour of the road to Moosonee going up that way. And a letter was written to Mr. F. Lacroix, president of the Board of Trade, Box 1468, Cochrane, Ont.:

> Dear Mr. Lacroix:
>
> Please accept my warmest thanks for the very well-prepared brief by the Cochrane Board of Trade, presented on behalf of the communities of Moose Factory, Moosonee, Iroquois Falls and Cochrane to the mid-September meeting of the Resources Development Policy Field committee.
>
> In regard to the selection of a route for a road connecting King's Highway No. 11 with James Bay, I am very pleased to be able to say that, of the various routes presented for consideration by the Northern Ontario Resources Transportation Committee, my ministry has consistently preferred and supported the route that you advocate.
>
> More specifically, the main road should connect Abitibi's north-south road of their Iroquois Falls division with Pierre and Kesagami Lakes and then proceed to the Argor Explorations columbium deposit on South Bluff Creek and terminate in the area of Bushy Island, located in the Moose River estuary. A crossing of the Moose River would complete what is considered essential for access to resources and the people of this area.
>
> My ministry is deeply appreciative of your contribution to the meeting.
>
> Yours sincerely . . .

It looks like the name of Leo Bernier, minister. So I guess the minister is in favour of that route.

I would like to see more consideration being given to develop that park. This study is called the Henderson report, but I can see that the hand of the Treasurer (Mr. McKeough) runs all through the report—

Mr. Laughren: It is not that Henderson needs any help.

Mr. Ferrier: One thing that he is suggesting, as far as public parks and recreational concerns are concerned, is that we should move to a reprivatization of some of these things. Let the public sector do it—the private sector.

Mr. Shore: Don't get mixed up.

Mr. Martel: He will fly to the Mediterranean.

Mr. Ferrier: We heard the Treasurer make those statements—or he's reported to have made those statements down in—Trinity College is it?—in Port Hope; or one of those private schools. He wanted to move in that direction. He kind of got off that kick of reprivatization but here this report is suggesting it.

I'm telling you that with a commitment to public recreation and the development of northern Ontario we can't go along with that kind of recommendation. I think the parks programme of this ministry is one they can be justifiably proud of.

Mr. Laughren: The great minister of parks.

Hon. Mr. Bernier: Yes, parks and trees.

Mr. Ferrier: I would view with very great disfavour the move suggested by Mr. Henderson to move to reprivatization.

Interjection.

Mr. Ferrier: He also said maybe the big companies and even some of the smaller companies should be paying their way more as far as silviculture is concerned, if I read him correctly. Maybe their taxes have to be adjusted a little bit but they should be doing the work, not leaving it for the ministry.

That's something they may look into. We've said all along that the companies should accept some of the responsibility and it should not all be in the hands of the Ministry of Natural Resources.

They also said that the WORT committee's programme, if I understand them, should be carefully looked at and that the users of those roads, the companies demanding them, should have more input in terms of cost rather than the public purse.

Those who live on the Great Lakes, like my friend from Kent-Elgin (Mr. Spence), will wonder at the statement suggesting that capital expenditure by conservation authorities to develop water control along Lake Erie and some of those places should be borne more by the municipalities than by the province.

A lot of his suggestions can't be taken at face value or there would be a revolution in this province, I suspect. We'll wait to see how the minister responds to some of those things.

Another thing I would be remiss on if I didn't bring it up once again is the Minister of Natural Resources finding some way to allow the handicapped people of this province into provincial parks without having to pay.

A year ago he said he was consulting with the Minister of Community and Social Services and I thought we pretty well had all that arranged. It was more a matter of identity than anything else. If they could find a way of identifying these people the minister was prepared to move but he hasn't moved yet. I have a very faithful constituent who with regularity, four or five times a year, brings that to my attention and I'll bring it to the minister's attention.

Another area of concern is one of adequate fish and wildlife management. The minister points out that they've increased the budget there, I believe, and you have 25 new conservation officers. Mr. Chairman, you will remember, as the member for Thunder Bay, you spoke very forcefully on this a number of times and the present Speaker had some input as well. Hopefully, our representations had some bearing on the minister's report to Management Board and he was able to get this commitment.

The think that has really aggravated the hunting and fishing clubs in my riding and, I think, in other parts of the province is what you referred to earlier: The fact that these conservation officers are working in some of the provincial parks and other programmes and are not spending their time on fish and wildlife management. We don't downgrade the work in the parks, but if they are going to be designated for this important function we feel they should be working at it full time.

I have talked to people in the field and they say that the kind of budgets that are allotted to the conservation officers are such that they are allotted such a measly amount for driving and operation that sometimes they haven't even got enough money left to go out and investigate a complaint. They say that you don't even give them enough money for that.

Now, the strategic land use committee in my part of the province is suggesting that we have got to increase the recreational benefits from fishing in this province very considerably in the next number of years. If we are going to do that, one of the prerequisites is to get an adequate inventory of the lakes in the province, particularly in the north, to see what kind of fish population

they can carry and develop. This work must be done by this fish and wildlife branch, and some of these conservation officers with some students. I would suggest that you consider making them full-time, and if you are going to be able to manage our resource properly that they have got to be doing that work. If we are going to provide for this kind of healthy recreation, then let's get on with the job.

I am glad to see that you are doing a little more in the fish-hatchery situation, but we must have a great deal more commitment, after inventory work is done, to the re-stocking of our lakes and streams to provide an adequate fishing experience for our people. It may not be possible to make the fishing experience as good as the old days were, but we can do a lot more about it—and this party is concerned that work take place in that direction—that there be much more stocking.

Another thing that is of concern to a lot of people is the way that some poachers and people on the Credit River down here, and other places during the pickerel-spawning season, will go in with, what do you call those?

Mr. Martel: Dipping nets.

Mr. Ferrier: Not dip nets, gill nets maybe —and those spears. There are all kinds of ways to deplete the pickerel during their spawning season. I know they are a productive fish.

But some were caught. There was some greater attention given to it, and some of the conservation officers were treated rather badly, I believe.

The work is good and it must be enforced with greater resolve. I am glad to see that there is still attention being given to trying to provide a humane trap. Perhaps the minister would say if that man from Timmins was successful in developing one? I don't know.

There is one other item that I want to deal with, and then I'd better yield the floor.

Mr. Shore: No, no, don't do that, stick in there.

Mr. Ferrier: I am glad the member for Brant-Oxford-Norfolk has stayed in here to hear my speech today.

Mr. Nixon: It is great. I have heard it for the last four years, and it gets better every year.

Mr. Ferrier: I am glad to know that.

Mr. Martel: That is what the public said to the member for Brant-Oxford-Norfolk on Sept. 18.

Mr. Ferrier: We didn't see him in Timmins during the election. We were very disappointed that he didn't make it.

Mr. Nixon: A little cool, I found it.

Mr. Martel: It was your first trip to the north, wasn't it?

Mr. Chairman: Order, please.

Mr. Ferrier: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, for bringing those unruly Liberals into line, and giving me the opportunity to continue my speech. I thought the member for Brant-Oxford-Norfolk was wanting me to say something about Texasgulf. You know, during the election his candidate and his father were thrown off the Texasgulf property for trying to meet a few of the workers, and put forward Liberal policy and platform. I think Murray Gaunt maybe resolved that problem that you had in discussing it. And my wife and I and a few others were put off the Texasgulf property, but the Premier (Mr. Davis) and his candidate were—

Mr. Nixon: They must remember, they should remember, that you voted against your party and in favour of them when the government wanted to give them some assistance. They should be more grateful for your friendship.

Mr. Ferrier: Yes, I did. Yes, I did. We all makes mistakes. I think maybe you might even be prepared to admit that you might have made a mistake or two.

[5:30]

Mr. Nixon: I will agree with you that you made a mistake.

Mr. Ferrier: I maybe made a few mistakes but judging by the thing in this House, you have made a lot of mistakes. Anyway, the Premier and his candidate were able to go on Texasgulf property and to mix with the white hats and talk to the workers of Texasgulf so the Texasgulf—

Mr. Chairman: Order, please. Will the hon. member for Cochrane South confine his remarks to these estimates?

Mr. Ferrier: This is to do with the mines of the province, Mr. Chairman—

Interjection.

Mr. Ferrier: —and I was just saying that Texasgulf know who their friends are and when an election is on.

Mr. Nixon: And you are one of them.

Mr. Ferrier: They know that you are not one of them. They know that I am not but the Premier and his candidate are.

Mr. Nixon: A little fairer treatment.

Mr. Ferrier: I want to conclude that I think it is time, if your Treasurer (Mr. McKeough) is suggesting that students have to pay more of their education as far as post-secondary education costs are concerned, that your conservation branch should take a look at the allocations of its SWORD and SWEEP programmes. The Mattagami region conservation authority has had its area and responsibility expanded a couple of years ago so that they are responsible for not just the small area they had but the great vast area in the largest city in the province.

You still continue to allocate the same number of students each summer to them. What usually happens is that your officials say: "Oh well, we will just do the same as last year. We won't even look at the changed circumstances." I think it is time that your officials took a look at the need in the Mattagami Region Conservation Authority, look at the work that is needed out at Kam-Kotia Park which is a great demand as far as work is concerned. A lot of use is made by the public of it, and other parts of the region, where students could do the work in the summer. And I think you've got to re-allocate your priorities and give us a little more help and attention up there in my riding.

Now that there has been a change in the Chair, I guess there should be a change in the speakers, and I will conclude my remarks.

Mr. Haggerty: Mr. Chairman, it is my pleasure as leadoff speaker for the Liberal Party to present our views and comments on the estimates of the Ministry of Natural Resources. I was interested in the comments of the member for Cochrane South in his leadoff speech when he was talking about the problems of the strike in the pulp industry in the Province of Ontario.

I would like to know what position they will be taking on the bill that I introduced to the House this afternoon concerning the amendments to the Labour Relations Act. The purpose of the bill is to provide a mechanism whereby the minister can order parties to a strike or lockout to end the strike or lockout for a period of 60 days during which time the parties may try to reach a settlement.

The bill will be discussed or debated Monday afternoon during the private members' hour. I was wondering what reference he was trying to convey to the minister in saying: "What plug are you going to pull out to assist the paper industry in getting back to the bargaining table?"

Mr. Laughren: The private-ownership plug.

Mr. Haggerty: Is that what it is? Or the nationalization of the pulp and paper industry in the Province of Ontario?

Mr. Nixon: The NDP is going to nationalize everything up there in the north. They are going to take over the mines, take over the forest industry, the land.

Mr. Haggerty: I thought perhaps that we were going to follow the practice that has been followed out in British Columbia under the Barrett government where they just went in and legislated them all back to work.

Mr. Martel: Good government. Great government out there.

Mr. Shore: Why don't you move out there?

Mr. Nixon: They forced them back to work.

An hon. member: He forced them all back to work.

Mr. Chairman: Order, please. The member for Erie has the floor.

Mr. Haggerty: This ministry is of great importance to the Province of Ontario as it relates particularly to the province's economic growth pattern and revenue generated by the province's forestry industry, mining industry and the tourist industry and creating much of Ontario's hard core labour force and much of Ontario's secondary employment. This party strongly believes that over the past decade and the early 1970s this ministry has lacked in leadership, or perhaps I should say the government of the day has done little to improve or to provide Ontario with a sound management programme for its natural resources. The history of resources management in Ontario shows that the resources planning has most often been carried on an ad hoc basis. This view has been aptly expressed by Prof. H. B. Nelles

in a recent publication entitled, "The Politics of Development Forests, Mines and Hydro-Electric Power in Ontario." He states:

> The habit of authority that survived from the 19th century did not greatly alter the pattern of resources development. It did, however contribute to the reduction of government, despite an expansion of its activities, to a client of the business community.
>
> This need not have been so. The failure to bring the regulatory and service functions of the state into the fromework of democratic accountability was the failure to pursue the logic of responsible government into the industrial age.

Too often in the past the pattern in this province has been of a fragmented approach to resource management. Major future developments of our resources must result from the techniques of the co-ordinated management and comprehensive resources planning. This pattern of a lack of responsible government is evident in all sectors of our natural resources.

I have several topics that I will discuss in more detail, outlining the areas where the government has not responded to any noticeable degree to improve our resources management programme. The abundance of the forest products readily available and the presence of minerals have added much to northern Ontario development and have generated much in revenue for the province and the related industries but little, if any, returns of actual benefit for Ontario in the long run as the province's resources are being depleted, and the indecision of the government to provide for Ontario in the next quarter century that remains continues.

As it seems to be a practice set by the minister to withhold reports and information relating to the estimates being debated in the Legislature, how any one member may properly scrutinize the estimates of this Ministry of Natural Resources is questionable. It can be considered as an attempt at deception which denies the members of the Legislature an opportunity to properly assess the minister's accountability to the Legislature.

Hon. Mr. Bernier: On a point of order, would the member explain those remarks a little more carefully about the hiding of reports and not providing members with enough information.

Mr. Haggerty: I will get into that. Let's put it this way since you asked me the question. The former Minister of Lands and Forests (Mr. Brunelle) always used to give us sufficient information on mineral production in the Province of Ontario and on forest production, all in detail in the past recorded year. We haven't seen this last year or this year or I think for the last two or three years. That is what I am getting at.

Hon. Mr. Bernier: I can answer that while we are on the subject. As you know, this was discussed on a number of occasions and a Management Board order about three years ago in a period of constraint directed us to stop this type of publication. The information is available in our ministry library. If you just grab the phone, or go down and see them, they have a very extensive library where all that information is available, but we don't publish it for extensive use throughout the entire province.

Mr. Haggerty: Surely the members of this Legislature should have access to that, and not have to go to a library. It should be put on each desk here in the Legislature. We shouldn't have to cow-tail to the ministry on that basis. That information should be here.

Mr. Chairman: Order, please. I wonder if he hon. member would continue with his remarks on the estimates.

Mr. Haggerty: Yes. It is a reflection of last year's estimates and the heated debates that followed. The efforts put forth by the opposition parties surely indicate that much was to be desired in improving the management of Ontario's natural resources. This party can take much of the credit for putting forth arguments on behalf of Ontario's employees in the mining resource industry, to expose some of the poor working conditions and the environment that many miners are confronted with, with little if any government involvement.

Interjections.

Mr. Martel: That's the joke of the year!

Hon. Mr. Bernier: How can things be so bad if everybody wants to take the credit for it?

Mr. Haggerty: I thought that would get a rise out of some of the members to my right.

Mr. Chairman: Order, please, the Chair is having difficulty listening to the remarks of the member for Erie.

Mr. Laughren: He is misleading Ontario.

Mr. Haggerty: I am sure all members of the Legislature welcome the minister's announcement establishing the Ham commission to investigate matters of health as well as environmental and safety factors affecting the mine workers in the province. It's a study long overdue in the area of industrial health hazards.

The province's miners have worked and lived with a fear of silicosis and lung cancer and the knowledge that the rest of Ontario apparently cares little about the risks they run. Opposition members have been urging the government for some time to take effective and immediate action to reduce the health hazards to which our miners and workers in related industries, that is smelters, are exposed.

The announcement in June, 1974, by the minister on the government's measures to reduce health hazards in Ontario mines stated that the government has undertaken to spare no effort to ensure that whatever deficiencies may be found in its sensitivity to the health needs of the miners, they will be rectified; although it neglected to mention that it has taken considerable prob'ng and questioning on the part of opposition members to make the government sensitive to these needs.

I find this is a rather precarious position that the government now finds itself—an embarrassment of conceit. All I can do is refer to page 17 of the minister's statement this afternoon:

> Mr. Chairman, I feel it can be reasonably said that we did not fully recognize or assess a number of important changes in the field of health and safety of mine workers over the past few years. One of the changes has been labour's growing awareness of health and safety measures. Another has been the result of the advance of medical knowledge and awareness coupled with vastly improved techniques for measuring health and safety levels.

It's pretty hard to accept that apology because I am sure there have been a number of occasions when members on this side of the House and the opposition have brought this matter forward to the government to make it aware of the problems of industrial health conditions and poor hygienic conditions in the mines. I can recall that for the past eight years—and I can go back to 1960—there's been enough information available that you should have acted then, not now.

Mr. Martel: You never know, do you?

Mr. Haggerty: Let us hope that the results and the recommendations from the Ham commission will prevent conditions that constitute a hazard to the health of the workers and miners and related industries.

Mr. Laughren: You are really worried now, where were you before?

Mr. Haggerty: Hopefully, it places safety inspection under the Ministry of Labour for the enforcement of mandatory health and safety standards, or even the Ministry of Health, particularly as it relates to the environmental health section of the Ministry of Health.

During the minister's estimates, on May 16, 1974, he touched on a national resources study given at a meeting held with resources ministers from other provinces.

To my knowledge we have not seen what has become of the national resources study. The public should be informed as to what direction the government plans to adopt in the management of our resources in the next quarter-century, particularly as it relates to energy resources. Has the minister or the government taken any steps to adopt some of the recommendations on foreign ownership in the mining industry as suggested in the report of the select committee on economic and cultural nationalism?

The minister has indicated that his own ministry was reviewing the report of its efforts, and the mining industry will be commenting, and it will go to the policy field and then on to the government of Ontario.

We are greatly concerned about this particular matter, particularly in this area which has so far been void of any government action. The mineral aggregate advisory committee should be established now to examine the entire aggregate situation. We are greatly concerned over the amount of foreign ownership and control of the Canadian mining and smelting industry and we need to have more processing and fabricating of minerals carried out in Canada. The high proportion of fabricated products among our mineral imports seems to suggest that there is some room for further processing minerals in Ontario, if only for the Canadian market. [5:45]

The annual statistical report on the mineral production of Ontario from the Department of Mines was the only publication to list the amount of processing in Ontario of major minerals mined in this province. The most

recent year for this publication was 1970. However, figures in this publication show that: cadmium, 19.1 per cent of the concentrate was smelted in Ontario and 12 per cent refined in Quebec; cobalt, 36.6 per cent smelted and refined in Ontario and the rest outside of Canada; copper, 67.7 per cent smelted in Ontario, and 57.7 per cent refined in the province; gold, 94.2 per cent refined in Ontario; iron, 49.4 per cent smelted and refined in Ontario; lead, none in Ontario, eight per cent was processed in British Columbia; nickel, 56 per cent refined in Ontario; silver, 19.5 per cent refined in Ontario and 28.1 per cent refined in other Canadian refineries; zinc, none in Ontario, 11.1 per cent processed in Quebec.

I would ask the minister whether his ministry has more recent figures concerning this question? It is my belief that secton 113 of the Mining Act, which requires that ores and minerals shall be treated and refined in Canada so as to yield refined metals, has not contributed to any additional development of minerals and metals in this province. Treatment and refinment of ores and minerals must be encouraged through the use of incentives and less through exemptions to the Mining Act.

The minister has also yet to make a decision on the report of foreign ownership in the mining industry in Ontario. Are we to expect that any of these recommendations will be adopted? We have suggested on this side that the government apply a mineral export tax to encourage complete processing of Ontario minerals in Ontario. It is also a measure for obtaining additional revenue that could be used for the further exploration and development in Ontario, thus maintaining a healthy climate for employment opportunities. The Onakawana feasibility study, along with Ontario Hydro who was also interested in this report, the minister has promised a statement in June, 1975.

Perhaps, Mr. Chairman, to back up some of the arguments that I have been putting forward, the report of the advisory committee on the revision of the Mining Act, December, 1974, says:

> The spirit in which this section was written is obvious in its intention to be beneficial to the development of resources in Ontario, with the ultimate goal of beneficiating the mineral resources to their highest form of refinement in the province before sale locally for export. To date we have not had access to any facts that would lead us to believe that this section of the Act has contributed to any additional development of minerals and metals in the province. On the contrary, there would appear to be strong evidence that the iron mining portion of the mineral industry has suffered severe setbacks in the area of development of new iron ore mines since the section became part of the Mining Act.

That's chapter 8 of "The Export of Unrefined Ore."

Recently we have been warned of the pending crisis in the mineral aggregate supply in this province. However, we must demand that any need to supply aggregates in Ontario not overshadow the need for other equally important requirements. A balance must be struck between alternative needs, and this can be best met by proper planning of future land use.

This province is in need of a good plan for the future management of mineral aggregates. While we cannot have both untouched rural hinterland and urban and industrial growth as well, it is the manner in which the province directs a compromise between those competing land uses which deserves immediate attention. There is no doubt that certain areas must be left untouched because of the detrimental impact which aggregate extraction has on the environment and where aggregate has been extracted.

Rehabilitation must be as complete and effective as possible. We are all aware that the direction and degree of the growth has profound implications on projected needs for aggregate. Therefore, a comprehensive plan for land use and resource development, which would set aside certain reserve areas for future use and facilitate aggregate extraction in designated areas is urgent priority.

A formulation of such a plan must result from consultation with the municipalities to ensure compatibility with their official plans. The formulation of this plan must take into consideration the supply, within environmental considerations over the long term, and prevent urban and private development from encroaching upon the supply where its extraction is the least detrimental.

It is most urgent that we do have a province-wide policy regarding land use in this province including the extraction industry. The minister must now move to apply the Pits and Quarries Control Act uniformly across Ontario. The Act should, however, continue to recognize local planning controls under the Planning Act within the framework of the province-wide set of guidelines.

The impact of existing quarries that are still being worked, but to which the conditions of the Pits Act do not apply, should fully be required to file approved site plans and incentives might be given to aid rehabilitation of abandoned operations.

A most disturbing matter, which is occurring more and more frequently today concerning gravel pit operations in this province, has arisen as a result of the deficiencies in the Pits and Quarries Control Act. In cases where operations are existing at a time that an area is designated under the Act, no public notice of the application for a gravel operation is given, and no opportunities for objections are reported. A practise of stockpiling has thus allowed many operators to dress up an inactive site to appear to be in current operation at the time of designation.

As long as the operator remembers to excavate a few yards each year, he may rest secure in the knowledge that no notice of his application or opportunity to object will be given to his neighbours at the time his area is designated. The Act is absolutely silent on this malpractice and the minister should move to plug up this deficiency. Moreover, a complete environmental impact assessment should be made prior to the licensing of any new extraction operation. Where an open pit operation has been undertaken, acceptable rehabilitation programmes should be approved before the operation begins and the programme should be carried out in stages as extraction proceeds.

Penalties for non-compliance should be levied and such progressive rehabilitation made mandatory. The crippling effect of the rehabilitation procedures in the Pits and Quarries Control Act lies in the weak planned site requirements. The operator may strictly meet all the demands made of him and yet not have to show final grades or excavation scheme, the rehabilitation, or even the ultimate pit development.

There is very little that an operator can be held to do. The transportation costs represent up to 50 per cent of the consumer price for the aggregate and it's 90 per cent done by trucks. Is the ministry examining the implications of extending rail networks to cover large potential deposits? The provincial governments should move to reimburse municipalities to cover the cost of maintenance on roads used by gravel pit operators.

New gravel developments which are approved in the future must be planned so the road by-passes built-up areas. Road traffic and noise are the greatest complaint. This situation must be prevented before it occurs. After all, a municipality would rather do without a gravel pit, with its inherent difficulties, than approve one. Yet we need all the aggregates in the future. An important remedy to alleviate this situation would be to centralize the growth in the Toronto region.

Another important area in which the Ministry of Natural Resources regrettably lacks initiative is one that's becoming alarmingly critical: the shortfall of reforestation programmes. I noticed that his 45- or 46-page leadoff speech today did include some programme on reforestation in the Province of Ontario, and rightfully so.

With the $41 million increase in his budget this year, I think he should have something in that speech this afternoon to indicate what programmes he does have outlined for this coming period and perhaps the next 25 years. The province is continually falling behind in this regeneration programme despite its 10-year programme for reforestation.

The forest industry is in the midst of a $500 million capital expansion surge that began in 1971 and is expected to increase the annual softwood harvest by more than 60 per cent to about 10.5 million units a year.

In the past year alone Abitibi Paper Co. Ltd. of Toronto has begun construction of a sawmill at White River with a capacity of 70 million board feet a year and acquired two independent lumber companies with 140 million board feet capacity. The Great Lakes Paper Co. Ltd. in Thunder Bay announced that it would double annual lumber capacity to 100 million board feet in July, 1973. In December, 1973, it announced plans to expand the lumber capacity to 200 million board feet, then add 250,000 tons a year to the pulp capacity.

Kimberly-Clark of Canada Ltd. of Toronto announced in October, 1973, that it would build a lumber mill at Terrace Bay with a capacity of 35 million board feet and in July, 1974, announced a $200 million expansion of pulp capacity at Terrace Bay from 450 tons a day to 1,250 tons. Spruce Falls Power and Paper Co. Ltd. of Kapuskasing plans to build a sawmill capacity of 85 million board feet, I guess it is. Anglo-Canadian Pulp and Paper Mills Ltd. announced in March that it plans to build sawmills with a capacity of about 460 million board feet over the next four years, plus 1,000 tons a day of new pulp capacity.

Since the government's policy is that the forests of Ontario must be managed in such a way as to ensure the greatest continuous benefits to the people of Ontario, the calculation of the allowable cut alone, without serious and adequate consideration of silivicultural inputs—regeneration—as is the case in Ontario, would constitute an inadequate management of the forests.

While Ontario's forest industry is in the midst of greatly increased expansion, we are continually falling behind in the regeneration of the cutover Crown lands. An analysis of figures from the Ministry of Natural Resources report aptly demonstrates the deficiency in the regeneration programme.

In the year 1972, ending March 31, the area of cutover Crown lands was 345,405 acres. The area regenerated by the silvicultural treatment was 167,320 acres. Therefore, a shortfall of 178,000-some acres was left unregenerated.

In 1973 the area regenerated by the Ministry of Natural Resources was 165,190 acres. No figures were given for the number of acres that were cut over and needed regeneration, but it is interesting to note that this figure is below the number of acres regenerated in 1972, while the wood cut had increased.

The hour is 6 o'clock? I can't see the clock.

Mr. Chairman: If the hon. member has reached a convenient point to break?

Mr. Haggerty: I can make a break here then, yes.

Mr. Nixon: A quarter of the way through.

The House recessed at 6 p.m.

APPENDIX

(See page 995)

Answers to questions were tabled as follows:

5. Mr. Foulds—Inquiry of the ministry: Would each Ministry list the names of every MPP (including cabinet ministers) who has made a personal presentation of a government cheque on behalf of the ministry in 1974 and until Nov. 1, 1975? Would the ministry also list the name of the receiver of each cheque and the amount of each cheque so presented?

Answer by the Treasurer:

Ministries, as a rule, do not maintain records on the means by which government cheques are delivered to recipients. Where a ministry has been empowered to give a grant, these cheques may be mailed or delivered as a personal presentation.

Therefore, it is not possible to provide an accurate or complete list of names of every MPP who has made a personal presentation of a government cheque on behalf of a ministry.

All payments of the type the hon. member is referring to will be included in the public accounts with regard to payee and amount.

6. Mr. Foulds—Inquiry of the ministry: Will the ministry indicate the estimated cash flow expected from teachers under the provisions of Bill 136 (An Act to provide Superannuation Adjustment Benefits to Persons in Receipt of Pensions Payable Out of Pension Funds to which Contributions are Paid Directly or Indirectly Out of the Consolidated Revenue Fund) on a year-by-year basis over the next 10 years? Will the ministry also indicate the estimate of benefits payable assuming a full eight per cent escalation on a year-by-year basis over the same period from this fund?

Answer by the Chairman of Management Board:

Details of the estimated cash flow for the teachers' superannuation adjustment fund account on a year-by-year basis over the next 10 years are given on the attached sheet. Benefits payable are also shown.

CASH FLOW OF SUPERANNUATION ADJUSTMENT FUND
(in millions)

TEACHERS' SUPERANNUATION FUND—8% ESCALATION

Year	Active Employees At End of 1974 *Contributions	Benefits	New Employees 1975-89 Inclusive *Contributions	Benefits	Net Cash Flow	Fund at 8%
1975	23.14	0.31	0.65	—	23.48	24.40
1976	24.11	1.44	1.92	0.05	24.54	51.86
1977	25.13	3.12	3.35	0.18	25.18	82.17
1978	26.16	5.43	4.95	0.36	25.32	115.06
1979	27.22	8.43	6.73	0.62	24.90	150.14
1980	28.33	12.25	8.71	0.95	23.84	186.93
1981	29.50	16.88	10.90	1.34	22.18	224.93
1982	30.75	22.53	13.30	1.80	19.72	263.42
1983	32.09	29.20	15.96	2.32	16.53	301.67
1984	33.52	37.39	18.88	2.88	12.13	338.41
1985	35.03	46.97	22.13	3.48	6.71	372.46

NOTE:

The above is extracted from documents which formed the basis for consultation between the Ontario Teachers' Federation and the government prior to the introduction of Bill 136 (Superannuation Adjustment Benefits Act).

Contributions shown under "Active Employees" and "New Employees" equal two per cent of payroll—one per cent from each of teachers and government. The calculations assumed that contributions might commence in January, 1975. In fact they commenced on Sept. 1, 1975, and the figures will need to be adjusted accordingly.

The above estimated cash flows are necessarily based on certain actuarial assumptions relative to: salary scales, growth of membership, rate of turnover, etc. They also assume full eight per cent escalation each year.

7. Mr. Foulds—Inquiry of the ministry: Will the ministry list the number enrolled in each training school on Oct. 20, 1975?

Answer by the Minister of Correctional Services:

Training School	Boys	Girls	Total
Pine Ridge	67	—	67
Brookside	67	16	83
Hillcrest	45	—	45
Sprucedale	72	—	72
White Oaks Village	33	—	33
DARE Portage Lake	11	—	11
DARE Wendigo Lake	33	—	33
Cecil Facer	77	31	108
St. John's	85	—	85
Champlain	52	—	52
Oakville Reception and Assessment Centre	85	26	111
Grand View	—	45	45
Grand View Treatment Unit	—	17	17
Kawartha Lakes	—	39	39
	627	174	801

8. Mr. Foulds—Inquiry of the ministry: Will the ministry list all teachers with their home addresses under contract to the Provincial Schools Authority working in Correctional Services as of Oct. 3, 1975?

Answer by the Minister of Education:

Please find attached a copy of the names of all teachers employed by the Provincial Schools Authority who teach in Correctional Services schools.

It is not the policy of the government to divulge confidential information of employees, such as their home addresses, until such time as the teacher has personally authorized the release of same.

MINISTRY OF CORRECTIONAL SERVICES
TEACHING COMPLEMENT

(October 31, 1975)

BROOKSIDE TRAINING SCHOOL
Carleton, E. R. Principal
Haynes, J.
Templer, V.
Lawless, T.
Houston, E.
Hillier, C.
Kane, M.
Goodwin, T.
McKellar, G.
Orf, I.
Cushing, J.

Part-time

Linton, P.
Malenfant, G.
Dorion, D.

CECIL FACER TRAINING SCHOOL
Marchand, M. Principal
Kechnie, D. Vice-Principal
Ripley, K.
Porychyj, O.
Piche, R.
Walker, D.
Tilson, R.
Farquhar, J.
Weddell, J.
Hicks, R.

Part-time

Pitre, D.

CHAMPLAIN TRAINING SCHOOL
Leduc, R. Principal
Quesnel, J. Vice-Principal
Deguire, F.
Dufour, G.
Gauthier, R.
Gravel, P.
Lavoie, O.
Leduc, S.
Menard, N.
Parisien, J.
Perreault, U.
Racine, R.
Simoneau, P.
Sauve, R.

GRAND VIEW TRAINING SCHOOL
Solomon, P. Acting Principal
King, E. Acting Vice-Principal
Ashcroft, A.
Crawford, L.
Crossman, P.
Gutjahr, R.
Hershey, E.
Robinson, S.
Vandeweg, A.
Yaunes, A.
Jowett, V.

Part-time

Dahmer, H.
Toushan, J.

HILLCREST TRAINING SCHOOL
Fairbridge, A. Principal
Hancock, D. Vice Principal
Spender, J.
Stone, L.
Struthers, F.

Part-time

Britton, F.
Watson, L.
Laszlo, M.

KAWARTHA LAKES TRAINING SCHOOL
Baldry, J. Principal
Watson, H. Vice-Principal
Hargrave, V.
Sing, P.
Musgrave, B.
Hedge, G.
Jukes, S.

Part-time

Rowley, B.

PINE RIDGE TRAINING SCHOOL
Paterson, J. Principal
Thompson, J. Vice-Principal
Crookall, S.
Davison, J.
Frise, R.
Gerber, C.
Huggett, J.
Sabean, B.
Smith, E.
Smith, V.
Swan, R.
Zerf, E.

SPRUCEDALE TRAINING SCHOOL
Duffy, J. Principal
Emerson, R. Vice-Principal
Gray, W.
Hodgson, M.
Horton, H.
Rahn, D.
Stewart, J.
Shrivrattan, J.
Wiley, D.
Birnie, N.
Johnson, K.

WHITE OAKS TRAINING SCHOOL
Ireland, J. Principal
Laidlaw, J.
McDougall, L.
McIntosh, B.
Dykstra, M.
Gonder, J.
Millett, B.
Richards, J.

Part-time

Wase, B.
Anderson, K.

D.A.R.E.–WENDIGO LAKE
Whitworth, R. Principal
D.A.R.E.–PORTAGE LAKE
Court, R. Principal
Dawson, R.

OAKVILLE RECEPTION & ASSESSMENT CENTRE
Ricketts, M. Principal
Kenny, S. Vice-Principal
Bolster, C.
Bardsley, P.
Marafor, A.
Eardley, R.

Part-time

Mathias, L.

BRAMPTON ADULT TRAINING CENTRE
Grills, H. Principal
Adamovits, M. Vice-Principal
Henry, H.

BURTCH CORRECTIONAL CENTRE
Erickson, E. Principal
Hickey, J.
Hughes, E.
Platt, G.
Yurcich, G.
MacNeil, J.

GLENDALE ADULT TRAINING CENTRE
Cole, R. Principal
Bink, A. Vice-Principal
Campbell, G.
Morrison, S.
Piggott, J.
Gorman, L.
Kott, D.
Lapalme, E.
Smith, L.

GUELPH C.C.
Ewing, N. Principal
Dresser, S. Vice-Principal
Glenny, M.

KENORA JAIL
Mitchell, A. Principal

MAPLEHURST, A.T.C.
Baker, F. Principal
Mills, R. Vice-Principal
Bartkiu, P.
Bedford, G.
Bertram, H.
Chisholm, V.
Drews, K.
Dundass, J.
Foley, D.
Hagge, J.
Hamilton, B.
Hawthorne, D.
Hladik, A.
Hunsinger, I.
Maguire, W.
Mann, B.
McCann, J.
Nicholson, J.
Phillipson, S.

MILLBROOK C.C.
Dyke, H. Principal

MONTEITH A.T.C.
Budd, G. Principal
Barr, J.
Dyer, F.

ONTARIO CORRECTIONAL INSTITUTE
Jacobs, D. Principal

RIDEAU A.T.C.
Smith, M. Principal
Hamilton, I. Vice-Principal
Hollands, B.

THUNDER BAY A.T.C.
Long, D. Acting Principal
Bennett, J.
Davies, J.
Martin, D.
Merits, M. (Principal on leave 75/76)

WINDSOR JAIL
Knight, L. Principal

VANIER CENTRE FOR WOMEN
Culver, P. Principal
Angle, T.
Guilford, R.
Henderson, B.
Lum, E.

CONTENTS

Thursday, November 27, 1975

Anti-inflation programme, statement by Mr. McKeough 979

Position of marketing boards in anti-inflation programme, statement by Mr. W. Newman 980

Point of privilege re home buyer grant, Mr. Rhodes 981

Role of parliamentary assistants, ruling by Mr. Speaker 982

Anti-inflation programme, questions of Mr. McKeough: Mr. Lewis, Mr. Nixon, Mr. Shore 982

Home buyer grant, question of Mr. Davis: Mr. Lewis 983

Paperworkers' strike, questions of B. Stephenson: Mr. Lewis, Mr. R. S. Smith, Mr. Swart 984

Mississauga inquiry, questions of Mr. McMurtry: Mr. Nixon, Mr. Roy, Mr. Lewis 984

Education relations commission, question of Mr. Wells: Mr. Nixon 987

Aid to third world, question of Mr. Davis: Mr. Nixon 987

Arnprior Hydro project, question of Mr. Timbrell: Mr. Yakabuski 988

Port Arthur clinic strike, question of B. Stephenson: Mr. Foulds 989

Metric road signs, question of Mr. Snow: Mr. Worton 989

Salary increases by education boards, question of Mr. Wells: Mr. Lewis 989

Cow-calf programme, questions of Mr. W. Newman: Mr. MacDonald, Mr. McKessock 990

Greening Donald strike, question of B. Stephenson: Mr. Deans 991

Paving of Spadina extension, question of Mr. Snow: Mr. Givens 991

Environmental Assessment Act, questions of Mr. Kerr: Mrs. Gigantes, Mr. Good 992

Credit rules for women, questions of Mr. Handleman: Mr. Mancini, Mrs. Sandeman 992

Provision of social services, question of Mr. Taylor: Mr. McClellan 993

Aid for egg producers, question of Mr. W. Newman: Mr. Gaunt 993

Salary increases by education boards, question of Mr. Wells: Mr. Lewis 993

Point of order re position of marketing boards in anti-inflation programme, Mr. Lewis 994

Motorized Snow Vehicles Amendment Act, Mr. Snow, first reading 994

Automobile Insurance Rate Control Board Act, Mr. Swart, first reading 994

Labour Relations Amendment Act, Mr. Haggerty, first reading 995

Tabling answers to questions on order paper, Mr. Welch 995

Estimates, Ministry of Natural Resources, Mr. Bernier 995

Recess 1027

Appendix, answers to questions 5, 6, 7, and 8 on order paper 1028

SPEAKERS IN THIS ISSUE

Bernier, Hon. L. Natural Resources (Kenora PC)
Breithaupt, J. R. (Kitchener L)
Campbell, M. (St. George L)
Davis, Hon. W. G. Premier (Brampton PC)
Deans, I. (Wentworth NDP)
Ferrier, W. (Cochrane South NDP)
Foulds, J. F. (Port Arthur NDP)
Gaunt, M. (Huron-Bruce L)
Gigantes, E. (Carleton East NDP)
Givens, P. G. (Armourdale L)
Good, E. R. (Waterloo North L)
Haggerty, R. (Erie L)
Handleman, Hon. S. B. Consumer and Commercial Relations (Carleton PC)
Jones, T. (Mississauga North PC)
Kerr, Hon. G. A. Environment (Burlington South PC)
Laughren, F. (Nickel Belt NDP)
Lewis, S. Leader of the Opposition (Scarborough West NDP)
MacDonald, D. C. (York South NDP)
Mancini, R. (Essex South L)
Martel, E. W. (Sudbury East NDP)
McClellan, R. (Bellwoods NDP)
McKeough, Hon. W. D. Treasurer, Minister of Economics and Intergovernmental Affairs (Chatham-Kent PC)
McKessock, R. (Grey L)
McMurtry, Hon. R. Attorney General (Eglinton PC)
Miller, G. I. (Haldimand-Norfolk L)
Moffatt, D. (Durham East NDP)
Newman, Hon. W. Agriculture and Food (Durham North PC)
Nixon, R. F. (Brant-Oxford-Norfolk L)
Reid, T. P. (Rainy River L)
Renwick, J. A. (Riverdale NDP)
Rhodes, Hon. J. R. Housing (Sault Ste. Marie PC)
Riddell, J. (Huron-Middlesex L)
Roy, A. J. (Ottawa East L)
Ruston, R. F. (Essex North L)
Sandeman, G. (Peterborough NDP)
Shore, M. (London North L)
Smith, R. S. (Nipissing L)
Snow, Hon. J. W. Transportation and Communications (Oakville PC)
Stephenson, Hon. B. Labour (York Mills PC)
Swart, M. (Welland NDP)
Taylor, Hon. J. A. Minister of Community and Social Services (Prince Edward-Lennox PC)
Timbrell, Hon. D. R. Energy (Don Mills PC)
Warner, D. (Scarborough-Ellesmere NDP)
Welch, Hon. R. Culture and Recreation (Brock PC)
Wells, Hon. T. L. Education (Scarborough North PC)
Wildman, B. (Algoma NDP)
Worton, H. (Wellington South L)
Young, F. (Yorkview NDP)

No. 26



Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT — DAILY EDITION

First Session of the Thirtieth Legislature

Thursday, November 27, 1975

Evening Session

Speaker: Honourable Russell Daniel Rowe
Clerk: Roderick Lewis, QC

THE QUEEN'S PRINTER
PARLIAMENT BUILDINGS, TORONTO
1975



CONTENTS

A list of the speakers taking part in the debates in this issue of Hansard appears, in alphabetical order, at the back of this issue.

Daily contents of proceedings also appears at the back of this issue. Reference to a cumulative index of previous issues can be obtained by calling the Hansard Reporting Service indexing staff. Phone 965-2159.

Hansard subscription price is $15.00 per session, from: Sessional Subscription Service, MGS, 9th Floor, Ferguson Block, Parliament Bldgs., Toronto, M7A 1N3. Phone 965-2238.

LEGISLATURE OF ONTARIO

The House resumed at 8 p.m.

ESTIMATES, MINISTRY OF NATURAL RESOURCES
(continued)

Mr. Chairman: When we rose at 6 o'clock the hon. member for Erie had the floor.

Mr. Haggerty: I was discussing the report presented to the government in 1972 by the forestry division of the Ministry of Natural Resources. At the end of the 10-year programme they estimated the province would be able to regenerate the number of acres which had been cut over. However, the increased expansion in the forest industry was not accounted for.

The amount of money generated from the forest industry in Ontario, that is, through stumpage, forest management, and fire protection was $17,058,000 in 1973-1974. For 1974-1975 it had been estimated that $30,600,000 will be received by the doubling of Crown dues paid for cutting timber on Crown lands and by reducing the large number of different grading groups on which payment of the dues is based. In 1973-1974, 142,265 acres of forest were regenerated at a cost of $4.5 million. For 1974-1975 the target estimate is that 148,600 acres will be regenerated at a cost of $7.8 million. The provincial government thus is intending to spend only about 23 per cent of its revenue from forests on forestry for 1974-1975.

I feel that the Ontario regeneration policy is greatly lacking. Last year the Ministry of Natural Resources had estimated that 370,000 acres should have been regenerated, rather than the actual 142,265 acres as was the case. Not enough is being done on the regeneration programme, especially in light of the great expansion of the wood industries. I was delighted to see in the minister's leadoff speech that he's indicated that they do have another programme on reforestation. Hopefully, this is going to meet the goal.

If not, I think we are going to be lacking in forest products for the next 25, 30 or 50 years. I think there is much to be learned by the reforestation programmes in the Scandinavian countries. I hope the minister has made a trip over there to see what they are doing, because certainly they have a good management programme on forestry, particularly in relation to the forest industry. If they didn't, they wouldn't be surviving today.

The other matter I wanted to talk about is the provincial government taking an irresponsible approach to the mercury pollution hazard in the English and Wabigoon river systems. Opposition members have been urging the government for five years now to take immediate and effective action to protect the Indians of the Grassy Narrows and Whitedog reserves along these river systems whose health is threatened by mercury contaminated fish. I am very disappointed at the lack of initiative so far demonstrated by the government.

It is sheer irresponsibility on the part of the Ontario government to claim that there is no health problem among the Kenora area Indians who eat the mercury-contaminated fish. The only action announced by the government has been the statement by the Ministry of Health to send a group of specialists to Japan to consult experts there on the disease. The health hazards to which these people are exposed are very real and we, on this side, have urged that more vigorous action on the situation be taken.

Government statements clearly indicate that they are not yet convinced of the gravity of the situation. While the Minister of Health (Mr. F. S. Miller) has admitted that 20 to 30 Indians tested by the provincial and federal governments' investigators showed symptoms of the disease, he added that they are "hard to pin down" to mercury pollution.

Earlier this year a group of the foremost mercury poison specialists from Japan warned Ontario that the Indians on the two reserves have blood levels 50 times higher than that considered safe and warned Ontario "not to repeat the Minimata tragedy," referring to the Japanese city where 200 people died violently and painfully from mercury poisoning and 750 are incurably ill.

It is truly unbelievable that five years after the problem was identified, the Environment Minister has promised that the polluter, Dryden Paper Co. Ltd., won't be dumping mercury by the end of 1975. However, the

pollutant remains in the bed of the river, contaminating the fish and damaging the life of the Indians. Long after the company is gone, the river will not be restored.

We on this side demand that compensation be provided to those who have lost out as a result of the pollution, both the Indian people and the tourist operators. It was on April 2, 1970, that the then Minister of the Environment, George Kerr, stated in the House in reply to questions on the mercury pollution situation in Ontario that: "It is the policy of those representing the Ontario government to arrange for full compensation for any losses to fishermen." He also demanded that Dryden Chemical Co., the polluter, be taken to court on behalf of the people of Ontario for the mercury pollution in the English and Wabigoon river systems. It is time that pollution of this magnitude be considered a criminal offence.

Well, we have the appointment of a minister—he's in the House tonight too—again in this portfolio. We are hopeful that he is going to take the polluter to the courts. I can recall the day that he stood up in the House here and he said: "The polluter will pay." We are still waiting for that day in court. The provincial government is still in the process of bringing Dow Chemical Co. to court for the mercury pollution of Lake St. Clair. Hopefully, the minister can remember that one.

In the English and Wabigoon river systems, there has merely been some mention of the provincial government taking the company to court. I have noticed recently that the new minister, the Attorney General of the Province of Ontario (Mr. McMurtry), has indicated that he is going to take them to court. So eventually we may get some action that these persons are brought to the courts.

Apparently the court channel depends upon the outcome of the suit against Dow Chemical. If the Dow suit is unsuccessful, it is most unlikely that Dryden Chemical Co. will be taken to court. It is also unlikely that a suit against Dow will be won.

No compensation has been paid to the fishermen. The Minister of Natural Resources (Mr. Bernier) has stated that:

> Our policy is that there will be no compensation for industrial pollution. That is stated government policy. The polluter is responsible and the courts are open to individuals to take on the polluter.

What chance do individuals have with meagre or non-existent funds when the government has been unsuccessful for the last five years?

Compensation must be paid out by the government to those who have lost out as a result of the pollution. The need is for strong and consistent enforcement procedures. The fact is that the government must have an increasing role to play in the development of Ontario's resources. Until co-ordinated programmes come into being, abatement of industrial pollution from existing establishments is likely to proceed no more quickly than the present modest rate.

I am also greatly concerned that the subdivision developments on our lakes are being approved on a hit-or-miss basis. A wider perspective must be required before approval of a subdivision development is approved. The situation today is that individual proposals for developments on Ontario water bodies are being approved without an examination of the carrying capacity of the entire lake. There have been innumerable instances where approvals have been granted, such as on Lake Nosbonsing, on Nappan Island. That has been hammered out on different occasions in the House, brought to the attention of the ministers and many others, where the burden of extra motor boats and extra pollution will greatly add to the destruction of the aquatic environment.

A comprehensive methodology must be developed which will examine the cumulative effects of development in a water body. Instead of creating for ourselves a cleanup situation as has been the case in the past, we must prevent the situation before it occurs.

We now have a situation consisting of a fragmentation of effort with different ministries being asked for their views by the Ministry of Housing before developments are approved. As is most often the case, not enough time—60 days—is allowed to carry out proper studies on these lakes. Therefore, in many instances when I have spoken to biologists in your ministry regarding subdivision approvals, the view that has been expressed is that a development will proceed because there is not enough data on which to oppose it. Carrying capacity of a lake is still a nebulous term.

Basically, the Ministry of Natural Resources had done its studies on critical lakes and not on all lakes. Often one set of guidelines has been used both for northern lakes and warmer lakes of southern Ontario. How-, ever, you cannot use one set of guidelines for both types of lakes because of variances in results. It must be a major responsibility for

the government to prevent destruction of our water bodies.

I want to refresh the minds of some of the members of the Legislature and also to inform the new members of some of the past promises of the government in its programme for the development of northern Ontario to provide the citizens of many small communities with the same as perhaps the other communities in southern Ontario now possess—and that is, the matter of all the amenities required for a community to survive on.

At times I think the minister and his cabinet colleagues have amnesia. Can you recall the Throne Speech, I believe it was, of 1973 or 1974? The government announced that legislation was being initiated for the incorporation of communities in territories without municipal organization, but Bill 102 in 1974 providing such legislation died on the order paper. Are these communities going to be continually misled and neglected? I suppose if one were to look closely at the first word in the minister's portfolio, "natural" means "unaffected," "insensibility," "apathy of the government to be responsible."

This is one particular area where the federal government has shown some responsibility in providing assistance through the DREE programme. Surely then, this ministry, which has a larger share of the government's responsibility, must provide more active programmes to use the availability of regional development subsidies—already signed and agreed to with the federal government for both the northwest and the northeast—to provide basic community services such as sewers, water, and recreation similar to the facilities that the larger communities in northern Ontario and southern Ontario now have.

[8:15]

To ease restrictions in sewer and water installations in the north, where environmental conditions permit, and to speed the development of new housing we need a strong commitment to established priorities for improved road transportation in northern Ontario. We need consideration by the government to strengthen and expand the Northern Development Corp. to include on its board of directors all elected northern members of the Legislature to guide future growth and government expenditures in the north.

While I'm talking on that particular matter I think the minister should be moving more of his staff to areas in northern Ontario. I think this is where his ministry should be working from, not from here at Toronto.

The other matter that I want to bring to the attention of the minister is the matter of the high levels of water particularly as it relates to Lake Erie. I've asked the minister or I've indicated to the minister that I thought he should be providing more initiative in this particular field, even, perhaps, to having an inquiry into the reasons Lake Erie remains at the high levels it does today.

As a member of the committee dealing with the Ontario Hydro rates, I've noticed in a number of the reports and information passed within that committee that Hydro is happy with the high levels on Lake Erie. It adds extra water for the hydraulic plant in Queenston and in the long run perhaps provides extra energy for Ontario, perhaps at a critical time.

Based upon that and the matter of the development of the St. Lawrence Seaway where there are larger ships with deeper draughts now using the inland waterways, that extra high level of water would be of great assistance to them. Based upon those two matters I've raised with you, I think it's time that you do something about the high level of water in Lake Erie.

If you have to establish a committee of this Legislature to look into it, I think it would be the most appropriate step at this time, I think it's time these people have some protection along the lakeshore. Many of them have spent quite an amount of money to provide some form of cribbing or some type of retaining wall along the lakeshore. I called home to my riding tonight and was informed that the winds are up again on Lake Erie, causing considerable concern to municipalities in the riding of Erie, such as the city of Port Colborne, the town of Fort Erie and the township of Wainfleet.

It does cause these municipalities considerable problems. One is that the high levels of water cause a high table of water to remain inland and causes some difficulties with the present sanitary and storm sewers. It has overloaded both systems and is going to cost quite a bit to find some remedy to control the levels of water going into the sewers and storm sewers.

I know the province has an 80-20 per cent assistance programme still available but that isn't going to cover the cost for enlargement of storm sewers and sanitary sewers in these municipalities. If there are two bodies which gain results from the high levels of Lake Erie, for the benefit of all the people of Ontario and, perhaps, of all of Canada, I think there is more responsibility this government can

take to assist those municipalities which are affected most by the high levels of water.

Hopefully, the minister will move in some direction to provide additional assistance to them. That concludes my remarks. I know there are other members who would like to continue with other particular parts of the esimates and I leave it with you how you continue with it.

Mr. Chairman: Does the minister have any reply to the opening remarks?

Mr. Martel: Does the minister intend to respond to any of those points?

Hon. Mr. Bernier: Mr. Chairman, I could respond to those two if you wish. I have a few notes here that I could talk on for a few minutes, maybe to set the record straight.

Mr. Haggerty: The record is straight, there are misconceptions.

Mr. Laughren: Let's hear your defence.

Hon. Mr. Bernier: I will respond to the member for Cochrane South first. I have just written in my notes here I feel a little bit of shock and surprise at his adamant attitude that the government become involved in the settling of the pulp and paper strike.

Mr. Ferrier: Yes, and I talked to the union officials in Iroquois Falls yesterday.

Hon. Mr. Bernier: I have to look at the enthusiasm of that particular member and his particular party in allowing these various groups to strike and their defence of the right to strike and the collective bargaining arrangements that we have in this province.

Mr Moffat: Allowing?

Hon. Mr. Bernier: It is certainly something that we agreed to.

Mr. Martel: There is an article on good faith—bargaining in good faith.

Hon. Mr. Bernier: I just went through an election back—

Mr. Martel: Bargaining in good faith!

Hon. Mr. Bernier: I went through the election campaign about two months ago and I can remember that particular issue coming up. One of the things, of course, was the right of the civil service to strike and how adamant the NDP member was, and the Liberal member, that the civil service be given the right to strike and how he pounded the table and thought that was a great thing. I can't help but relate to the situation now; now that we get into a strike—

Mr. Ferrier: Bargaining in good faith.

Hon. Mr. Bernier: —you want the—No, that's a new cliché—bargaining in good faith.

Mr. Moffatt: It is new to you.

Mr. Martel: How many ministers were around here for four years?

Interjections.

An hon. member: How about a little order over there.

Hon. Mr. Bernier: So we give them this right and now you expect us to move in and settle it. I think that our job is to bring them to the bargaining table.

Mr. Ferrier: That is what I have been advocating. Bring them to the bargaining table.

Hon. Mr. Bernier: Certainly, we will do everything we can. I have been involved wih the discussions with the Minister of Labour (B. Stephenson) on a very regular basis as late as today—

Mr. Martel: Yesterday.

Hon. Mr. Bernier: —and we will go back at it tomorrow afternoon again. To say we are not interested in correcting this particular situation, as it is affecing about 25,000 workers in the woods industry in northern Ontario, is entirely wrong. This government is very sensitive to the people in that particular area who are affected. We have a responsibility, of course, to use those resources in the betterment of the public at large.

Mr. Laughren: When do we start?

Hon. Mr. Bernier: You know, I am very closely connected with that particular strike. In my home town, right today, there is a small mill that depends on the Great Lakes Pulp and Paper mill at Thunder Bay. They cannot ship their chips there. So, they have been on strike now for about 2½ months, not being able to ship their chips. When I go home, I have to tell you, just about a week ago was the first time that a group came to me, and said: "Look, do something. Up to now, we thought we could work it ourselves." I have to tell you this further that they are not totally satisfied with the attitude of the union leaders in dealing with this particular issue. They are very dissatisfied. That is coming to me loud and clear.

I have to put this on the record. It is something that they would like to speak about and it is coming to me.

Mr. Ferrier: That's not the message I got.

Hon. Mr. Bernier: Well, this is northwestern Ontario. It is there and it is something we have to deal with.

Mr. Laughren: It sounds like the Bryce Mackasey trip.

An hon. member: Secret ballot.

Hon. Mr. Bernier: You mentioned the limits aspect and that the limits maybe should be taken away from those major corporations. Sometimes I think you fail to realize the capital investment that those companies have put in there on the strength that there would be a supply of that raw resource to maintain those jobs and to maintain productivity and to utilize a renewable resource.

Somebody said to me today: "Would you take the limits away from Abitibi if they don't go to the bargaining table?" That, to me, is a little ridiculous. What would we do with huge trucks of timber, some of it overmature? Some would have to be harvested. They have forest management plans. So, if we took the timber limits away from them, what would we do with it? There is no other place to process it.

An hon. member: Set up a Crown Corporation.

Hon. Mr. Bernier: It's there. Do you build a new mill? Do you take the mill away from them?

Mr. Ferrier: You are not doing anything while they are on strike.

Hon. Mr. Bernier: There is no relationship.

Mr. Ferrier: Responsible corporate backing—

Hon. Mr. Bernier: There is no relationship between the timber limits of those paper companies and the labour problems that they are having. There is just no relationship because they go hand in hand: the mill and the wood resources.

Mr. Ferrier: Put conditions on their right to use those limits.

Hon. Mr. Bernier: That's the type of management we use. You put in a mill, like we are doing in the Ear Falls and the Red Lake area. There is a pulp mill going in there. We allocate, after a very close inventory—a check on the inventories and the wood available in the area—so that the two go hand in hand. The resources are there and the processing plant goes with them. To tie the two, it just doesn't add up at all.

I was interested in the member's comment about the free enterprise system. I was just waiting for him to refer to Sweden, really, because I heard in this House from that particular party how great things were in Sweden because it was all run by the government.

Mr. Moffatt: That is what you heard; that isn't what we said.

Hon. Mr. Bernier: You know, the public sector did everything. The public sector looked after all the forests. They owned all the trees.

Interjection.

Hon. Mr. Bernier: They don't. Go to Sweden. I went to Sweden myself and I learned that more than 50 per cent—

Mr. Martel: More than what?

Hon. Mr. Bernier: More than 50 per cent is held by the private sector.

Mr. Martel: Talk about economic planning.

Hon. Mr. Bernier: I was left with the impression from previous discussions in this House that it was total socialism. It is not.

Mr. Germa: What are you talking about?

Mr. Martel: They plan. That's more than you do.

Hon. Mr. Bernier: Tell me how great things are over there. Don't worry, they get the free enterprise. There's a lot of free enterprise over there.

Mr. Martel: They plan the economy.

Hon. Mr. Bernier: And they are very active.

Mr. Laughren: They should be planning the economy here.

Hon. Mr. Bernier: Well, I am telling you, don't say that Sweden has a total socialistic economy, because they don't.

Mr. MacDonald: Who said it was?

Mr. Moffatt: We never said it was.

Hon. Mr. Bernier: Yes, you guys have said it for years.

Mr. Bain: Socialism is capitalism reversed: In socialism the people get the benefits; in capitalism the corporations get the benefits.

Hon. Mr. Bernier: They've got a mix and the trend is to go to the private sector, not the public. I can tell you that. The suggestion is that we get involved in controlling the major pulp and paper companies to stop the boom and bust aspect. You know, there hasn't been that kind of a boom and bust in the forest industry. It's tied very closely to world markets.

Mr. Shore: Talk to all of us.

Hon. Mr. Bernier: They go up as the economy moves up and down. They are tied to that. The paper products are an essential part. That's one thing that is very quickly affected as the economy drops. The need and the demand for paper products and paper packaging drops accordingly. So that is where you get the boom and bust. It's tied to the economy. And how you could move in and level it off and make it an even and smooth process right across the board is just beyond me.

I don't know how you would ever do that. Really, I think that's just not possible. I don't know of any economy in the western world that tends to control the corporate sector in that particular way. If you have one, I would like to see it. I would like to see where it has been done—

Mr. Martel: Go to Sweden.

Hon. Mr. Bernier: —because it has not been done. And you know it has not been done.

We were over there. There was a very high demand for newsprint and they were very concerned because they weren't able to keep up, they were having their peak then too. So they go along with it.

In connection with the mining aspect, I am glad the member recognized the ministry's presence before a royal commission. I think you have to accept the fact that it's very unusual. I don't know if it has ever happened before in this province, where a government sets up a royal commission to look into a particular aspect of a certain problem and then that particular ministry and minister appear before that royal commission, which we did. We spent a whole day before the royal commission giving our side of the picture.

Mr. Laughren: Long apology.

Hon. Mr. Bernier: We didn't make any apologies. Sure we made mistakes. We admitted those mistakes. It's all documented in our presentation.

We also pointed out a number of directions that we think we should be going in to improve the working conditions in our mines right across tihs province. We have gone a long way. We have asked the commissioner himself to give us his reaction after he had heard all the presentations across this province and indeed from other jurisdictions as to how our thinking and how our ideas would fit into an overall programme that would involve the workers with management in coming to certain conclusions and improving these particular conditions.

It surprised me that during the election campaign when I picked up the paper I read that a certain political party had announced a miners' code and a miners' bill of rights. I kept on reading and I swear it was out of the Ministry of Natural Resources' report to the Ham commission.

Mr. Martel: No blood on our hands.

Hon. Mr. Bernier: It was right there the whole works is right there.

Hon. Mr. Henderson: That's terrible, Elie.

Hon. Mr. Bernier: So it shows that though you are reading our material and I think you are accepting it, you won't admit it.

Interjection.

[8:30]

Hon. Mr. Bernier: You won't admit it. And it's there. And we intend to move ahead in this direction. We are looking anxiously to the report of the commissioner himself which should be around the end of February. In fact, getting back to the royal commission, I remember our estimates last year. There were some very emotional pleas made and we responded. As the leader of the New Democratic Party said: "Old Bernier went far beyond what we thought he would. We didn't even expect that he would go that far."

Mr. MacDonald: He did.

Hon. Mr. Bernier: It shows that our concern was greater than yours, because we knew that there was something wrong. You fellows are taking the credit for it. It annoys me to hear that the New Democratic Party is the one that forced a royal commission on mines safey in the province.

Interjections.

Hon. Mr. Bernier: Your leader is on record as saying I went far beyond what he expected.

Interjections.

Hon. Mr. Bernier: In my opening remarks you'll see the safety record as it relates to accidents in the mines of the Province of Ontario. It's there for the record. The Mines Accident Prevention Association is sponsored by the industry. Labour wasn't involved. They did it themselves. They were there. They paid the shot. They set up their own committee. They made an attempt. They made corrective measures. The record is there to show they have a good accident record in the minds of this province. Look around and compare us with other jurisdictions. We have gone further in this province than any other jurisdictions.

Mr. Moffatt: That's not their fault. Tell us about the Reeves mine.

Hon. Mr. Bernier: I'll talk about the Reeves mine. Somebody mentioned we didn't take any testing. We did take tests at the Reeves mine in 1968. The test at that time—

Mr. Laughren: For six years you have sat on that information.

Hon. Mr. Bernier: It was available. We didn't sit on any information.

Mr. Laughren: You had that for six years and you didn't even tell the workers about it.

Interjections.

Mr. Martel: You told the company.

Hon. Mr. Bernier: I would point out that there were new testing devices and changes in standards.

Interjections.

Mr. Chairman: I must remind the committee that there are only six hours and 43 minutes left for the committee of supply. If you want the opinion of the Chair, you are wasting time.

Mr. Reid: I think he was referring to the minister wasn't he?

Hon. Mr. Bernier: I just want to point out that the standards of 1968 were 12 fibres per cubic centimetre, I will give you the list and the times of the tests that we have taken at the Reeves mine over that particular period of time. It was 12 fibres per cubic centimetre. Then the standards changed down to five; now it is down to two.

Mr. Laughren: Tell us what the readings were when the standards were 12.

Hon. Mr. Bernier: It was there. We did.

Mr. Laughren: Tell us what the readings were. Don't tell us the standards were 12 when the readings were 200.

Hon. Mr. Bernier: In certain areas, sure, when we moved in. But by saying that the mines safety branch has not been doing its job, I think you have done a disservice not only to the industry itself, but I think a disservice to the miners, because you have created a certain suspicion in the miners' minds, a real suspicion and a feeling of distrust.

Mr. Martel: Get off your knees.

Hon. Mr. Bernier: I think there is a feeling of hate in certain cases and this is not good.

Mr. Laughren: I should think so.

Hon. Mr. Bernier: I admit we make mistakes. I think you should get off that kick and get on the bandwagon and help us correct the situation. You have a responsibility too.

Mr. Laughren: I was in Elliot Lake. I know.

Hon. Mr. Bernier: I would point out you are a little more responsible than you were last year.

Mr. Martel: All you ever did was listen to Harold Davies for years.

Hon. Mr. Bernier: Get with us and help us correct the situation; that's all I can say.

Mr. Martel: Davies intercepted everything. You finally had to fire him.

Hon. Mr. Bernier: No, we didn't.

Mr. Martel: No, you moved him out, because he buggered everything up.

Hon. Mr. Bernier: There was one question about the mineral exploration corporation which was announced in the Throne Speech some time ago. As I indicated shortly after that particular announcement, we were working on a certain programme but with budgetary constraints we had to put it on the shelf for a period of time. That's where it stands at the present time and, until financial conditions improve, it will remain there and we'll have to depend on the private sector along with our mineral exploration assistance programme and along with our other programmes in the geological branch of the ministry to carry on. You asked for information on exemption 113. What you are inter-

ested in is the new exemptions that were given.

Mr. Haggerty: Yes.

Hon. Mr. Bernier: There is quite a list. These are the total ones here. I am just wondering whether it may take too much time of the committee.

Mr. Ferrier: Will you make a photocopy of that list and send it to my office?

Hon. Mr. Bernier: I will photostat it and send it across. I will get each a copy. Maybe that will be simpler and if there are questions relating to this, maybe we can—

Mr. Haggerty: Is it up to date? Not 1970?

Hon. Mr. Bernier: This was revised on Oct. 20, 1975, so it gives you the latest information on all exemptions. I will get copies of this and make sure you get copies for your remarks.

I think the member was mentioning the mining taxes, the taxes that are being obtained now from the non-renewable resources of this province. I think it is something like $152 million that will be taken in in this particular year. Next year we are estimating this to be about $100 million. That is because the profits will be down. Many of the metals themselves have all gone down drastically so it's certainly showing up.

I have to admit as I look across this country of ours and see the problems in the mining industry, the disallowance of the write-off of the provincial tax against the federal tax is causing me concern as the minister responsible for the development of the non-renewable resources of this province. I am wondering myself if maybe we have not gone just a little too far in putting too much tax burden on those particular mines of this province. I don't want to mention them here tonight but there are several that are in financial difficulty today.

Mr. Laughren: Falconbridge.

Hon. Mr. Bernier: No, not Falconbridge. I exclude Falconbridge.

Mr. Germa: Inco is in trouble.

Hon. Mr. Bernier: It's one of a number of things. I tell you as the months and weeks go by we will be hearing more about this problem in the mining industry, and it gives me a great deal of concern. It's something that I personally am going to take a very close look at, to see if that may be one of the causes. The mining industry as it affects the northern part of this province is something that we can't afford to lose. In my own particular riding the mining industry is the second largest employer, so we have got to maintain that economic stimulus in that particular area and indeed right across the north.

You mentioned the Onakawana development—some question as to where that stands. You will recall we entered into a tri-party feasibility study with the Manalta people, now called Mannix of Alberta, and the Ontario government and Ontario Hydro. Ontario Hydro has been going through the feasibility of that particular report, of the facts and figures in that report. As you correctly point out, the development of the Onakawana lignite deposit in this feasibility report shows that it could come in slightly under the present fossil fuel costs, much higher than nuclear and of course much higher than the water power that Hydro's receiving now.

I am hopeful that we will have a firm statement from Ontario Hydro within the next short period, but I have to tell you that informaion coming to me—it's not firm yet, it's maybe a little premature for me even to say it but I will—is that Hydro is a little less than enthusiastic about moving into this particular type of development. I am not sure if it's because of the lack of expertise or if it's a cost factor or if it's tied to their whole aspect of development and the long range planning for the supplying of electrical power to this province. But I expect that the reply will not be an enthusiastic one.

If that's the case, then we will have to go back to the Onakawana people, to the Alberta coal, as they hold the expiration licence, to see if there may be some other avenue we could go. Maybe they would like to develop the power and sell it to Hydro or maybe we could go just to straight gasification. I think they have expressed an interest in processing some of that lignite for use in the Sudbury area as a briquette to be used in the smelters and in the paper mills of northern Ontario.

So there are a number of possibilities down the road that we think we can move on, but we have to have the reaction and a positive statement from Hydro because that is the first obstacle. We believe, as you do, that if there's a source of energy there, it should be developed by Ontario Hydro in the interests of the people at large. There may be extenuating circumstances which I'm sure they will point out to us, if that is the situation.

One of the members mentioned the Henderson report of the Special Programme Review Committee that was just tabled. They mentioned the private sector should be involved or maybe take full responsibility for the regeneration of our forests and the silviculture programme on their own particular limits. This is not a new proposal. We're looking at it very carefully. We want to make sure we have a guarantee, as we have in our own long-range programme, that in the year 2020, we will have 50 per cent more fibre available than we had in the year 1972. These are things that we will have to weigh out very carefully and the government will have to make a decision on those particular recommendations.

One of the members mentioned handicapped persons being allowed into provincial parks. As I pointed out to him last year, if we had some way to identify these people promptly it would make it much easier. I just want to tell him that groups of handicapped persons that are sponsored by an institution or a hospital are admitted into our provincial parks on a day-use or a camping basis free of charge. We've got that particular situation as it relates to groups in place, which makes it very acceptable to us. We're still working with Community and Social Services and if they come up with some identity programme, it'll certainly make it much easier for us to deal with.

The member for Erie mentioned a number of issues. I must admit I had difficulty hearing all his comments because of the acoustics, but I strongly felt that many of the points that he raised are answered in my opening remarks as they relate to the regeneration programme. I strongly feel that if you review what I said—

Mr. Haggerty: Well, you said that about five years ago and it is still on paper.

Hon. Mr. Bernier: —in that opening statement, you'll find a lot of answers to the questions you have raised.

The committee established to review the Mining Act, as I pointed out in my opening remarks, is established and is in place. We also have a mineral aggregate review committee that, as you correctly point out, is looking at the Pits and Quarries Control Act. I recall vividly when that particular piece of legislation was piloted through this Legislature indicating at that time that this was a new piece of legislation. Nowhere else on the North American continent do we have anything comparable or anything to look at, so there will be amendments required. We've set up a very general committee having broad representation from the municipalities.

Mr. Haggerty: Why haven't you designated every municipality?

Hon. Mr. Bernier: We have desgnated, I would say, 90 per cent of the problem areas in the Province of Ontario, including Sudbury, I might say.

Mr. Haggerty: I can think of one now that you just designated about a year ago.

Hon. Mr. Bernier: There may be the odd one. But here again, it's a question of staff and personnel to police the Act.

Mr. Haggerty: You seem to pick and choose.

Hon. Mr. Bernier: I have to tell you that I'm satisfied as far as we've gone, but the Act itself has to be amended.

Mr. Haggerty: I think it's a great piece of legislation.

Hon. Mr. Bernier: Yes, it's a great step forward, but the Act itself has to be strengthened and have a few more teeth and a few corrective measures in it. You very clearly spelled them out. We'll look at those comments and certainly make sure that particular review committee gets a copy of them because I think you made some very valuable contributions.

[8:45]

Mr. Haggerty: The main point I wanted to raise with the minister was that the municipalities should have some say in it. As it is now, the ministry has complete control; it can say what industry or quarry it wants to go into a municipality, without even consulting the municipality. What I want the ministry to do is to consult them first.

Hon. Mr. Bernier: That is not entirely correct, because under the Pits and Quarries Control Act today, if a new pit is to be established within their area of jurisdiction, and if that particular area is zoned as extractive, then of course it's zoned as extractive; but if it's not, then there have to be certain zoning amendments made. The municipality has the veto power if that is its feeling and its view. I think in section 6 of the Act it's laid out in various clauses that they could veto that particular operation. In fact, we have taken it upon ourselves for about two years now to contact a municipality prior to

issuing a licence for a pit and quarry to get their reaction and to get them involved; that is working very well. It may well be that we will have to strengthen that aspect of it, but at the present time they do have a veto power.

The question of a zinc or copper refinery in northern Ontario was raised by the member for Erie, I think. As I mentioned in my opening remarks we are reviewing the zinc potential in Ontario at the present time. He is quite right in stating that very little is refined in the Province of Ontario. We think there's a possibility that something could be done along these lines in Ontario.

The hon. member will be interested to know that five zinc refineries in the United States have been closed up because of environmental problems, and that is creating a new problem here in Canada; there are a number of major firms looking around this country today to see where they could expand or establish a zinc smelter and refinery. That study is going on within the ministry at the present time.

I have to tell the hon. member that we did a review of the copper potential some time ago. It was not very encouraging for a number of reasons. We will be updating this information, of course, as new information comes forward. But the encouraging area would be something in the zinc field at the present time.

In connection with a mineral export tax, I think I have made known my views and my concerns as it affects the mining industry today and as we see the mining industry being affected right across the Province of Ontario. The hon. member will be interested to know about a small mining development in the Province of Manitoba. He knows the problems they had in bringing in amendments to their Mining Tax Act. Now I'm told there are certain exemptions being given so that over a certain period of time the capital required to develop that particular facility in Manitoba will be written off in taxes. So they are using tax incentive, much as we are doing here in the Province of Ontario, to get further processing in the northern part of their province.

I mentioned the amendments to the Mining Act are moving ahead. I hope they will result in certain changes that will make it easier for the mining industry, particularly to get on with more exploration. Regardless of what we do, if we don't get exploration dollars going into northern Ontario or any part of this province we'll never have any mineral discoveries.

Mr. Reid: Extend your plan.

Hon. Mr. Bernier: Right now we have about $12 million or $13 million, maybe $14 million worth of exploration going on in the province. We should have $30 million. So we're a long way down.

Mr. Haggerty: If you're going to tie yourself in with the Shell oil company and go out to Saskatchewan for uranium, that doesn't make much sense, does it?

Hon. Mr. Bernier: Well, I don't know that there are too many mining industries that are going to go to Saskatchewan after the potash business.

Mr. Haggerty: If you look at the comments in your leadoff statement, why—

Mr. Martel: Blakeney wants them.

Hon. Mr. Bernier: I don't think Blakeney can afford them.

Regarding regeneration, the member made some very lengthy comments about our forestry programme. Again, I would say to him that if he looks at my opening statement I think he'll find many of the answers he is looking for. I am particularly pleased and proud of the regeneration programme that we have in place today, and I can assure him that from my own point of view I am fighting desperately, with the shortage of dollars and the budget constraints that are being applied to the various ministries today, to keep that programme in place—because I can see the needs and the demands of the Minister of Health (Mr. F. S. Miller), the Minister of Education (Mr. Wells), the Minister of Community and Social Services (Mr. J. A. Taylor), the dollars that they need today. And here I find myself asking for dollars to plant trees today that will not reap any economic benefit for 50 or 60 years. It's a difficult task, but I have to say again that my colleagues are very sensitive to the needs of the north and as it relates to the forest industry.

An hon. member: Who's he kidding?

Hon. Mr. Bernier: You mentioned the situation as it relates to Grassy Narrows and Whitedog, and certainly I would be remiss if I didn't comment briefly on it, not only from the ministry's point of view but being the local member of that particular area I am particularly concerned as it relates to the health of not only the native peoples but the entire population that is living close to the

mercury-polluted waters of the Wabigoon and English river systems. I think the first step we had to take was to stop the pollution of that particular system. That has been done. Today there is no mercury chlor-alkaline plant at Dryden; it's completely changed over. There's no more fear that that will be accelerated or even extended.

The second step we had to take was to do a very careful close check on the health of the native peoples. That has been done and it's an ongoing thing in co-operation with the federal government. Of course, the third thing is the socio-economic problems related to both of those reserves. There is a problem here with constitutionality. Primarily, the reserves themselves are federal jurisdiction. We've gone beyond. I think it's fair to say the province stepped in where constitutionally we didn't have the right, such as sending up freezers and making sure that they would have an alternate source of uncontaminated protein. We did that at a cost of about $140,000 just to put up the freezers. Next year we've budgeted $100,000 just to make sure that there is protein made available in those particular freezers. We've replaced that lost source of food on a very regular basis.

As you know, the federal government suggested just last week that if the situation from the native peoples' point of view is so serious they would seriously consider relocating those reserves off the polluted waters. That was turned down flat. I had the opportunity of speaking to the minister just as late as yesterday, and he tells me that that offer still stands. He said, "There may be some that will want to move. We'll pay their costs and we'll assist them in every way we can." But I know those people personally, they have been moved once already because of the flooding, the Hydro developments, and I accept that they want to stay where they are. This is their home, and you've got to know those people to realize that.

The steps that we've been taking are maybe not as much on a long-term basis, but we've been doing short-term things, such as providing job opportunities where we can as it relates to my ministry. In our silviculture programmes, of course, we hire as many natives as we can. In forest-fire fighting they're the best forest-fire fighters that we have in the Province of Ontario, our native peoples. We recognize that and the bulk of our force is made up of native peoples.

Tree planting is another area where we use a number of native peoples. We've used them in all those places, even in the testing programmes where we go out and test a number of lakes for mercury contamination, outside of the English and the Wabigoon river system, we use native people. Just last week—the member from Nipigon will be interested in this—we found a number of smaller lakes in the Ignace area that have a high level of mercury contamination in the fish of those particular lakes. There is no industry around at all. There is no industry leading into those particular lakes. That is giving us some concern. Lac Seul, the lake that I live on personally, is contaminated by natural mercury. There's a large Indian reserve there, and I recently asked that they be tested to see if there was any health damage to those particular people. So we are moving ahead.

I want to just mention one thing we hear so much about as it relates to the Ministry of Natural Resources in regard to our particular jurisdiction—that is guaranteeing that their trapping rights are protected. We do that, and we've been concentrating on that particular area. But I have to say I'm disappointed that in the last two or three years they've only been trapping 50 per cent of their potential. It's very discouraging to me for people to be oriented in that way and not capitalizing on that potential and that possibility.

We've given them timberlands; the staff did a brief review and they tell me that over the last five years they've been cutting only 21 per cent of their allowable cut. So there is a responsibility on the chief and the councils to assist us in getting those programmes off the ground. I accept the fact that it's going to take time, it's going to take patience and it's going to take understanding, and we're prepared to do those.

Hon. members will be interested to know that we forgave the loans under the Fisheries Loans Act as it relates to Lake St. Clair and the English and Wabigoon river system. Many people said to me that the commercial fishing industry in that particular area of northwestern Ontario was a big industry, it meant a lot; it was a big thing. In fact, one news reporter told me it was a $300,000-a-year industry. Well, it wasn't anywhere near that, because in the 2½-year period that we gave loans to those commercial fishermen, which were for 70 per cent of the average of the three previous years, we only wrote off $57,000. So commercial fishing wasn't a great financial thing to the Indian people, but it was a big source of food. We recognize that.

Very recently I had the pleasure of going up to Kenora with my colleagues, the Minister of the Environment (Mr. Kerr) and the Minister of Health (Mr. F. S. Miller), and we met the two chiefs and the president of Treaty No. 3. We reviewed a number of requests that they had made. We also indicated that we would be establishing a provincial co-ordinator in Kenora to deal specifically with those two particular reserves on an emergency basis, to provide some socio-economic stimulus in the short term and to try to work out something in co-operation with the federal government on a long-term basis.

To listen to the media or to read the media, you'd think that the demands and the needs of those particular two reserves were not being heard. This is not true, because they are getting attention; they are getting funds and they'll continue to get more—along with some direction. As the chief from Whitedog told me, "It's great to give us these programmes but you must realize I have to do all the clerical work myself; I just can't handle it. I have to have somebody to give me a hand to make application, to give us some guidance and some leadership as it goes into the white man's society." So these are areas we are looking into.

I might say that the negotiations regarding the Ontario Northland-DREE agreement are progressing—I think the member for Erie mentioned this. They are moving ahead, and I'm told we can expect the agreement to be finalized in the not too distant future. They will again provide us with some federal dollars, 50-cent dollars, but nevertheless they will give us a little bit of additional funding to assist in meeting the needs of the people who live in the far-flung reaches of the province.

The question of moving the Ministry of Natural Resources to northern Ontario is a matter that came through to me loud and clear, particularly during the last election campaign. I had to point out and—

Mr. Haggerty: I've heard mentions of Sault Ste. Marie, Sudbury, New Liskeard and Fort William.

Hon. Mr. Bernier: I have to admit that was a gimmick; really, that's what it was. Because in my ministry, 75 per cent of my staff now are outside of the Metropolitan Toronto area, working in the field. We went through a reorganization—we went from four regions to eight regions and from 21 districts to 49 districts—to take our programmes out to the people and to give the public better service. For the first time, we established in Thunder Bay an assistant deputy minister who has the same power as a deputy minister. So we have a strong image. But to say to me, a northerner, that I should be established, say, in Sault Ste. Marie, Geraldton, Kenora or somewhere—

Mr. Ferrier: What about Armstrong?

Mr. Martel: Or Wawa?

[9:00]

Hon. Mr. Bernier: —I think would be doing a disservice to the people of northern Ontario, because we need an extra voice here.

You know, we have only got 15 in northern Ontario. We should have 25 and then for the Liberal party to come along and say: "Take them out and put them out there in Wawa or some place, and keep them up there"—we have got to be here, we have got to be here to get our fair share. And I am sure that the member from Nipigon would agree with me.

The only way we can get our fair share for our particular area, for the north, is to be here and to make sure that we are heard loud and clear, so I just can't accept that argument. I don't see the federal government putting the Ministry of Fisheries in Newfoundland, or in BC. I don't see the federal government putting the Ministry of Agriculture in western Canada. You have got to be where the action is. You have got to be where the bucks are, and make sure that you get your fair share.

Mr. Haggerty: I don't know if there is any action over there, though.

Hon. Mr. Bernier: There's action here and I would strongly recommend as a northerner that that's one particular plank, if we go into an election in the not too distant future, that the Liberal Party would be wise to remove from their platform, really. They would be doing the north a service and their own party a real good service, because it just doesn't go over in the north. It is just something that is not accepted. That's the end of my remarks.

Mr. Ferrier: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman, I believe it is understood, and I think the hon. member for Erie and I think the minister will agree to this, that we consider all the votes together and that speakers from at least the Liberal and the NDP

groups limit themselves to between 15 and 20 minutes so that we can make the best use of the time available. If the minister agrees, I think that's the consensus that we can work on.

Hon. Mr. Bernier: Mr. Chairman, I gather you are going to go through all aspects of the estimates?

Mr. Chairman: Is that agreeable with the committee?

Agreed.

Mr. Chairman: It is agreed we will limit the remarks or the debate between the minister and the various members of the committee to 15 to 20 minutes each.

Mr. Martel: Mr. Chairman, the minister started off today by deliberately—I shouldn't say deliberately—he misled the House. And I can't pass up this opportunity to correct the minister.

In his opening statement, he makes the following point. One of the changes has been labour's growing awareness of health and safety measures, and the minister knows full well that it's his own legislation which even until this time prevents labour from really being involved in health and safety of the miners. The minister knows full well that under the section of the Mining Act, the sole prerogative for safety programmes in the mines is left to the company. If you want to spank the industry, Mr. Minister, I suggest you not include labour, because they have had no part in the health-and-safety programme. What they have gained, they have gained through the collective bargaining process and have had to fight like mad to get it despite the wishes of this government. I think that it was unfair of you to put that statement in.

Hon. Mr. Bernier: I must respond to that.

Mr. Martel: You will have your day in court. I want to make three or four very quick points and then get to what I want to talk about in the few minutes that I have. There are three main recommendations on the select committee pertaining to land that I would ask the minister to consider. The first one he mentioned partly this afternoon in dealing with Crown land for recreational purposes. The select committee, as I am sure the minister is aware, recommended in its final report that Crown land be leased to Canadians and landed immigrants and no one else. And I would urge the minister to take a look if he hasn't at the select committee's report on which two of his cabinet colleagues sat, and that they take that recommendation into consideration and implement it as quickly as possible. There have been some test cases as I understand it in other jurisdictions which would give us the authority to do that.

Secondly, I would ask the minister, again based on the select committee report, to consider the reclaiming of the surface rights of all of the mineral rights that are held in the province and let me explain that quickly. Many of the mining companies hold great tracts of land for which they don't want surface rights—pardon me, I said mineral rights. They don't need the surface rights. They need the mineral rights which invariably are below the surface and surely in my own area we should not be allowing mining companies to tie up 200, 300, 400, 1,000 acres, most of which they don't need the surface rights for. Surely in this day and age we should be saying to the mining companies, "You have a right to the mineral rights, but the surface rights return to the Crown so that we can utilize those for a variety of programmes that we want for our citizens."

I know that in the Sudbury area it's even difficult for some of the municipalities to get a dump site, because a mining company has the land tied up totally. I don't think they need the surface rights unless, of course, pit mining is involved. If you're talking about pit mining, that's vastly different. But if you're talking about underground mining, I don't think they need the rights.

The select committee two years ago recommended that we reclaim most of that, particularly in view of the tax pittance that we get for tying up all that land. What is it now—a dollar an acre per year? I think it's ridiculous that they have those surface rights. They don't need them anyway.

The same thing applies with the pulp and paper industry, although somewhat more difficult. I understand that position. It is somewhat more difficult in that the roads are paid for by the industry; but there are large tracts of land that they're not using that we could make multi-use of.

I think it's time that the government took a look at the select committee's reports on those three things and came up with some legislation which would see multi-use wherever possible. If the land isn't needed by the mining industry, the surface rights should be returned to the Crown; and the other one concerns who has a right to the land.

I'm going to go through these quickly. About four years ago, the ministry staff prepared a report on the degree of foreign owner-

ship in the Ontario wood-using industry. I understand it was to be renewed every year. Could the minister make available to us the latest review? In the 1970 review it indicated that we were falling behind and there was more foreign domination—and it was growing. I'd simply like to be assured that that trend has stopped and maybe the last report has been finalized.

I want to deal primarily with three aspects of health and safety as they pertain to the mining industry. I want to deal first with silicosis in my own area. For years we've been told that there's no silicosis in the mining industry in the Sudbury area—or very little. I believed that. Nothing showed up for the longest time.

However, I have before me from the Mine, Mill and Smelter Workers Union, eight silicosis cases which have been established in the last little while and 15 which are presently being considered for some type of ailment for chest problems coming out of the mining industry in the Sudbury area. This deals with Falconbridge alone.

There are two aspects of it. If we've been told that there's very little silica dust, why have about eight claims been established of late? One of them I worked on only about a year ago, for a man by the name of Lawrence Henry. The other 15 have a variety of ailments dealing with the chest.

In the 14 or 15 cases which haven't been accepted for silicosis, the Workmen's Compensation Board is now saying it's pneumoconiosis. Many of the men involved worked for three or four years in the coal fields in Belgium after the war. Many of them are immigrants who came to the Sudbury area, having spent four or five years in the Belgian coal mines. The Workmen's Compensation Board is simply taking the easy way out. The WCB is saying it is pneumoconiosis because of the exposure to the coal dust for four or five years.

I wrote the United Mine Workers union, who've done probably more work in this field than any other group, because they have so many coal mines in the United States, and they tell me that it takes approximately 15 years of exposure to get pneumoconiosis.

I find it strange that the Workmen's Compensation Board in Ontario, with the four or five cases I have before me—information which I can give to the minister—attributes it to pneumoconiosis with only four or five years of exposure, when the mining unions in the United States say that it takes roughly 15 years of exposure to develop pneumoconiosis.

I think the Workmen's Compensation Board is taking the easy way out. They don't want to blame the mining industry in the Sudbury area, and are saying that it's the Belgian coal mines. That to me is the easy way out, because the statistics that I have indicate that that isn't the case. It isn't a four-year or five-year exposure, it takes 15 years. I think that has to be looked at.

I also have a number of cases from the United Steelworkers and they also have a growing concern that there is more silicosis in the Sudbury area than we've been led to believe over the past little while. I have four cases from the United Steelworkers; they haven't even gone through all their files.

It is disturbing because we have been told all along that there is no silica dust in the type of minerals that are in the Sudbury area. There are just too many cases of late which destroy that theory that there is no silica dust there. I have the cases from the Steelworkers; I have the names from the mine workers. I think it has to be investigated to determine if that's occurring, before it is too late. If it is occurring, let's get the ventilation improved to ensure that it doesn't continue. But based on what's gone before, there are just too many cases coming up now and it really bothers me.

There was a study commissioned in 1973 to study the chest ailments in the Sudbury area. To my knowledge, to this date, that report has not been finalized. Part of the reason I am told is that Dr. Joe Cowle, who was involved in the study, passed away last spring. Surely, after two or three years that report should now be ready. I understand other problems interfered with it—the silicosis problems that came out of the Elliot Lake area might have slowed it down, but I would like to know if that report is ready.

I want to deal with two other problems. One is Elliot Lake, again for a few moments. The union contacted me. There are several things I want to talk about. The allowing of your mining engineers to grant Denison or Rio Algom permits for overtime. I don't think it should rest with the engineers—I am sorry. I think it should come either directly to the minister or the deputy minister. The reason I say that is that I don't know what the back record of most of those men are, and neither does Denison and neither does Rio Algom, in the accumulative number of work level months of exposure.

I think, and the union is in full agreement, if there is a real emergency the union would be the first to say yes. But, when there is a scoop tram broken down—it gets that ridiculous—they request special permission for additional overtime. I don't think that you should pass that off to your mining inspectors to make that decision. That should come here and the reason for overtime should be emergency in the true sense. I don't think the unions will object; I know they won't, but what's going on is ridiculous.

The second point I want to make—and I would like an answer—is the way you are establishing work level months. You are establishing work level months simply, as I understand it, as a gimmick which will prove that most of the men have not been overexposed. As I understand it, you are simply taking, for your reports, the total work force divided into the number of hours of work, and coming up with the final figure as being the work level exposure.

That's nonsense, that's total and absolute nonsense. As I understand it, you are not taking into consideration the number of hours that people are away; you are not taking sickness into consideration; you are not taking the number of people on the work force and dividing it into the hours worked. I venture to say here tonight that using that formula you won't find 10 men who are overexposed. You are deceiving everyone by doing it if that's the case. If that's the way you're doing it I would beg you to start all over again. I would ask that you look at each man's record individually, taking from him what he considers he has worked and not strictly what the company is going to present to you. It's just too dangerous to play that kind of game. I'd like to know if that's the formula you're using to consider the work level months.

[9:15]

I'm also told that the ministry doesn't intend to give its final findings on work level months to other than Denison and Rio Algom and to the Workmen's Compensation Board. The unions have been advised they will not receive that information. I'm told Rio Algom is willing to pass it on. Surely to God, the minister would give that information directly to the union involved? The lives of those men are too important to give that material simply to the Workmen's Compensation Board and to the two corporations. Surely, you must pass that information on to the union at the same time as the government gives it to the two companies involved.

Mr. Chairman: I would draw to the hon. member's attention he has used 14 minutes and 10 seconds.

Mr. Martel: Yes, Mr. Chairman, I appreciate that. The other point I want to turn to only briefly. I'm working within a time limit by the way. They told me I have five minutes grace but they didn't tell me ahead of time so you'll notice I'm going very quickly.

I want to turn to industrial deafness now for only a few moments. This is a file I've been gathering for the past year; that's all one year just on industrial deafness. The situation is critical and I can't get the government to move.

A year ago, when the Minister of Health (Mr. F. S. Miller) made his statement on the silicosis problem at Elliot Lake, the minister deliberately left off the last point in his statement which he had prepared, and that dealt with industrial deafness. He did not present it to the Legislature. I tell you now that some of the medical people I know in Sudbury are conducting tests at the request of the Workmen's Compensation Board until the end of April and have recently been asked to conduct 300 more.

We have the highest incidence of industrial deafness and the most severe industrial deafness in northern Ontario. Fifty per cent of the industrial deafness cases are coming from the north, from the pulp and paper industry and from the mining industry. Surely, with less than one-seventh of the population in northern Ontario, we should not have 50 per cent of the industrial deaf cases and we shouldn't have the most severe. I'm told we have both; the most severe and 50 per cent.

I have been after the government to introduce some type of programme by which it can do the actual testing because industrial deafness is insidious. The man is the last person to know he is going deaf. He's deaf; no one tells him. He takes all of these tests and I hope the minister is sincere when he says from here on in the men will get the medical information. There should be an annual test, at the very minimum, for deafness.

At the first sign of industrial deafness the man should be advised because it's at that point he makes the determination to stay on the job or get out. If he stays on the job he's doomed to go on to be totally deaf and he gets the magnificent sum of 30 per cent for total deafness—30 per cent of 75 per cent. He's isolated from his family; cut off. Not only that, I'm told by the experts in the field that the effects of industrial deafness on the

nervous system lead to serious heart conditions and a whole host of other problems.

I'm asking you to use your influence on the Workmen's Compensation Board to establish in northern Ontario a testing programme; experimentation to determine what are the side effects of all the exposure, as well as the deafness; the other side effects; the other medical side effects. I'm asking that this be done and done immediately because in the year and a half I've pleaded this issue nothing of any significance really has occurred in that field.

If we've got 50 per cent of the total deafness coming from the pulp and paper industry and from the mining industry—over both of which you have tremendous control—surely we must move in with the types of programmes which will ensure that industrial deafness will be eliminated. I'm told there should not be one person who suffers from industrial deafness; it can all be overcome if we simply set about to do it. In the year and a half I've raised this issue nothing has happened, and I would ask for some answers to these issues. I realize I am dealing with them quickly, but I wanted to get those three very important areas in.

Hon. Mr. Bernier: Mr. Chairman, I just wanted to relate to the initial remarks of the hon. member when he questioned my comments about labour becoming more involved.

Even in my brief time in this ministry, I heard it from union leaders that they are pleased that today they have the expertise within their organization to become involved in the health and safety of mines. And we accept that. I think it is fair to say in some areas they have experts far better than what we have, and in some areas even better than the industry. So more credit to them. What I am saying is that it is a new awareness. Great. It's happened over the last five or 10 years and we welcome it. I must make that point very clear.

The select committee on foreign ownership, as I mentioned earlier, is something that we did look at when we changed our criteria as they relate to summer cottage lots, but they are certainly something that we will be looking at on a continuing basis.

Your comments with regard to surface rights: It's something that I have to agree with you because I have a similar problem in my own particular area of northwestern Ontario. At the present time, of course, these lands are patented lands. They pay taxes, or they pay an acreage tax. And it may be if we go the route of obtaining that for the public then we have to expropriate or purchase them, I don't know.

I am not totally satisfied that the way the structure is set now for a mining company that owns, as in Red Lake—30 mining claims are held there, and they own the surface rights. They are throttling development. You can't buy the land.

The prices—they are holding you to ransom, really, and the town is having extreme difficulties because it can't negotiate with the mining companies. I have asked the committee looking at the Mining Act to look at this particular aspect. There may be some way, or somewhere, that we can work something into the Act, as we amend the Act, whereby they do hold large surface areas, particularly in the urban areas where there is a need in the adjacent municipality, or in that particular municipality.

I'm not worried about away out in the boondocks or the lower James Bay basin, but when it comes in the middle of a community or adjacent to the community I don't think that they should control the surface rights. And we don't give them the surface rights now under the new system. They don't get the surface rights. Mineral rights, yes—no question. If they are looking for minerals and they think there is some value and some potential there, and they are willing to pay us for that, then fine and dandy.

But on the surface rights I have to agree with you 100 per cent, and I hope that the mining committee will come up with some suggestions because I tell you I just won't rest until we find an answer to that particular problem.

You asked for a review on foreign ownership of the forest industry—we'll pull that together and make sure you get a copy of it.

Silicosis in the Sudbury area—as I mentioned to you some time ago I was advised that it was developing to the particular degree to which you say. Obviously the problem is a Workmen's Compensation problem, or one of health. We have been doing surveys and studies in the Inco setup. In fact, I will just read you a comment that the staff has just given me. It says that the Inco underground operations, a screening survey was started to locate and define problem areas. The total environmental survey made use of two personal dust samplers, plus the GCA; direct-reading grammometric sampler.

In addition to this, the underground team also carried noise meters for measuring noise levels, dust sampling equipment, wet and dry

bulb thermometers to check heat stress, and also gas-testing instrumentation for gases such as oxides and nitrogen, ammonia, carbon monoxide, carbon dioxide and oxygen. At surface operations they use a high-volume sampler to get total dust and to measure for silica. They completed noise surveys at all operations on the surface and all areas with noise levels in excess of 90 db(a). They are now designated as such, and the use of hearing protection is mandatory. So that we are moving into the noise aspect and, of course, checking all the time for silica dust.

I'll certainly bring it to the attention of the Minister of Labour (B. Stephenson). If you want to give me the information you have gathered I will make sure that she gets it, because I know that she will be interested. At least I certainly don't want to be around if there is another occurrence similar to what happened in Elliot Lake. No way! We will be most pleased to get the information you have and we want it as quickly as possible.

In regard to the chest studies in Sudbury: The Ministry of Health would have that chest survey. We can check with them too and make sure that it's moving or get you a copy.

In connection with the overtime permits: You suggested that that be funneled down here to Queen's Park, to my own particular office. I really can't accept that. I think we have expertise. We have the experts, the most knowledgeable people in my ministry as it relates to mine safety, now located in Sudbury. They have the knowledge. They are highly qualified and I think there is a certain element of time involved here.

They have all the information available right at Sudbury and I have every confidence in the people we have there to make that decision. But, if there are certain abuses, it may be something that we should be looking at. Because if there are abuses by the companies in demanding these permits for—

Mr. Martel: Ridiculous. It is the demands they make, some of them are so ridiculous.

Hon. Mr. Bernier: We will certainly follow that up. That's a comment that we will really put a watch on.

The connection with the radiation: That's very complex. How much time do I have, Mr. Chairman?

Mr. Chairman: I think you just ran out.

Mr. Bullbrook: Twenty minutes, it's supposed to be.

Hon. Mr. Bernier: Twenty minutes? Well, the working level months is something that we discussed at great length with the group that was down from the United Steelworkers just the other day. I think there were three or four ministers at that particular meeting. That was, I think, a very fruitful discussion and it is my understanding that further discussions are going to be taking place with the mine management, union leaders and my staff in attendance. Some of the problems to which you related we heard at that particular meeting and some of these accusations. They will be completely followed through.

Mr. Bullbrook: I can assure you I want you to stop me when I have got to the five minutes, because I don't want to take issue with the ministry. As a matter of fact, I think I want to congratulate the hon. minister in this respect, that he obviously has been really training his conservation officers. I wish he were in the Attorney General's seat or the Solicitor General's seat. CID could use the investigative talents of your conservation officers. Let me read you from the Sarnia Observer of last week:

> A Ministry of Natural Resources conservation officer Tuesday specifically named coloured boys, Italians and females as being a large part of groups of non-resident hunters causing problems in Moore township. Dale Gartley said by the term 'non resident' he means non-resident of Ontario. He told Moore township council that Michigan residents come over here hunting mainly for squirrel and raccoon. He said most of those hunters are the coloured boys, really. They come over for the meat, not the pelt, he said. The pelt is worth about $20 and is sought by experienced hunters as something of value.
>
> We are not even going to warn these females any more. We used to warn them but they are flagrantly disobeying the law. If all the Italians—

I must say I imagine he says "I"talians I would think—as in "eye." I don't know Dale. I imagine he is one of Lorne's appointees.

> If all the Italians in Windsor cannot get away, they send their friends to get township hunting licences for them.

Mr. Mancini: Isn't that awful?

Mr. Bullbrook: I want to say this to you: There is a combination of Hercule Poirot and Sherlock Holmes. Can you imagine looking at a squirrel—a dead squirrel carcass—and saying, "I know that was killed by a coloured

guy"; or looking at a coon skin and saying, "An Italian got him"?

Mr. Shore: Or a woman.

[9:30]

Mr. Bullbrook: You know, if he killed a frog, you'd wonder if he said, "Maybe a frog got him."

I just wanted to bring to your attention the calibre of people in our area. The dispensation of patronage and largesse leads to almost a Tennessee-like atmosphere. You remember that movie "In the Heat of the Night" with Rod Steiger? This guy Dale Gartley makes that look like Heidi. Perhaps you'd like to look into this fellow, whoever he is Goodness gracious, how disgusting can we be?

Hon. Mr. Bernier: Just to comment briefly on the member's final few words. We'll certainly look into those comments because they're not supported by myself or I think any one in the senior staff. I just want to point out to you that—

Mr. Bullbrook: I know they are not. But you know how you get those people there? Because of the way you make your appointments.

Hon. Mr. Bernier: Wait a minute. That's the point I want to get on.

Mr. Bullbrook: That is the way it is.

Hon. Mr. Bernier: There has never been a political appointment as a conservation officer. Let's get that straight.

Mr. Shore: How about the liquor stores?

Hon. Mr. Bernier: I have nothing to do with liquor stores. You'd better ask the Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations (Mr. Handleman). Our conservation officers are highly trained and carefully selected individuals to do a job.

Mr. Bullbrook: Yes, yes.

Hon. Mr. Bernier: They have a very difficult job. They'v got to apply the Fish and Game Act and we hand-pick them, not for their political affiliation or anything else. I want to make that point. And Lorne Henderson has never made any recommendations to me.

Mr. Bullbrook: I am going to send that now to the Minister of Labour (B. Stephenson). Right now. I am going to send it to the Minister of Labour right now.

Mr. Stokes: Mr. Chairman, I am going to be very brief because of the time constraints. I didn't want to pass up the opportunity to say something about a ministry that I've been keenly interested in over the last eight years, While I'm not going to be partisan in my comments, I think some of the things that the minister mentioned in his opening remarks are subject to challenge or at least clarification.

He did mention in his wide-ranging remarks that his ministry and the fish and wildlife branch were doing all in their power to manage wisely our fish and wildlife resources. He did make a definite commitment about a year ago to allocate $400,000 for moose management. We know the financial constraints that all ministries are under but I think that it is incumbent upon the minister from time to time to explain to members of this House that are keenly interested in all aspects of his ministry as to why he can't keep commitments. We know he hasn't kept the commitment with regard to moose management and the allocation of funds.

All too often when we're dealing with resources, whether they be renewable or non-renewable, the decisions are taken for socio-political reasons rather than for technical reasons. I think that whenever it's impossible for the minister to live up to a commitment that he's already made, it's incumbent upon him to give us an explanation. We don't have to wait for the estimates. I think the House has a responsibility to monitor what goes on in all ministries on an on-going basis and this one is no exception.

He did mention that he had been able to enlist the services of 25 conservation officers, according to his statement on page 41. We know that he hasn't got 25 new conservation officers in the field, whether they be working part-time in the parks branch or whether they be out enforcing the fish and game laws of the province. I know and the minister knows. that he hasn't got 25 new conservation officers in the field. I know there are four vacancies that were created just since the minister made that announcement that haven't been advertised let alone filled. I think it's incumbent upon the minister to come clean and say we haven't met our commitment. I'm sure there are very valid and logical reasons why he hasn't met his commitment and I think we're entitled to know.

The one final area that I want to get into is a commitment made by the minister in 1972, reiterated in 1973 and 1974, concerning reforestation and the silviculture and regeneration programme. I think it is quite ob-

vious that in my conversations with people within the ministry, with people in the industry and with people in the academic world, in the foresty schools, if they are honest at all, they will tell you that we have been mining the forest for far too long and that we can no longer go on paying no regard or heed to the need to regenerate our forest.

It was quite all right when we were only harvesting up to 35 to 40 per cent of our forestry resources. Since we are now getting close to 90 per cent with all of the increased capacity that is on stream, or soon to come on stream, we obviously know that we haven't got the kind of leeway we once had. When the minister trots out the figures that are included in his opening remarks, where he says we have exceeded our target of 150,000 or 160,000 acres tended in 1974-1975, I want to remind the minister that in 1974 we harvested over 400,000 acres. It is his target by the year 1982-1983 to tend and to practise intensive and extensive silvicultural and regeneration practices on something like 290,000 acres. I want to remind him that by those years we could be up to a figure of 600,000 acres that we will be harvesting.

If you are going to allow the prime users to high-grade close to the mills for economic reasons, it's quite obvious that a lot of the areas that should be harvested now will be overmature; the degree of decadence in those areas will be just so great that it won't even be worth their while going into them at all. Using the $8 million that the minister referred to through NORT funds, I think that where it can be justified you are going to have to assist the industry to get into areas much farther away from the mill so that they will cease and desist from the high-grading that they are used to doing close to the mill for economic reasons. I don't think we can allow that to happen any more.

We have to husband those resources. We have to manage them, in much the same way as the minister referred to, as a crop, an agricultural crop. There isn't a farmer anyplace who is worth his salt who says we will only harvest 50 per cent of a grain field, a corn field or any kind of agricultural crop. We've got so little leeway in the forest industry now, with the volumes of timber that have already been committed and spoken for, that you are going to have to manage those resources in a much more realistic way.

I realize the financial constraints that all ministries, including this one, are under. But I think it's a case that we just can't afford not to do the things that we all agree must be done. So when the minister speaks of a target of 296,000 acres by the year 1982-1983, I don't think it's enough and I am sure there are a good many people in the industry and a good many people within your ministry who think it's not enough. If you want some assistance going before Management Board to justify greater expenditure of funds in this area, that's what must be done.

I think the minister is on the right track. I won't say that it is too little, too late, but we just don't have much lead time and I think that we need additional funds to meet the targets that you and I know are staring us in the face. I don't think we've got 20 or 30 years; I think we must start right now.

Hon. Mr. Bernier: Mr. Chairman, if I could just respond briefly. In connection with the moose management budget of last year, we indicated at that particular time it would be around $400,000 and, as the member correctly points out, because of budgetary constraints and cutbacks we were cut back to $126,000. This did get the moose management off the ground.

We established the basis for further management this year. I'm not going to indicate what we've got in the budget next year in case something happens between now and then. You learn from experience, I guess; I was so enthusiastic about the acceptance by my colleagues. I can assure you that it's something we have in the budget for next year but I just don't want to mention the amount at the present time. This is for the 1976-1977 year.

I'm looking forward to the results of our studies this year, the first year of operation. I think they are going to be very interesting because we've gone to smaller management units. We have four regional moose biologists now stationed in the four regions of northern Ontario which we never had before. We've got that in place and it's moving ahead.

In connection with the COs, I mentioned we had been given permission to increase our staff which will result in an increase of 25 conservation officers by the end of this fiscal year which is March 31, 1976. We have 16 more conservation officers than we had at this time last year. We have applications; we have openings for nine more.

Getting back to the member for Sarnia (Mr. Bullbrook), one of the reasons we are slow in picking up this extra staff is the quality and the calibre of the individuals

we're looking for to be conservation officers. We're not taking the middle of the run or, as the member pointed out, political hacks. We're not interested. We want good people who want to make a career in this particular field, in resource management and enforcement of the Game and Fish Act. We are moving ahead and we will have the full complement in place by the end of March next year.

Mr. Martel: What about Havrot?

Mr. Laughren: What about Havrot?

Mr. Martel: Havrot would make a good conservation officer for you.

Mr. Reed: It is a privilege to be able to address this ministry inasmuch as the particular situation in my riding, which is located near a large metropolitan area and is directly affected by the Ministry of Natural Resources, is nonetheless affected in a very different way from the bulk of this great province.

Most of the authority of the ministry is authority over private freehold land, private property, and I would like to address that situation for just a moment. We are finding that the owners of private property who are affected by the Ministry of Natural Resources have come under increasing levels of regulation in recent years.

We realize that the regulation is made with the very best of intent because in each case the ministry is trying to achieve something in particular. But we're finding that very little regard is being paid to the integrity and the conscience of the individual landowners who come under your jurisdiction.

I'll use only one brief example for the sake of saving time and that is on the regulations imposed by the conservation authorities. I think you should be aware that those regulations are so strictly enforced that in conservation-administered valleys and rivers in my riding a farmer can't even put in a fencepost without a permit from the conservation authority. I would like to ask your ministry to look very seriously at the kinds of regulations you impose upon private landowners with some kind of thought being given to the fact that they are responsible citizens, too.

For a point of clarification, I expect that operation SWEEP comes under your particular jurisdictin. Is that correct, sir?

Hon. Mr. Bernier: Yes.

[9:45]

Mr. Reed: I would, in passing, like to mention this organization and commend your ministry for setting up SWEEP. I do feel it has been a very effective thing in our area where we have a lot of refuse that's dumped into rivers and down banks and so on. I can say from personal experience that they were a very conscientious group of young people who worked hard and earned all their money.

One thing that I had some reservations about was the fact that in the particular case to which I'm referring the young people connected with SWEEP came in and cleaned out an area of the Credit River. In the space of half a mile, they removed 100 automobile and truck tires. It took them four days to get them out. I asked the foreman of the project if they knew where the tires had come from. It was indicated to me that they did know where they had come from. I said, "Can this be prosecuted?" They had gone to the conservation authority and asked them and were advised that the kind of teeth that were in the law were not strong enough to effect a conviction. I would say in this regard that I would like the ministry to give some consideration to the kind of laws that are applied to this type of pollution.

Your ministry is responsible for water control and engineering. For your information it is of rather great concern to me that in some areas your engineering staffs are advocating types of water management in terms of flood control and so on that really are not suitable to the given rivers. I will refer specifically to a programme of channelization which is being advocated on the Credit River which runs through my riding. Coupled with that is the advocating of the removal of the existing dams. In this particular area, this land is being paved over very rapidly. What we have is a watershed that is shedding its water far more quickly than in the past.

We know that the programme of channelization simply encourages the collection of ice. What we're getting with the removal of the dams and the channelization are ice jams that we've never had before. When the ice jam breaks sometimes the water will rise 6 ft in half an hour. I submit to you that this situation will become more and more acute as the watershed is paved over to a greater extent.

The ministry has made a statement about the necessity to encourage the use of renewable resources in terms of the forest industry. May I suggest to you that there is another area of renewable resource which your same ministry is discouraging and that is the private utilization of small water

powers in Ontario. It's too bad that the Minister of Energy (Mr. Timbrell), the Minister of the Environment (Mr. Kerr) and the Minister of Agriculture and Food (Mr. W. Newman) weren't sitting there beside you so that you could put your heads together.

We have had a little bit of experience in this regard, and have discovered that your ministry with its present approach to conservation seems to consider that the damming of rivers in however small a way is not a positive thing. We would submit in this age of increasing demand for energy resources that you give some consideration to changing your stance from one of discouragement to one of encouragement for these small developments. I have spoken with the Minister of Energy on this subject and his reaction has not been negative in the least. I would now present you with the same proposition that perhaps your ministry could now take a changed and more realistic position when it comes to the utilization of this non-polluting and renewable resource.

I would also like to point out to the minister that it has been brought to my attention that recently aggregates which are mined in Ontario have been exported out of the country to a certain extent and I am not sure how large it is to this time. I am in the midst of trying to determine just what the degree of export has been and whether it is continuing at this time, but the information given to me is that the export either has been or is taking place from the area of the Niagara Escarpment.

Finally, I would ask the minister if he would direct his people in the field to recognize that those private landowners who come under his jurisdiction are responsible individuals and were very often practising conservation in the truest sense, sometimes for generations, before governments became involved in the necessary practice of preserving our environment and our resources. It's particularly critical in my riding and I know it's only a small portion of the large area the minister has to contend with.

I thank you very much for listening to me at this time.

Hon. Mr. Bernier: Mr. Chairman, to comment briefly, I am sorry I didn't bring it to the attention of the House when you were speaking, but an area with which you have been particularly concerned has been the land problem of the Big Trout Lake Indian band. I think you are aware that the order in council has been passed by the Lieutenant Governor, whereby additional lands would be given to the Big Trout Lake Indian reserve to meet the economic and social needs of that particular band.

I think we made it clear in the order in council, as will the federal government in its order, I hope, that this is not necessarily an opening up of the treaty. It should not be considered a precedent because other areas will have similar problems and we don't want to be involved in that particular problem which brings in the federal government.

The problems as they relate to Sachigo, Bearskin, Rat Dam, Wonaman, Kasabonika, Anglin and Kingfisher have now been resolved. Hopefully, we will see a whole new form of municipal or reserve government spring up and a new chief on each one of them. I am sure the chairman and I will be in that area to congratulate those who have been elected by their respective communities.

It's indeed a pleasure for me to have been involved; there were long, complex, tedious discussions not only with the native people but with the federal government. Now that they are resolved we can go on to other areas which have similar problems.

In answer to the member for Halton-Burlington (Mr. Reed), I am very much aware of the landfill regulations and the problems they are imposing—at least the conservation authorities are. Maybe problem is not the correct word because they are doing their job in protecting the public at large and controlling development in the flood plain areas. We are moving into a very broad mapping programme for the flood plains to see if the criteria we are using today is correct. In some areas we use the hurricane flood and in some areas it is a 25-year flood; in other areas we refer to the 100-year flood or the Timmins flood. This is something that we are going into now to find out if that particular criterion is the one we should be using at this point in time.

It is an area that is high on our priority list and an area that we will be looking at very carefully. But we must respect the tremendous job the conservation authorities have done in the past. They have been given a mandate to protect the public at large and they have done it exceptionally well. I think they have a lot of credit coming their way; but I do recognize the problems you bring forward.

In connection with the SWEEP programme—that is, Students Working in an Environmental Enhancement Programme—we have changed the name. We now call it Experience '75 and next year it will be Experience '76. I appreciate your comments because I share your views of this group of young

people who are environmentally aware and environmentally conscious of our outdoors. They have done a tremendous job. I think it is one of the best government programmes we have today—along with our Junior Ranger programme. Those kind words of congratulations and thanks are sincerely appreciated.

You mentioned the problem of development of small power sites on certain channels. I have not been made aware of any that we have turned down. We have a responsibility, of course, to make sure that the fish habitat is maintained, that water quality is maintained and that flow is maintained. But certainly we would look favourably, if all criteria could be met and no real consequence extended, at the granting of leases for the generation of electrical power. So if you have any specific sites you would like me to look at, I would be only too pleased to hear from you.

There was the question of export of aggregate; we don't consider this a major problem. In fact, off the top of my head I would estimate, and it is just an estimate, that it is only five to 10 per cent of the total production. In fact in many areas we import a lot of the rip-rap for diking from the United States. So there is an exchange, and in our opinion what is moving over there is certainly not a big item in the overall production of aggregate in the southern part of the province.

Mr. Reed: Are you saying then, Mr. Minister, that there is material coming back in?

Hon. Mr. Bernier: Very much so.

Mr. Reed: So there is a transfer back in.

Hon. Mr. Bernier: Yes, it goes both ways.

Mr. Chairman: The hon. member for Nickel Belt.

Mr. Laughren: Thank you Mr. Chairman. I must say that I am really surprised we are still debating with the same Minister of Natural Resources. I was convinced that when the cabinet shuffle occurred he would become the Provincial Secretary for Resources Development. I really mean it, I did not think that this minister would remain in the cabinet in this particular position.

I think the events of the last few years are ample proof that he should not be in that portfolio. With what has happened in the mining industry, with the safety and health problems, and with the return on non-renewable resources, he indeed shouldn't be sitting in his chair. However, he is there and we will deal with him as best we can.

I think, Mr. Chairman, that those of us in the New Democratic Party feel almost passionately about the subject of non-renewable resources. It is not just ideological thinking either, although that certainly is a part of it. It is the nature of the non-renewable resource industry in this province, and the way the industry is so totally dominated by the multi-nationals. One does not have to have a conspiratorial mind or to be paranoid about multi-nationals to know that the ore bodies and the people—in the Sudbury basin, for example—truly are pawns in a multi-national resource game. It is not in the best interests of the people in the area or the people in the Province of Ontario that this be allowed to continue. And lest anyone have any doubts as to the priorities of the people who run Falconbridge, I would recommend to them a book called, "Falconbridge: Portrait of a Canadian Mining Multinational", written by John Deverell of the Latin American Working Group.

[10:00]

If I could, I would like to read a very brief paragraph that shows the priorities of the people who run Falconbridge, namely Mr. Marsh Cooper, the president. I quote:

> The insider trading report of the Ontario Securities Commission shows that Marsh Cooper purchased 30,000 treasury shares of McIntyre at a stock option cost of $83.25 per share in January, 1970. Seven months later he sold 16,000 shares at a market price of $160 per share—enough to recapture his original outlay, with $63,000 to spare. The 14,000 shares remaining to him clear and free had a market value of $2.2 million at that time.

Marsh Cooper's interests are with Marsh Cooper and certainly not with the workers or the people in the Sudbury basin, let alone the balance of the Province of Ontario.

Part of the problem is the inability of this government, and quite frankly any other government, to tax the resource industry properly. We know, and the minister surely must know, that if taxes are laid on the resource sector, what will happen to the ore bodies. The corporations, by the very fact of their existence, must maximize their profits. If they are maximizing their profits and the taxes are high on their operations, they simply must extract a grade of ore that makes their operation profitable. If that means they bypass the low-grade ores and

take out the high-grade ores, who could argue with them? They simply must do it, according to the rules of the free enterprise system.

As well, we know that the resource corporations have extensive developments elsewhere and they are exploring elsewhere. As a matter of fact, at the very time that Falconbridge is laying off in the Sudbury area, they are expanding their operations in Norway and in the Dominican Republic. At the same time that the market analysts are saying there is going to be a six per cent growth in the steel industry and in the nickel industry in the foreseeable future, and at the same time International Nickel is working its men overtime, seven days a week in some cases, Falconbridge is laying off.

So it is not a question of the ore bodies. It's not a question of Falconbridge's share of the market when the two of them share 60 per cent of the market between them. It's a question of what role the Sudbury ore bodies play in Falconbridge's intentions around the world. As long as they remain in the private sector, that's the way it is going to be.

When we look around the Sudbury area we see that there hasn't been the manufacturing going on that should have gone on, considering the amount of resources that are there. I have to say that I am insulted when I see Falconbridge still shipping ore to Norway for refining. Smelting is the dirty part of their job; refining is the clean part. Guess what they do in the Sudbury basin? Smelting only. Surely the time has come when that has got to stop. But no, they are granted exemptions and now they are playing a game of bluff and blackmail; they say profits are down and the minister must reconsider the amount of taxes the resource sector pays.

I would suggest that we've had about enough of boom, bust and uncertainty in the Sudbury area. There's one big reason the regional municipality of Sudbury has reached a maximum on its borrowing capacity according to the ceilings laid down by the Ontario Municipal Board; it's because, of course, the resource sector never has paid its share of assessment in the Sudbury area. That's another reason it must change.

At the present time, Falconbridge is in the process of laying off 438 workers in phase one. There is a phase two, we suspect, and that probably will involve about the same number of men again. Yet when we raise it with the Premier (Mr. Davis) and with the Minister of Labour (Hon. B. Stephenson) they use a clause in the Employment Standards Act to say that because the number laid off doesn't represent 10 per cent of the work force, they don't even have to give notice to the minister.

Because they just happen to be a large employer, they are allowed to get away with it. That layoff is having an enormous impact on the Sudbury basin, and this government isn't doing anything about it.

Mr. Warner: They are negligent.

Mr. Laughren: The government will allow that layoff again. There will be phase two of the layoff and you will sit back smugly and say: "That's the way the free enterprise system works. Let it carry on as it will."

We asked a couple of weeks ago, when the layoff was announced, that a number of things be done: That the Premier appoint a select committee to look into the layoff and the other intentions of the resource industry in the Sudbury area. I won't repeat the points that we asked be covered in dealing with the Falconbridge layoff, but I will tell you about the four points we think need to be investigated about the resource sector itself.

No. 1; obtain from Inco and Falconbridge their long term plans for the extraction and processing of ores in the Sudbury area with special emphasis on reserves.

No. 2; investigate the exploration, development and processing plans of Inco and Falconbridge elsewhere in the world. The public has a right to know why Falconbridge is expanding in Norway and the Dominican Republic and laying off workers in Sudbury.

Mr. Martel: The Minister of Labour might be interested, yes.

Mr. Laughren: The market analysts predict an annual growth rate of six per cent of both nickel and steel. Why a Falconbridge layoff at this time?

No. 3; examine the world market demands and supply of nickel and copper to determine market share and the relationship of Inco and Falconbridge in the sharing of markets and the determination of prices.

No. 4; determine the level of stockpiled reserves held by Inco and Falconbridge and the role that stockpiles play in contract negotiations and the pricing of nickel.

As an aside, does the minister really think that was good-faith bargaining that went on between Falconbridge Nickel Mines and the Mine-Mill union; laying off the same week that the contract is settled?

Mr. Warner: He knows it wasn't.

Mr. Laughren: Finally, to determine the effect of rate of taxation of the resource corporations and the relationship between taxes levied and the extraction of low grade ores.

As the years go by and we see the cavalier attitude of the resource sector again and again, whether it has to do with the economy of the community or whether it has to do with the health and safety of the workers, the inescapable fact keeps coming back to us that there is only one answer for the non-renewable resources in this province and that's that they be brought under public ownership.

Mr. Martel: It will come.

Mr. Laughren: Perhaps you could tell us, through you, Mr. Chairman, to the minister, just what it is that makes the resource sector untouchable by this minister or any other minister of the Crown. Tell us that it's not just a free enterprise fixation by this minister. I would like to know what it is.

When I read that statement and the comment in the minister's opening statement when he indicated, on page 20, that: "Our emphasis cannot be on negative regulation by external agencies." What an incredible comment that is. Perhaps the minister could indicate to us what the negative regulations are and by what external agencies. It is like Allan Grossman's face in the crowd, for heaven's sake. What does he mean, "negative regulations by external agencies"? What a lot of nonsense. Whatever it is, it is unadulterated.

I would like to indicate the kind of contempt I have for a ministry of this type. In 1969, an inspector of this ministry could go into the Reeves mine, which just happens to be an asbestos mine run by Johns-Manville—if ever there was a corporation with the morals of a clam, it's the Johns-Manville Co. In 1969 an inspector from this ministry went in there and inspected the mill and the mine and came out with four very specific recommendations, all based on the dust conditions of the mine. I won't take the time of the House to read them tonight. But again, three years later, the same man—and this report went to the Ministry of Health—three years later, in 1972, the same inspector, a Mr. Lockhart whom I just happened to know, went into the mine. In his letter, which went to the chief engineer for Northern Ontario, he says:

> This plant has about a year to go. If we are going to insist on changes, then there should be some uncontestable grounds for doing so.

That's after he made the comment that:

> In general, the dust conditions are much worse than found on the previous occasion, three years earlier. The housekeeping throughout the mill and crusher buildings were considered to be extremely poor, especially the fourth floor of the mill building where the dust on the floor was ankle deep.

Asbestos ankle deep! With the threshold limit value of two fibres per cubic centimetre, a worker can inhale 16 million fibres in an eight hour shift; and the inspector can say that the dust is ankle deep, but if anything is done about it it must be on uncontestable grounds because there is only another year to go in the operation of the mine.

Mr. Chairman, I must tell you that's the reason I have contempt for this ministry. Let me give you the conclusion of that report:

> No improvement in the dust conditions have been made since my last visit, which was in 1969. In fact, the conditions have become worse.
>
> There appeared to be no concern among the company's officials about the deteriorating dust conditions. This was pretty obvious in the poor maintenance of the exhaust systems. It is my feeling that if the condition is allowed to continue it would not be too long before a case of asbestos disease would develop. [Listen to this, Mr. Chairman.] However, there is a big turnover of the employees in the mill building and this may help to limit the individual asbestos exposure.

Mr. Martel: Imagine that.

Mr. Laughren: And to think that I said that Johns-Manville had the morals of a claim. I ask you, Mr. Chairman, to look to your ministry when you have those kinds of statements coming from the inspectors of your ministry. That was in 1972.

In 1974, in a confidential document to the ministry by an industrial hygiene laboratory, the dust counts in the mill, with a threshold limit value of 2, were as high as 225. And the average dust count in the whole mill was 14.7. That was in the fall of 1974. In the spring of 1975 the mill closed.

Mr. Martel: Were you the Minister of Mines then?

Mr. Laughren: I want to tell you something, Mr. Chairman, that is just one of the reasons we have no confidence whatsoever in this ministry or this minister, because in the intervening years, 1969 to 1975, asbestos plants were actually closed in the United States because of the dust problem. So nobody was paying any attention to what was going on in other parts of North America, let alone in our own jurisdiction.

In summary, I don't want to take up too much time, I would say that for the following reasons: The fact the resources are nonrenewable; the fact there is a lack of a secondary industry established by the resource corporations; the fact the resource corporations such as Falconbridge in particular have failed to refine their resources here; the fact there is a boom-and-bust mentality and economic activity on the part of the resource corporations; the fact there is an inability to tax them properly; the fact they have such holdings elsewhere they can manipulate the exploitation of the resources to their own benefit; the fact they have an ability to stockpile and sell the ores at a later date to their own profit, despite what contract negotiations might be going on; the fact the nature of the industry is all oligopolistic; the fact the industry has paid little heed to the safety and the health of the miners; the fact those resources are ours, not yours and not theirs; and the fact all this evidence continues to mount, Mr. Chairman —that is why we say that we're not just concerned with the economics of the resource industry, we are concerned because that's our heritage and that's our future, and the minister and the private sector have no right to take that from us.

Mr. Chairman: The name I have on my list is that of the member for Renfrew North.

Mr. Bain: Here he comes.

Mr. Davison: He is hurrying to his desk.

Mr. Martel: Mr. Minister aren't you going to respond?

Mr. Warner: No response from the minister.

Mr. Martel: Manville's your friend.

Mr. Conway: My apologies. I had anticipated a response to that speech.

Mr. Bain: So did everybody else.

Mr. Warner: We all did.

Mr. Conway: My remarks, Mr. Chairman, shall be brief. I would like to begin by congratulating my counterpart in Renfrew South (Mr. Yakabuski) who unfortunately is not with us at the present time. He was recently appointed as parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Natural Resources.

Mr. Mancini: He was the only one left.

Mr. Conway: I might say I wish him well in that. He certainly comes from an area that should provide him with an environment to be of very constructive help to the minister. So I would begin my remarks, certainly, with that congratulatory note.

I was also impressed by some of the comments in the minister's opening remarks, which I regret to say by their very length seemed more of a filibuster than an opening statement, given the shortage of time.

[10:15]

An hon. member: Here he comes, Sean.

Mr. Conway: One of the people to whom attention was drawn in the earlier remarks was Frank MacDougall, to whom those of us who have grown up in the area of Algonquin Park owe a great deal. I certainly share in the minister's sentiments as expressed in his opening remarks. Frank MacDougall certainly was a man of considerable pioneering skill who brought to Lands and Forests then, and Natural Resources later, the kind of spirit and the kind of pioneering attitude from which I think we have all profited.

In the remarks made by the minister, there was a certain contention, brought out later by one of our members, as to the information. I wanted at that time to draw attention to one thing that I think has not been said thus far, and that is the matter of the annual report of the ministry. I may be in error here. I do not think, however, that I am; and that is, as I understand it, the annual report of the Ministry of Natural Resources this year was planned as a shorter document, so we're told, than in past years—if I can believe it, becaust the last one issued was certainly a rather concise document. But we were promised, as I understand it, a shorter annual report this year because of the fact that it was to be offered sooner.

My information now is that the annual report of the Ministry of Natural Resources is now about 6½ months overdue. This is the kind of thing that's very unfortunate, because we're brought in here tonight to discuss the estimates of Natural Resources and it seems to me that it would certainly

be very helpful if we were presented with an annual report. There is much to regret if, in fact, the annual report is ready only to be released when the estimates are completed.

Mr. Haggerty: The ink isn't dry yet, is it Leo?

Mr. Conway: It was said also, and I concur in this, that the annual report as it is traditionally presented is very inadequate. Last Saturday, I met in Pembroke with a group of professional foresters from the Algonquin region of the Canadian Institute of Forestry. I asked them for their general comments about the Ministry of Natural Resources, and I asked them what it was they would like me to say and what they would say to the minister if they were presented with the opportunity. One of the complaints that they all had was with the annual report.

They didn't use the word useless, but that certainly came out in some of their deliberations. The fact is that they find the material or the lack thereof simply very difficult to understand. They find that the ministry is presenting them with the kinds of information which are almost routine, and the facts they want as foresters and the facts I would certainly like to bring to bear to a discussion of this nature are simply not there. So I think the ministry should certainly be urged to present a more factually responsible annual report.

One thing that came out in the minister's statement to which I would like to draw some attention, relates to the area of conservation authorities. It was with some interest that I noticed the minister's statement, beginning on page 27 and running through the subsequent pages, that the ministry and the minister felt a certain degree of comfort with the progress made in the area of conservation and particularly in water management. I thought that was rather interesting in the light of a report which I read in the Toronto Globe and Mail on Nov. 22 of this year. If I might be allowed to read the first two paragraphs of this article, from the Globe and Mail of Nov. 22 of this year:

> Ontario's 33 conservation authorities have asked the government for a policy decision on their future role in water management, land acquisition and a variety of other things. The authorities have complained to the provincial procedures committee that they have been faced with inconsistent decisions and interpretations from the Ministry of Natural Resources.
>
> The agencies told the committee they feel they are working in an administrative nightmare. No one understands provincial budgetary forms, statistical reports from the ministry yield little useful information and there appears to be a lack of communication between sections of the ministry.

I find it a rather contradictory set of circumstances that we should be presented with this report with a feeling from the ministry that there is a certain degree of progress—in fact more than a little progress—being made on the one hand, while and on the other hand we have all 33 conservation authorities saying they are working in an administrative nightmare. Clearly those people involved do not share the minister's feeling of accomplishment here.

My area of particular concern relates to the Algonquin region, particularly the Algonquin Park situation. One of the things we face for the first time is an institution and an agency known as the Algonquin Forest Authority. Independent of how I may feel about the Algonquin Forest Authority, I think it important for me at this point in time to transmit some of the growing concern that foresters and forest people in my area have about the AFA. There is, I might say, a deep-seated suspicion about it. Whether or not it's a justified one we shall see with the passage of time.

The suspicion I sense is that lumber people, both labour and management, are concerned that we have here yet another government-run and government-sponsored marketing agency. If we have learned anything in the past number of months, both from provincial and federal experience, it seems to be that very often government-run marketing agencies create more problems than they solve.

In particular, I am concerned that the Ministry of Natural Resources, and in fact the government of the day, in a sincere effort—and I'm willing to concede this—to redirect resource policy development and programmes in a very contentious area of Ontario have failed seriously in one area. They appointed an Algonquin Forest Authority and they appointed to the board of that agency in my area of Renfrew county two members—and we received only two members on the eight or 10 man board of directors—whose political profile is of such a kind that it discredits, in the eyes of many, the Algonquin Forest Authority. The two men who were appointed to the Algonquin Forest Authority from Renfrew county are two very high profile Pro-

gressive Conservatives. It concerns me. Someone mentioned earlier today a very interesting book by Prof. H. V. Nelles, a book which those of us in the resource area might profitably read. It's called "Politics of Development: Forests, Mines, and Hydro-Electric Power in Ontario in the Past 100 Years." The Nelles thesis is that the government has been far too political in the resource sector I can certainly say that is so, as someone who has grown up in the area of Algonquin Park. I am not ashamed to admit, as someone who has relatives very actively involved in the forest industries, they are relatives who, I might add, share not only the political affiliations of my party but of the government of the day.

Mr. Bain: Aren't you ashamed of that? You shouldn't admit that.

Mr. Conway: I might say what has happened here is that the effort of the ministry to take the pork-barrel aspect away, if this can possibly be done, from resource development in Algonquin Park, has been defeated. When you appoint two people of such a kind to something like the Algonquin Forest Authority, you simply remind people who deal with the ministry and with the Algonquin Forest Authority—what else is new? What has changed? Nothing. And I regret that. I think that the Algonquin Forest Authority might have been given more of a chance.

I wish it well but, given the politicization of those appointments, it will succeed less quickly than it might otherwise have done.

Mr. Haggerty: They had John Robarts at one time as head.

Mr. Philip: Enough of that.

Mr. Conway: The question of cottages in Algonquin Park is one I would also like to draw attention to. I'm not sure the Minister of Natural Resources is aware of the fact that given the pattern of dissolution of the present lease-hold arrangement – whereby cottagers are allowed to lease cottages in Algonquin Park—given the pattern that we seem to be facing, it may very well be that in the last years of cottage leases in Algonquin Park we will have by far and away a majority of non-residents in a position of holding leases. I think that's something that the ministry might direct its attention toward.

I see the time is running out but there is one point that I'd like to raise. It deals with timber licensing and the collection of timber dues from the various timber producers. I would end my remarks very briefly tonight with a question to the minister: Does the Ministry of Natural Resources entertain and exercise a series of exceptions—

Mr. Mancini: He definitely entertains.

Mr. Conway: —to the Crown Timber Act, such that certain timber operators might for a variety of reasons be allowed an exemption? So that they be allowed not to pay their stumpage dues? Is there a set of exceptions to the regulations in your ministry such that a timber operator might not pay his stumpage dues for whatever reason?

Hon. Mr. Irvine moved the committee rise and report.

Motion agreed to.

The House resumed, Mr. Speaker in the chair.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Speaker, the committee of supply begs to report progress and asks for leave to sit again.

Report agreed to.

Hon. Mr. Irvine: Mr. Speaker, before moving the adjournment of the House I'd like to remind the members that tomorrow we continue with the debate on the Throne Speech.

Hon. Mr. Irvine moved the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to.

The House adjourned at 10:30 p.m.

CONTENTS

Thursday, November 27, 1975

Estimates, Ministry of Natural Resources, Mr. Bernier, continued 1037

Motion to adjourn, Mr. Irvine, agreed to 1063

SPEAKERS IN THIS ISSUE

Bain, R. (Timiskaming NDP)
Bernier, Hon. L. Natural Resources (Kenora PC)
Bullbrook, J. E. (Sarnia L)
Conway, S. (Renfrew North L)
Davison, M. (Hamilton Centre NDP)
Ferrier, W. (Cochrane South NDP)
Germa, M. C. (Sudbury NDP)
Haggerty, R. (Ernie L)
Henderson, Hon. L. C. Minister without Portfolio (Lambton PC)
Irvine, Hon. D. R. Provincial Secretary for Resources Development (Carleton-Grenville PC)
Laughren, F. (Nickel Belt NDP)
MacDonald, D. C. (York South NDP)
Mancini, R. (Essex South L)
Martel, E. W. (Sudbury East NDP)
Moffatt, D. (Durham East NDP)
Philip, E. (Etobicoke NDP)
Reed, J. (Halton-Burlington L)
Reid, T. P. (Rainy River L)
Shore, M. (London North L)
Stokes, J. E. (Lake Nipigon NDP)
Warner, D. (Scarborough-Ellesmere NDP)

No. 27



Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT — DAILY EDITION

First Session of the Thirtieth Legislature

Friday, November 28, 1975

Speaker: Honourable Russell Daniel Rowe
Clerk: Roderick Lewis, QC

THE QUEEN'S PRINTER
PARLIAMENT BUILDINGS, TORONTO
1975

10

CONTENTS

A list of the speakers taking part in the debates in this issue of Hansard appears, in alphabetical order, at the back of this issue.

Daily contents of proceedings also appears at the back of this issue. Reference to a cumulative index of previous issues can be obtained by calling the Hansard Reporting Service indexing staff. Phone 965-2159.

Hansard subscription price is $15.00 per session, from: Sessional Subscription Service, MGS, 9th Floor, Ferguson Block, Parliament Bldgs., Toronto, M7A 1N3. Phone 965-2238.

LEGISLATURE OF ONTARIO

FRIDAY, NOVEMBER 28, 1975

The House met at 10 a.m.

Prayers.

ST. ANDREW'S DAY

Mr. Grossman: In carrying on the tradition of this House, I would as the member for St. Andrew-St. Patrick draw to the attention of this House that this coming Sunday is St. Andrew's Day. I am informed that at this stage there are more than two million people in Canada who are Scots by birth or descent.

That would, of course, include the hon. member for Wentworth (Mr. Deans), who cautioned this House some two years ago on this occasion that haggis, which is one of those foods feasted upon on this day, was at the point of going out of existence and becoming extinct. Perhaps he can let us know whether that has occurred.

In any event I am happy to say that I have certainly done my part. I've named my two sons Robbie Brett and Jamie Andrew. I'd hoped today to help commemorate the day by sending each of the members of this House a small piece of the Minister of Health's sports jacket but he escaped my grasp.

I should point out that yesterday the British government published a white paper outlining its plans for the establishment of a Scottish assembly that will have approximately the same powers, responsibilities and decorum as this Legislature. This is being done in response to nationalist sentiment in Scotland and will mark the return of a form of direct representation to those people.

Mr. Lewis: What do you mean by "those people"?

Mr. Speaker: Statements by the ministry.

Oral questions,

Mr. Lewis: Such a lavish cabinet turnout this morning.

Mr. Nixon: They are not much for staying.

Mr. Deans: Would you say something nice about Scotland please.

Mr. Lewis: Could I say something nice about Scotland?

Mr. Deans: Yes, please.

Mr. Lewis: By all means.

Mr. Deans: I said pretty nice things last week.

HEALTH OF STELCO COKE OVEN WORKERS

Mr. Lewis: May I ask the Minister of Labour, has she concerned herself with the question of coke oven exposures in Hamilton and the Soo in particular, with the various applications which are before the Workmen's Compensation Board now, and the procedures for safeguarding the exposure which the workers have experienced over the last little while?

Hon. B. Stephenson: I can tell the hon. Leader of the Opposition that I have been attempting to learn as much as possible from the literature which is available regarding coke oven exposure, and about the hazards to which the workers are subjected. I have some very real concern about this, as he knows. I feel that this is one of the areas in which the new occupational health advisory committee is probably going to be of great help to the ministries involved in the occupational health accord within this government. I can assure him that this is one of the areas in which I have deep interest and which I shall continue to explore and to be of as much assistance as possible.

Mr. Lewis: By way of supplementary, did the minister know that the occupational health branch of the Ministry of Health had apparently contracted out to the Ontario Research Foundation, a project for a major survey of the levels of emission and the extent of exposure, and was that done with her knowledge or the collaboration of her ministry?

Hon. B. Stephenson: I am sure, as a matter of fact, that this was contracted out before the accord was developed and before the occupational health advisory committee

was appointed. This was one of the areas of concern of the Ministry of Health, and I think very wisely, they began to explore this before there was any totally co-ordinated effort developed on an interministerial basis within the government. I have not seen that report; but I did know that it had been done.

Mr. Lewis: Further supplementary or related question: Has the minister concerned herself with the processing of Workmen's Compensation claims from Stelco, in particular, for requests to receive widows' pensions in the case of workers who have died and from others who are presently stricken? Has she concerned herself with the processing of claims that arose out of the Johns-Manville situation in Scarborough as well?

Hon. B. Stephenson: We have asked for a report from the Workmen's Compensation Board regarding the length of time required, the mechanism of processing and the results of the processing of those specific areas.

Mr. Lewis: Does the minister intend to be present when the Workmen's Compensation Board comes before the committee of the Legislature for, I think, a full day of scrutiny or more than one day?

Hon. B. Stephenson: It was my suggestion, as a matter of fact, that one extra day of the committee of estimates be devoted to examination of the function of the Workmen's Compensation Board, although it is not in fact required under the estimates.

Mr. Deans: Your suggestion? When did the minister make that suggestion?

Hon. B. Stephenson: Early on in the course of the estimates committee function.

Mr. Lewis: What does the minister mean by it is not required?

Mr. Deans: It is required by the Act.

Mr. Lewis: What is she talking about?

Hon. B. Stephenson: However, because of the concern and the interest of members of this House in the function and the results developed by the Workmen's Compensation Board, we felt it would be well to allow the members—

Mr. Lewis: They are required to be before the House.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Hon. B. Stephenson: They came before the House earlier this year and it was not in fact required that they come before the House again.

Mr. Renwick: Not during this parliament.

Mr. Lewis: Not during these estimates.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Interjections.

Hon. B. Stephenson: On Wednesday, Dec. 3, the entire day will be given over to an examination of the Workmen's Compensation Board in the estimates committee. I shall be there all day.

Mr. Laughren: Supplementary: Is the minister aware that the estimates committee requested that more than one day, if necessary, be granted for hearings with the Workmen's Compensation Board? As a matter of fact, I think the minister was there when that request was made.

Hon. B. Stephenson: During the course of the estimates debate this question was raised, and the chairman and I both acknowledged that we were going to spend one day with the Workmen's Compensation Board.

Mr. Speaker: Further questions?

Mr. Laughren: A final supplementary, Mr. Speaker: That is not correct; it was agreed—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I think there have been many questions on this particular point and now it's becoming a debate. Did the hon. Leader of the Opposition have further questions?

AID TO THIRD WORLD

Mr. Lewis: May I ask the Minister of Agriculture and Food, following on a question which was put to him by the leader of the Liberal Party yesterday, can he report on the international perambulations of Dick Hilliard and what he achieved?

Hon. W. Newman: Mr. Speaker, I believe that question more properly should be directed to the Premier this morning.

Mr. Reid: What is this, the Howdy Doody show?

Mr. Lewis: Now that we have the hierarchy sorted out around here—it's sometimes uncertain—can the Premier tell us what Dick Hilliard did, perhaps how much it cost and what follows upon it?

Hon. Mr. Davis: No, I can't, but I'm in the process. Mr. Hilliard's report apparently is due at the end of December. He has been working very diligently on the request that was made of him by the government to look into the proposals that have come from a number of groups, which I'm sure are familiar to the members who were here prior to the last election—and perhaps they've been in touch with some of the new members as well about the question of assistance in terms basically of food or agricultural produce.

Mr. Hilliard has recommended two programmes and I think they have been approved. In fact, I think one was approved yesterday. The minister has some of the details, but it involves the supply—through the Canadian Hunger Foundation, to a total of $150,000 value—of 250 heifers to the Punjab and 80 to the Republic of India. That part of his recommendation has already been approved and I know the Leader of the Opposition, with his great interest in this, would totally approve of these moves. But I will not have a full report on Mr. Hilliard's recommendations until the end of the month.

Mr. Nixon: A supplementary: Since the journeys of Mr. Hilliard were triggered by the request of a number of charitable institutions led by five churches, that the government consider making matching grants to funds raised, and not just to sell heifers to the Punjab, is the government considering making available some public funds on the basis of matching grants?

Hon. Mr. Davis: I should not have used the term "sale." The Minister of Agriculture and Food could give us the details. It was a grant; it was not a sale, as I understand it.

The question of the dollar-for-dollar matching grant is something, of course, that Mr. Hilliard is still assessing. I think one or two other provinces have become involved. One of the provinces that has become involved, I think, did not do it on the basis of matching dollar for dollar, but it did relate to agricultural produce surplus, I guess, on some occasions from that particular province.

In other words, they did participate but I believe it was done with some control on what the produce was and the fact that it came from that particular province. As I say, we will have a full report from Mr. Hilliard at the end of the month.

Mr. McClellan: A further supplementary: Did I understand the Premier to say, in response to the Leader of the Opposition, that we are sending cows to India?

Mr. Lewis: You have to admit it really takes imagination to send cows to India.

Hon. Mr. Davis: My information is that, through the Canadian Hunger Foundation, 250 heifers will go to the Republic of India; and 80 will go, I think, to the Punjab. I will ask the Minister of Agriculture and Food to give a more technical and detailed definition of that.

Mr. Nixon: And on the religious overtones of that; we've got a lot of sacred cows here.

Mr. Lewis: Maybe you could send him to Newcastle to find out if they need fuel.

[10:15]

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I have to say to the Leader of the Opposition, I know he intended that in a very facetious way, but just in case some people take him seriously, as they do on some issues, we have no intention of sending Mr. Hilliard to Newcastle.

Mr. Lewis: But if you moved it, we'd support you.

Hon. Mr. Davis: In other words, you would support sending Mr. Hilliard.

TORONTO TEACHERS' NEGOTIATIONS

Mr. Lewis: May I ask the Minister of Education, if the Anti-Inflation Board has been in touch with him this morning about the ruling they're giving on the secondary school teachers?

Hon. Mr. Wells: No, they have not, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Nixon: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to ask the Minister of Education if he can report to the House the cost of the mediation and fact-finding that was undertaken at the initiative of the Ministry of Education to assist in the settlement of the continuing dispute between the secondary school teachers of Metro Toronto and their board?

Hon. Mr. Wells: Mr. Speaker, as I recall, the charges of the mediator, Mr. Hartt, for his services were about $37,000 and there was something like $5,500 expenses. The charges for his fact-finding operation, which had nothing to do with us but was under the Education Relations Commission, was something a little over $4,000, as I recall. They're just round figures that I can recall.

Mr. Nixon: Supplementary: Does it concern the minister that the procedure that

we have established under Bill 100—for all of its great philosophical advantages—in practical terms hasn't been effective as yet and is being established as a terribly expensive procedure indeed? By the time the teachers pay the expenses that they have, the boards pay the expenses that they have, and the taxpayers, through mediation and fact-finding, pay the expenses that we have, surely we have created—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. Is this a question for information?

Mr. Nixon: Would the minister not agree that—

Mr. Speaker: Order please.

Mr. Nixon: What do you want?

Mr. Speaker: Really, I think a question for information is a little more appropriate. Perhaps the member might rephrase it. To ask a minister's opinion on something is not really of urgent public importance, if I may make that observation.

Mr. Nixon: It might be of some assistance then if I were to ask the minister if he would ask somebody in his department to total up the full cost of the first utilization of Bill 100 in this particular negotiation, which still has not given us even a move toward a settlement?

Hon. Mr. Wells: I think, Mr. Speaker, that the record has got to be straight here. First of all, I think it has to be pointed out that Bill 100, as a piece of legislation, is working.

Mr. Lewis: Excellently. There are 60 settlements.

Hon. Mr. Wells: Yes. Let's not look at one tragic situation and cloud the whole of Bill 100 with what's going on here in Metropolitan Toronto. Eighty-four fact-finders were appointed and 60 settlements have occurred since the bill came into effect.

Mr. Lewis: That is way ahead of the last time.

Hon. Mr. Wells: We have, at the present time, one work stoppage in the province. We've had more than that, as my friend knows.

Mr. Nixon: It is a doozer.

Hon. Mr. Wells: So let's not downgrade Bill 100. It's working and I think it's working well, and I don't think the procedures are costing any more than some of the money that was spent in other procedures in the past. In fact, it's probably working better. Let's also get this very clear—there's been a demand in this House, particularly from the leader of the Liberal Party, that this Minister of Education play some part in what's going on in Metropolitan Toronto. Indeed, I was concerned about the Metropolitan Toronto situation perhaps well before he or anyone else in this House was, and that concern led me to take the unusual step of appointing Stanley Hartt, and the ministry agreeing to pay for him—which I agree has cost a lot of money—in the hopes that we could bring about a settlement in Metropolitan Toronto.

Remember, his appointment came about before Bill 100 was brought into this House, and we attempted to get him in there to help the parties reach an agreement. I wish he had been able to bring them to total agreement, but he couldn't. It should also be remembered that he did get about 300 or so items of agreement. I can't remember the exact number, but he did get agreement on practically all parts of the contract except the monetary parts, which, again, was a very remarkable job on his part.

Mr. Nixon: Supplementary: Since we are concerning ourselves with this one instance, in all of the other successes, is the minister having a problem convincing anybody to serve on the Education Relations Commission? Is that the only reason he has not been able to bring it up to its full complement?

Hon. Mr. Wells: Mr. Speaker, I think some people find they don't have the time when they're asked to serve on these commissions, and this has been a problem from time to time. We're trying to find the right type of people, as I indicated during the debate in this House, and one of the big qualifications, my friend will remember, was that we weren't going to put adversaries on the commission—in other words, we weren't going to select people who had been directly involved with the teaching profession or with school boards—but we were going to select people who were impartial and had a knowledge of bargaining so that they could provide the general assistance necessary. This, in some way, limits the number of people who are available or who could serve on this commission.

I might also say there was a story in the Globe and Mail this morning which indicated that I had said—and I don't recall the words I used but certainly I would want to correct them—that we have three capable men on the commission. We have, of course, two men

and one woman, all of them very capable, and the people we're looking for to fill the two vacancies are not men, but they are competent people. That's who we will find.

MORTGAGE INTEREST TAX CREDIT

Mr. Nixon: I would like to put a question to the Premier having to do with the words in the Speech from the Throne which indicated that, failing adequate federal action, the Legislature would be asked to approve legislation to give assistance on the basis of interest payments to homeowners. Is he satisfied with the federal action? Are we going to be presented with legislation here? Is there a statement of policy in this regard?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, we're not sure of that yet. The Minister of Housing (Mr. Rhodes), I would presume, has had some further discussions in the past two or three days but at this moment we haven't really fully assessed the implications of the federal programme. I expect we will have some statement on it before the House rises.

Mr. Nixon: It might then be worthwhile if I might, with the Speaker's permission, direct a question to the Minister of Housing on that. Did the minister hear what we were talking about?

We were talking about the policy having to do with making payments to assist with the interest payments of homeowners in this province, as referred to in the Speech from the Throne. It might also give the Minister of Housing a chance to comment on the reports of housing starts during October and perhaps to claim credit for them. Let's see if he will.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I certainly will take any credit there is for housing starts. I saw those figures and was encouraged.

Mr. Nixon: Underlying conditions show through.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: I really can't make any comment about the mortgage interest subsidy at this time. That's a matter of budget requirements.

Mr. Bullbrook: Budget requirements? That is not what the Premier said; you should have heard his response.

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: The Premier's right again.

Mr. Nixon: Supplementary, Mr. Speaker, with your permission: Since it was referred to in the Speech from the Throne, and since there was some indication early on that this session might even prorogue before Christmas, it seems that if we're going to have legislation having to do with that we should hear about it fairly soon. Is the minister working on legislation? Is he or is he not?

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: I'm not working on any legislation in any great detail at this time. We're looking at the programme.

Mr. Bullbrook: May I ask—sorry; after you.

Mr. Lewis: I take it from the Premier's reply, and the minister's, that the pathetic federal trifling with interest rates means the minister is using it as a lever to avoid legislation or to avoid a commitment on a promise made during the campaign. That is now clear, is it not?

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: No, obviously the member has taken it wrongly. That is not correct.

Mr. Lewis: Have I? Then why isn't the minister drafting legislation?

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: I didn't say I wasn't drafting legislation. I said we were working on it now.

Mr. Nixon: You said you weren't working on it very hard.

Mr. Bullbrook: That was the basis of my supplementary question, though I might not have used the phrase "pathetic federal trifling."

SPEECH OF MINISTER OF LABOUR

Mr. Germa: A question of the Minister of Labour. The minister will recall addressing the Ontario Medical Association in London this spring, at which time she was reported to have said, "It is my considered opinion that our members have little desire to take on the trappings, postures, position or policies of a truculent, demanding, completely money-oriented union." Does this statement still represent her present-day position as it relates to the trade union movement?

Hon. B. Stephenson: Mr. Speaker, I must tell you that I am extremely flattered that the opposition has taken the trouble to research so many of my old speeches in various other roles. I think that is an honour not usually accorded to a freshman member of this House.

Mr. MacDonald: Answer the question.

Mr. Bain: They make interesting reading,

Mr. Lewis: Someone has to read them.

Hon. B. Stephenson: However, I was speaking about a specific situation in a set of specific circumstances and in fact, about a specific union at that point.

Mr. Lewis: Which one?

Hon. B. Stephenson: I don't have to name it for you.

Mr. Lewis: Yes, you do.

Hon. B. Stephenson: No, I don't, thank you, because it was in earlier circumstances and has nothing to do with the question at the moment. My attitude would be the same about any group which was in fact truculent, which was in fact money gouging and which was in fact considering only its own interests and nothing else.

Mr. Warner: The OMA.

Mr. Nixon: How about the OMA?

Hon. B. Stephenson: No, it doesn't qualify.

Mr. Germa: A supplementary: I wonder if the minister would be prepared to name the specific union which she described in this contemptuous fashion?

Hon. B. Stephenson: Mr. Speaker, I just said a moment ago that I was not prepared to do so.

Mr. Lewis: Oh, that is very good. It's very good for the Minister of Labour to be impartial.

PAYMENT OF FUNDS TO MUNICIPALITIES

Mr. Shore: I'd like to direct a question to the Treasurer. Would the Treasurer please comment and give us his observations, in view of his statement the other day relative to the grants to municipalities, on a statement that was made by the Ministry of Treasury:

> The Ontario government therefore gives this guarantee to its local governments: Provincial assistance in future years will grow at a rate not less than the growth rate of Ontario's total revenue.

Would the Treasurer please comment on that?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: That's precisely what we're doing, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Shore: A supplementary: If the revenue was growing at 12 per cent, could I ask why they were talking about five per cent to six per cent this year?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Because we have made it clear that we carry forward either surpluses or deficits from year to year.

Mr. Good: No, the Treasurer didn't make it clear.

Mr. Shore: Could I ask the Treasurer why does the statement say "not less than growth in each year"?

Hon. Mr. McKeough: It's on an accumulative basis.

Mr. Shore: I don't think you have answered the question.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: I have answered it to my satisfaction.

Mr. Shore: Yes, I know you did—but I don't think you answered it to the satisfaction of the people.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Marvin, you are an accountant; you know what "accumulative" means.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Waterloo North has a supplementary.

Mr. Good: How can the Treasurer use this accumulative basis for the transfer of funds when the shortfall to the municipalities, which he is now determining for next year, is directly related to actions by the government to reduce its own income through election promises last year by taking off the sales tax on automobiles? The government created the shortfall and it expects the municipalities to pay for it.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Mr. Nixon: The municipal taxpayers pay the bill.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: Mr. Speaker, actually the shortfall—the member has it a little twisted around as a matter of fact—

Hon. Mr. Davis: Again.

Mr. Good: The Treasurer is the one who is twisted.

Hon. Mr. McKeough: We reduced the taxes during this current year and the municipalities actually did not suffer from that, as it turned out. They're getting more money than they should. They did not share in the reduction to the extent which they should have. How can I explain it? Very easily.

Mr. Good: Supplementary—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. This is developing into a debate. The member for Peterborough has a question.

Mr. Good: This is very important, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: I realize this, but it has been turned into a debate by the sort of questions that are being asked. The member for Peterborough.

HOSPITAL BUDGETS

Mrs. Sandeman: I have a question of the Minister of Health. Could the minister tell me what answer he is giving to hospitals, such as the Peterborough Civic Hospital, and others across the province which, after extreme care and cost-cutting measures, are still forced to ask for a budget supplement for 1975?

Hon. F. S. Miller: If the hospital in fact asks for a budget supplement for 1975 we will, after a preliminary review of the request and discussions, go into a line-by-line review if necessary. We have done this in about five or six instances. This is a very costly and time consuming procedure; therefore, we usually try to have some discussions before we agree to do that to see whether in fact we can accept any of the arguments or reject them and get mutual agreements. This has been quite effective so far, but I think most hospitals have realized that their budget in fact was the upper limit of the amount they could spend and some have taken fairly extreme measures to live within it. I commend them for doing that. On the other hand, if in fact the costs are unavoidable and if in fact we feel they've used good management, we've usually awarded the differenc.

ONTARIO HOUSING CORP.

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the Attorney General. Relative to the refusal of both the Minister of Housing and Norm Webster's friend over there, would the Attorney General, being completely objective, suggest that we would get better action from the RCMP than the OPP in having access to the OHC files for the issuance of a search warrant?

Mr. Yakabuski: What is the member talking about? Sky Shops?

[10:30]

Hon. Mr. McMurtry: I have no opinion on that matter at this time.

Mr. Sargent: Supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Good: That's the first time you haven't had an opinion.

Mr. Sargent: Does the minister think we should have to resort to search warrants for access to public information? Does he have an opinion on that?

Hon. Mr. McMurtry: I don't understand the question; or I didn't quite hear the question, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Good: Come on, you understand it.

Hon. Mr. McMurtry: I'm not sure I heard the question, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Do you wish to repeat it?

Mr. Sargent: Be glad to do it again.

Mr. B. Newman: Recycle it.

Mr. Sargent: As the minister knows we've been refused access by both ministers to OHC files going back seven or eight years because of alleged mishandling of millions of dollars in funds. In view of the fact that the ongoing—

Mr. Speaker: The question is?

Interjections.

Mr. Sargent: In view of the fact that the ongoing searches in Ottawa are a lot less meaningful than this, do we have to resort to getting the RCMP to issue a search warrant or would the OPP do for the job here?

Hon. Mr. McMurtry: I have no comment, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Sargent: Supplementary to that then—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. ,

Mr. Sargent: I am entitled to a supplementary.

Mr. Speaker: You had a supplementary.

Mr. MacDonald: Would the Attorney General consider helping himself and the hon. member who has just queried him, out of the problem by adopting my private member's bill on freedom of information? Then procedures would be established for getting information without this wrangling.

Hon. Mr. McMurtry: Mr. Speaker, I have not really had an opportunity to consider in any degree of depth my hon. friend's pri-

vate member's bill. I shall be happy to do that and communicate further with my hon. friend.

ENTERIC-COATED ASPIRIN

Mr. Godfrey: Question of the Minister of Health, Mr. Speaker: In view of the information I made available to him last week with regard to enteric-coated aspirin, which is mandatory in the treatment of old age pensioners with arthritis, will he undertake to remove as soon as possible the product Novasen from the drug benefit formulary?

Hon. F. S. Miller: Mr. Speaker, I'm still considering that.

Mr. Godfrey: Supplementary, Mr. Speaker: While the minister is considering this—and this medication has been proved to be inadequate—does he intend to let people be maltreated by this medication?

Hon. F. S. Miller: Mr. Speaker, I hope the medical profession would also look at it.

EGGS IMPORTED FROM U.S.

Mr. Ruston: Mr. Speaker, a question of the Minister of Agriculture: Is the minister aware of a recent newspaper report that a member of the Ontario Egg Marketing Board imported four million eggs from the United States to sell them as his own eggs to the marketing board?

Hon. W. Newman: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I'm quite aware of the situation.

Mr. Ruston: Is the minister investigating it?

Hon. W. Newman: Yes, Mr. Speaker.

BREATHALYSER TESTS

Mr. Kennedy: Would the Attorney General request the federal Minister of Justice to amend the Criminal Code whereby requests to take a breathalyser test following motor accidents where there is personal injury or a fatality be made mandatory, rather than discretionary, by investigating officers, as I understand is now the case?

Hon. Mr. McMurtry: Mr. Speaker, my hon. friend has spoken to me about this matter. I think in relation to where there is evidence of alcohol, the present section of the Criminal Code of Canada, being section 235, states that "where a peace officer on reasonable and probable ground believes that a person is committing an offence in relation to alcohol—"

Mr. Deans: You just happened to have that with you.

Hon. Mr. McMurtry: As I indicated my hon. friend had spoken to me privately about it. I think, in view of the dimensions of the tragedy involved in relation to those accidents on the highway, my hon. friend opposite might take the matter a little more seriously than he apparently does.

Mr. Deans: It is very serious.

Mr. Sargent: Come on, it was a planted question. What are you talking about?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. Will the minister continue with his answer.

Hon. Mr. McMurtry: Where there is evidence of alcohol the provision of the Code indicates that a police officer may give the test. My hon. friend has suggested that it should be mandatory. I just want to indicate to the Legislature that I agree with him that it should be mandatory where practical, and I will be corresponding with my federal counterpart in this regard.

REDUCTION OF SPEED LIMITS

Mr. Bain: I have a question of the Minister of Transportation and Communications. Since the main highway arteries in southern Ontario, the expressways, will have a 60 mph speed limit, is the minister prepared to set a 60 mph speed limit on the two main highway arteries in northern Ontario, the trans-Canada routes, Highways 11 and 17?

Hon. Mr. Snow: No, not at this time. I haven't given consideration to that. Those two highways are not throughways such as—

Mr. Ferrier: They are the main arteries.

Mr. Laughren: They are also dangerous.

Hon. Mr. Snow: —the other highways that the hon. member refers to that will have a 60 mph limit and which are divided highways. I don't think there is a reasonable comparison between the two. I realize the hon. member's argument—

Mr. Stokes: It is not safe to go over 50 mph on them.

Hon. Mr. Snow: —of the extreme distances between municipalities in northern Ontario and the fact that at least in most months of the year the traffic on those highways is considerably less than what would be expected in southern Ontario. But from the energy point of view and from the safety point of view I think it is still necessary to have the lower speed limits.

Mr. Bain: Supplementary: In view of the minister's answer—and many of the items in his answer lead me to conclude there should be a 60 mph limit—I would just ask does he think it is reasonable to expect someone to drive from New Liskeard to Kirkland to Cochrane to Kap to Heart to Longlac to Geraldton to Thunder Bay at 50 mph, especially in the light of the fact that many people travel those highways to and from work?

Mr. Speaker: I think the hon. minister answered that question. Now you are debating. The hon. minister has already answered what was in your mind.

Mr. Bain: I am asking him does he think it is reasonable, yes or no?

Hon. Mr. Snow: Because of the beautiful scenery and attributes—

Mr. Speaker: Thank you. The member for Halton-Burlington.

Mr. Sargent: He didn't want to know that much about it.

Hon. Mr. Snow: I had the advantage of enjoying it last year.

Interjections.

PCBs AND TORONTO WATER SUPPLY

Mr. Reed: I have a question of the Minister of the Environment. Does the minister know if there are any PCBs being ingested by the people of the city of Toronto through their drinking water?

Hon. Mr. Kerr: No. We are satisfied that any PCBs that exist anywhere in the harbour area or in Lake Ontario or in those areas where water is used and drawn are properly filtrated and prevented from affecting drinking water.

Mr. Reed: Supplementary: Are PCBs removed through filtration?

Hon. Mr. Kerr: PCBs are a type of contaminant that are properly filtrated. The salinization process and the general filtration process make it certain, as far as my people are concerned, that they don't affect water drunk by humans.

SALARY INCREASES FOR MEMBERS

Mr. Williams: Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the Premier.

Mr. Sargent: When are you going to put him in the cabinet?

Mr. Williams: Notwithstanding the government's announced anti-inflation programme, it is my understanding that members of the opposition parties are in fact seeking self-enrichment by way of salary increases at this time.

Mr. Good: Butch Cassidy and the Sundance Kid, that's all.

Mr. Williams: Would the Premier clarify the government's position with regard to these untimely demands?

Hon. Mr. Davis: I have read observations in the press by the member for Ottawa Centre (Mr. Cassidy) and the member for Sudbury East (Mr. Martel) relating to compensation being paid members of this Legislature.

Mr. Martel: The Camp commission raised it and you established the select committee.

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I don't care what the commission said and I don't care what the member for Sudbury East says, I think it would be totally wrong for the members of this House at this period of time to be considering voting themselves a raise. I say very simply to the members opposite, I would be quite delighted to walk down the hall and visit Her Honour on that particular issue if they wish to bring it to a head in this House.

Mr. Lewis: That's bravado.

Mr. Deans: That's really great. In order that the committee not waste its time studying matters that the Premier has already decided are not to be touched on at this point, would he mind standing up in his place and telling me exactly what he intends they should look at when they review the Camp recommendations?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, the committee is a select committee of this House, where the members opposite constitute the majority; I am just telling the members of this House in reply to a question that

was asked — and I must say without any prompting from me — what my personal point of view is, and I would like to think the view of the members of this caucus, and that is that it would be irresponsible for this House to consider a salary increase for the members of this Legislature at this time and I make that abundantly clear. I think there are a lot of recommendations in that report that the select committee is considering and should be considering where I think all of us would benefit from their advice.

If the member for Wentworth feels very strongly that the select committee should be considering the matter of salary, so be it. Why doesn't he stand up and say that he thinks he should have a salary increase?

Interjections.

Mr. Speaker: Order please.

Hon. Mr. Davis: I don't think we should.

Mr. Deans: Why don't you?

Hon. Mr. Davis: I don't think it is right; I don't think it is proper.

Mr. Speaker: Order please. We will get on with the next question.

Mr. Deans: At least give them some guidance.

Mr. Speaker: Order please.

Hon. Mr. Davis: I am surprised you are pressing it. Why are you pressing; why do you need to do that?

Mr. Deans: Why am pressing you? Because you were asked to clarify the position on a salary increase.

Mr. Speaker: Order please.

Mr. Nixon: All your back-benchers get additional income.

Mr. Speaker: I would ask that the crossfire cease. Order please. Order from all sides please. Order, order.

Mr. Renwick: Why don't you ask your Minister without Portfolio what he thinks about the increase?

Mr. Lewis: How many Tory back-benchers have supplementary incomes?

Hon. Mr. Rhodes: Why don't you offer your services?

Mr. Lewis: I'd love to.

DOW CHEMICAL ACTION

Mrs. Bryden: I have a question for the full-circle Minister of the Environment, who, when he came back to the Environment portfolio, said that one of his first undertakings would be to find out the status of the government's most spectacular effort to make polluters pay—it dates back to the 1971 election, not the most recent one—the $35 million suit against the Dow Chemical Co. Has the minister had time to find out the status of that lawsuit?

Hon. Mr. Kerr: That question was asked of the Attorney General some time during the first week of this current session—

Mr. Sargent: And 100 times last year and you haven't given the answer.

Hon. Mr. Kerr: —as well as a number of times before, and I believe the Attorney General said at that time that he was giving full attention to that particular suit, but that certain motions made by the defence have had the effect of delaying the action, and I believe he said he expected to be in court in March.

Mr. Ferrier: In the fullness of time though.

Hon. Mr. Kerr: Is that right? I am not sure, I think he said he hoped the matter would eventually get to court some time in 1976.

MILK PRODUCERS' SUBSIDIES

Mr. Sweeney: A question of the Minister of Agriculture and Food, based on reports of hardship from my own constituency: Would he please advise us if he plans to take any action to counteract the decision by the federal agricultural ministry to reduce subsidies for milk production?

Hon. W. Newman: Mr. Speaker, I assume the member is talking about the industrial milk production programme in Ontario. Yes, I have had discussions with the Quebec Minister of Agriculture, where most of the industrial milk is produced—not all, but most of it—and that is one of the items we will be discussing as soon as we can get together with Mr. Whelan in Ottawa. We both feel it is a deplorable situation for the farmers of the Province of Ontario and also the Province of Quebec and I am sure the other provinces in Canada.

[10:45]

RELIEF FOR IMPOVERISHED SENIOR CITIZENS

Mr. McClellan: I have a question for the Minister of Community and Social Services—

An hon. member: Do you want a pay raise too?

Mr. McClellan: No, I don't.

The most recent report of the Canadian Council on Social Development has indicated that over half of retired Canadians, some one million senior citizens in this country, are living in poverty. I really wanted to ask the minister if that had made any dent in his complacency and whether he has any plans to alleviate the plight of impoverished senior citizens or whether the needs of senior citizens are expendable to the great Conservative god of cost saving?

Hon. Mr. Taylor: I'm sorry, Mr. Speaker, I didn't hear the full question but I surmised what it was. I gather that—

Mr. Germa: You have a guilt complex.

Hon. Mr. Taylor: —the member is referring to the recent newspaper article in connection with a Canadian statistic in terms of the hundreds of thousands of persons below a certain income line. If my memory serves me correctly it is something like 600,000 Canadians. They weren't talking about people in Ontario. I believe the salary indicated was around $7,000. Is that the subject matter to which the hon. member refers?

Mr. McClellan: No.

Hon. Mr. Taylor: If not, would he please rephrase his question so that I could give an appropriate answer?

Hon. Mr. Henderson: He doesn't know.

Mr. Speaker: Very briefly—because it was a general question and probably not of urgent public importance in its generality. If it's a specific question, fine.

Mr. McClellan: I wanted to have the specific response of this ministry to a very specific report published about two days ago by the Canadian Council on Social Development, which identified some one million senior citizens as living below the poverty line. I wondered very simply if the minister has any plans.

Hon. Mr. Taylor: First of all, the member is talking about a Canadian statistic.

Mr. Wildman: Not American.

Hon. Mr. Taylor: Not an Ontario statistic.

Mr. Wildman: None of them live here, of course.

Hon. Mr. Henderson: Most of them are in Manitoba and British Columbia.

Hon. Mr. Taylor: All right; the member is talking about a Canadian statistic. If we look at a statistic in terms of income, that doesn't necessarily measure need.

Mr. McClellan: Supplementary.

Mr. Speaker: We are not getting anywhere. Order, please. I think the hon. minister answered that it was a statement or a report outside his jurisdiction. That was my understanding of the question and answer.

NIAGARA POLICE COMMISSION'S DEFICIT

Mr. Kerrio: Mr. Speaker, I would direct my question to the Solicitor General: Is the minister aware that as a result of an arbitration award made under the Police Act, the Niagara Regional Police Commission faces a deficit of over $400,000 in addition to a deficit position in their pension of $600,000?

Hon. Mr. MacBeth: Mr. Speaker, I am aware that some of the awards granted to the various police forces across the province are considerably greater than the various councils expected they would be. I am not so sure what part of any expenditure by the municipal council accounts for the deficit. These awards are great but likewise there are other increasing expenditures and they all form part of any deficit the council may run into.

It will be up to the various councils to take whatever steps are necessary to meet those in their tax bills or payments from the provincial government.

Mr. Kerrio: Supplementary, Mr. Speaker: What function does the arbitrator perform in a settlement when he grants a greater settlement than the police themselves were asking?

Hon. Mr. MacBeth: Mr. Speaker, I am afraid I can't always account for the decisions arbitrators make but that is part of the system. Both sides have the right to put their case before the arbitrator; the arbitrator comes down with a decision and that is the system.

I don't think for one minute that I should be able to change the arbtitrator's award.

Mr. Bullbrook: By way of supplementary, I am very much interested in whether the minister has been in liaison with the Treasurer or the Premier to advise police commissions as to whether they are legally bound by the arbitrator's award, it being a voluntary arbitration. Or can they, as the municipal council, subject themselves to the federal anti-inflationary guidelines?

Hon. Mr. MacBeth: When I have spoken to some of these people—and I must admit that I haven't conferred directly with my confrères—I have taken the position that the awards are subject to the federal guidelines but in the meantime, whether it's police or fire, they can sign their agreement subject to whatever decision the federal authorities may make.

Mr. Speaker: The oral question period has expired.

Petitions.

Presenting reports.

Mr. Edighoffer from the standing estimates committee reported the following resolution:

Resolved: That supply in the following amounts and to defray the expenses of the Ministry of Housing be granted to Her Majesty for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1976:

MINISTRY OF HOUSING

Ministry administration programme	$ 5,128,000
Community planning programme	34,609,000
Housing action programme	45,007,000
Housing development programme	343,169,000
Home buyers' grant programme	55,000,000

Hon. Mr. Welch: Mr. Speaker, if I might just comment on that—

Mr. Bullbrook: On a point of order, if I may. Do you mind?

Mr. Speaker: Point of order?

Hon. Mr. Welch: I'd just like to comment on that report.

Mr. Bullbrook: That is what I wanted to do, but of course I defer to the government House leader.

Hon. Mr. Welch: I just wanted to indicate that this completes the work of the standing committee on estimates but by agreement there will be a meeting of this committee next Wednesday to review the Workmen's Compensation Board. I just thought I would report that to the House at this time.

Mr. Bullbrook: Mr. Speaker, may I beg your indulgence by asking you a question in the form of a point of order? On the filing of that report, is it subject to comment by ourselves at this time?

Mr. Speaker: I am just reminded of something that was a bit unfresh in my memory. There is a concurrence debate opportunity after the report comes into the House. In other words, there is a 2½-hour concurrence debate, which may be allotted to discussion of any report that comes in. That's all.

Mr. Bullbrook: Mr. Speaker, I don't wish in any way to speak to the matter as to the question of concurrence, but I want to raise a point of order at some time as to what transpired in committee yesterday evening when it was found that there was a restriction placed upon the committee which traditionally had not been there.

Mr. Speaker: I might also add to my earlier remark by saying that if it were decided by the House to use that 2½ hours for concurrence debate, it would come off the time remaining for supply in the House. I didn't complete the first part of my answer.

Mr. Bullbrook: I am sorry, sir, I obviously am not making myself clear.

Mr. Speaker: No, my second remark had nothing to do with your remark.

Mr. Bullbrook: Well, I had hoped that a remark from you might respond to my remark. Should I rise on a point of order now, sir, to bring something—

Mr. Deans: Yes, you should.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. Anything on a point of order that happened in committee should be taken up in the committee.

Mr. Deans: No, the Premier said this morning that is not the case.

SUPPLY COMMITTEE

Mr. Bullbrook: I rise on a point of order then, sir, in connection with what transpired in the estimates committee yesterday evening. One of my colleagues put forward to the chairman of the committee, my colleague the member for Perth (Mr. Edighoffer) the ques-

tion of the committee ordering the last five years of records of the Ontario Housing Corp. to be brought before the committee. I believe the chairman had the benefit of advice from the Clerk during the dinner hour and he, in my respectful opinion, properly ruled that under the terms of the motion put forward by the government House leader and seconded by the House leader of the New Democratic Party, under the strict wording of the motion adopting the committee, as it was put, there was not sufficient power. The normal phrase, as I understand it, wherein the standing committee on estimates had been given power to request the production of documents or the presentation of people before the committee, had not been included in this year's resolution of the House.

There are two things I want to take up with you which I think we should really have clarified prior to the next session of this Parliament. The first one is whether that particular error was in fact an error; whether it was purely an oversight—and I say it most respectfully—on the part of the House leader and the House leader of the New Democratic Party, who seconded the motion. I'd be inclined to think it was and that therefore in the future we will include those powers.

More importantly, for myself, I would like to have from you some type of ruling as to what type of material is available to us from the past in assessing current estimates for a fiscal year. This becomes a focal issue with the opposition, with this party. Concurrent, I take it, with the general attitude expressed by the member for York Souh (Mr. MacDonald) this morning—not only through his private bill but through his comments—we feel we must have an opportunity to look at these records in evaluating whether we should vote in favour of certain of the estimates, for example, those of the Ontario Housing Corp.

Therefore, I would like you to rule upon the question of whether the strictures placed upon the estimates committee by the present motion make it, in effect, a situation in which they cannot request documentation to be brought before them. More importantly, where can we go in the future with respect to looking into past historical documents?

Mr. Hodgson: Mr. Speaker, on a point of personal privilege, before we get into this debate—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. If I might just answer the hon. member, we will have to take that under consideration and get back to you because it's quite a long proposition you put forward there.

Mr. Lewis: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker—

Mr. Hodgson: On a point of personal privilege, before we get into this debate and because they're going to leave in a few minutes, I have 160 students in both galleries from Newmarket, Huron Heights Secondary School, under the direction of Mr. Harper. I would like the hon. members to welcome this party.

Mr. Speaker: It's not really a point of personal privilege. I was going to give the hon. member a moment later.

Mr. Lewis: I'd like to speak to the point of order for a moment, Mr. Speaker. As you consider the position put forward by the member for Sarnia, and if you decide that the standard motion which we normally pass for estimates would not cover such a matter, can you indicate to the Legislature how we, as opposition parties, go about effecting the release of information used by a public corporation in the determinations or the decisions it makes? How do we get that information out for public scrutiny? What avenues are available to us by way of motion, either in the House or in estimates, which would be seen to be in order and which would be debated and brought to a conclusion?

[11:00]

Mr. Speaker: I forgot what the last motion was now.

Any further reports?

Motions.

Hon. Mr. Welch moved that Mr. Mancini be substituted for Mr. Singer on the select committee to consider Bill 5.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. Speaker: Introduction of bills.

INCOME TAX AMENDMENT ACT

Hon. Mr. Meen moved first reading of bill intituled, An Act to amend the Income Tax Act.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Hon. Mr. Meen: Mr. Speaker, this amendment provides for the continuation in 1976 of the rate of income tax that's been in effect since the 1972 taxation year.

Hon. Mrs. Scrivener: Mr. Speaker, just before the orders of the day, I would like to introduce some students who are here

from Parkview Secondary School with their teacher, Mr. Clarke.

Mr. Speaker: Orders of the day.

Clerk of the House: The first order, resuming the adjourned debate on the amendment to the motion for an address in reply to the speech of the Honourable the Lieutenant Governor at the opening of the session.

THRONE SPEECH DEBATE
(continued)

Mr. Warner: Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the opportunity to resume my remarks from last Friday when we were discussing the whole business of government leadership. It really hasn't changed much in the last week. The basic remarks that I had to make at that time were to show that government leadership in every area has not really changed. What we have seen is some political changes, but we have not really seen any government changes. For the next few moments, I would like to track over that territory.

It is highly unfortunate, in my view, that we have had for some years a political party at Queen's Park which is concerned about political leadership as opposed to government leadership. It is highly unfortunate, for example, that within the Ministry of Education, we see a move toward—

Mr. Speaker: Could we have some order in the chamber, please?

Mr. Warner: —controlling all of the educational facilities through Queen's Park and lightly talking about autonomy for the local boards. The whole term of autonomy should be discussed and well understood and I don't think that it is. I don't think it's understood at all by the Ministry of Education. I think it's a term that's nice to talk about. I think it's something that's very pleasant to send out to the publicly elected trustees, but in fact, the controls rest here.

In fact, growth factors are determined by Queen's Park. Curriculum, ultimately, is determined through the ministry. The ceilings are set through the ministry. Decision-making powers really rest here, and all of that came to bear when we saw the strife occurring in the teacher section. It must be noted that all of the teacher strife and all of the arguments and the strikes which resulted come only after the power was centralized here at Queen's Park, not before.

At a time some years back, when the local boards had autonomy, when they made the real decisions with regard to salaries, there weren't strikes and a very good relationship existed between the teachers and their boards. That relationship has been eroded and the erosion came after the centralization of power here at Queen's Park.

But we must move on to other areas such as housing where we have seen a similar kind of situation. Again, we don't see government leadership in any way but political leadership. Let us talk in terms that will get us re-elected. Let's say the kinds of things that will render us favourably to the public. Let us in no way present policies that can be debated by the public; in no way invite ideas from the public and adopt them.

In no way do we see government leadership, but we only look at a political arena. If this government were really serious about housing and solving the housing problem, it would look at 115,000 housing starts which are needed and try to encourage a growth in co-op housing. We would try to encourage government spending to provide the market with the houses which are needed. It would assist, as I mentioned last week, credit unions in this province to get involved in the mortgage business as a public service. And I suppose that gets us into an area which the government is always reluctant to discuss—the money business.

We all know that heritage says it must only be banks and trust companies and other financial institutions which are involved in the money business and that the lending of money for such things as mortgages should never be seen as a public service. I submit that that is a totally wrong viewpoint. It's a single-minded kind of viewpoint that does not allow the individual to avail himself of funds so that he may get himself into a form of housing that suits his needs.

When we look at the whole business of occupational health, I think it must be noted here that the member for Nickel Belt (Mr. Laughren) last night made some of the most pertinent remarks that have been heard in this House for some time with regard to the government's indifference toward occupational health and its indifference toward the way corporations run their business up north. It can only be remarked that in that area again we do not see government leadership.

At this point, I'm sure many members are wondering what government leadership really means, and so I will endeavour to enlighten. Government leadership evolves around several

points, the first of which is listening. It includes listening to the people who elect you and those who don't, and listening to those not even entitled to vote by way of not having citizenship or by way of being under age. Those voices must be heard, for they are citizens of our province. All too frequently they are not listened to.

The first tenet of government leadership is to listen. Secondly, it is to initiate policy in forms of leading, and not in forms of reacting. I propose that this government for 30 years has been in a position of reacting and never in a position of leading. Policies are formulated as a Band-Aid approach to problems. They are never formulated as a position to lead, to anticipate problems and situations and head them off.

If that were the case, then years ago we would have seen, through the Ministry of Labour, some very serious attempts and some real guidelines toward labour disputes. We would have seen a third-party situation, a mediation role drawn up, improvised and set up for all of the bargaining units for organized and unorganized workers in the work field. We would have seen that, but we haven't. We have seen rather an adversary position subscribed to by this government, and adhered to, and in some cases, I think, promoted.

There has never been a sensitive attitude and a sensitive kind of feeling that it is in the best interests of workers not to have strikes. It is in the best interests of the community not to have strikes. It is in the best interests of companies not to have strikes. The Minister of Labour (B. Stephenson) knows precisely what I am talking about. I'm sure she recalls some of my remarks in the estimates committee.

I propose we look at a three-party situation, that it be an ongoing situation, that there be mediation talks prior to the expiry of contracts, that we look at a kind of grievance procedure that is informal in its matter and that we look at less structured ways of dealing with grievances throughout the life of a contract as one means of helping to alleviate the tension. I propose that wherever we can reduce the tension between management and labour, we have a better atmosphere for settling all of the differences prior to the expiry of a contract. That isn't possible through an adversary relationship. It is possible through a three-party relationship, but it must be structured on an ongoing basis. It requires government leadership.

I think part of it also rests with the fact that the Minister of Labour must come to grips with the issue that we have in this province, in fact, anti-labour legislation. We have attitudes expressed through history that workers should not be encouraged to form unions, and that is why at this point in time we see approximately only a third of the work force unionized. The workers should be encouraged to form unions. There are rumours, and I'm not going to make specific allegations, but rather emphasize the rumours I have heard that in some factories in the past—not under the present minister's tenure, but in the past—the government found ways of having persons in factories where union organizing was occurring so that discouragement would take place and the workers would in fact not receive a union.

The certification process in this province is lengthy, involved and ultimately results in hardship for those who are trying to procure such certification. In addition, we still have on the books a 44-hour work week, which is absolutely astounding in 1975. However, so as not to upset the Minister of Labour, who I'm sure is making an energetic attempt at her position, we must move on to other areas.

I suppose the most condemning feature of 30 years of heritage for this political party that is now the government of the day is in the whole area of social services. It is that area where we have not seen sensitivity. It is that area where we have not leadership in any sense. It is that area where people must come and demand action from government, because the government never goes out and listens, researches and finds material and innovates policy. Its policy is always a reaction to problems.

I don't wish to bore the Provincial Secretary, the hon. member for Scarborough East (Mrs. Birch), by reiterating remarks I made the other night, but I think a dramatic point in hand is where, when only 350 people came from the Mother-led Union to put their very just cause in front of the minister, they came away, rightly or wrongly, with the impression that what was required was the voices of several thousand in order to be listened to. I submit again that that is the wrong approach. The quantity should never be our benchmark, our way of measuring things, but the justice of the cause.

What is left to that group is to go out and organize the 90,000 persons who are in a similar position and perhaps then, when they amass several thousand in front of the Legislature, someone will listen, but now no one listens because they are only 350 in number. Where is the magic line? Where do they

draw it? How many must they have before the government listens?

[11:15]

Again, it comes back to the whole business of leadership. It is my view that government must have some imagination. The government must show leadership and it can best do that by listening to everyone, regardless of political persuasion, regardless of whether or not they are allowed to vote, and it must try to take bold steps in creating policies. Then, if those policies prove to be inappropriate, the changes can be made but at least the government is showing initiative. As a point in hand, I point to the very curious kind of situation that we had in the rent control bill, where the bill had to be constructed and presented first before we go into the point of criticism and before we got into the committee to hear from the public.

There was not an avenue for public input prior to drawing up that bill by the minister. That's the system which exists. I had the Metro Tenants Association approach prior to the introduction of the bill, wondering if they could be entertained by the minister to present their views in a constructive way. Could they be of assistance to the Minister of Housing (Mr. Rhodes) before the bill was introduced, they asked, so as to allow the minister the opportunity of creating something for which he would not be severely criticized? A very interesting viewpoint.

The citizens were, in fact, offering the minister the opportunity to avoid criticism by opposition members. Although it less affords us the opportunity to criticize, surely it presents the government with the opportunity of presenting a less offensive bill. That, I submit, is first rate, first rate from the standpoint of being real leadership.

If the government could, in fact, invite opinion prior to its setting up of a bill, if it could invite opinion from the public, from all interested parties, it could in fact avoid for itself a great deal of problem and perhaps avoid a great deal of harassment not only from the opposition but from the media. Again, that needs government leadership.

So I say, to make it very clear, that what we have seen over the last 30 years is some form of political leadership and that may be rejected. It was partially rejected on Sept. 18. At some point in time that may be totally rejected. That is not the issue. I think the issue for the government of the day is to take a look at government leadership, to take a look at being innovative and to assuming a leadership role.

I do very much appreciate the opportunity of taking part in the debate on the Throne Speech. In conclusion, I viewed the Throne Speech as something like a wedding. The government, as the bride, had something old, that is rent control, which has been used in other jurisdictions and was used here during wartime; something new, the security of tenure measures for Ontario; something borrowed, the federal anti-inflation programme; and something blue, the feeling it left us with when we discovered that there was still no leadership. It is inevitable that at some time a divorce shall occur.

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Speaker, I welcome this opportunity to have some dialogue on the Throne Speech. A while back I heard about a speaker who was told he would be speaking to a vast audience. He was disappointed because the hall was only half full. So I say here today, I am speaking to a half-vast audience.

Hon. Mr. Kerr: I got your announcement. I read your circular letter.

Mr. Sargent: This is not the case here today because it is a very informed group and you have some big goings-on downstairs. One of our members is announcing today—

Mr. Kennedy: Which one?

Mr. Sargent: —sealing the fate of the "big blue machine."

Mr. Young: You are supporting him, are you?

Mr. Germa: I will support you.

Mr. Sargent: That will be the kiss of death.

Mr. Germa: I will be your campaign manager.

Mr. Sargent: If you can do as good a job for me as you did in Sudbury I'd give you $50,000 for that. I'm privileged to speak in this non-election year and I assure you that nothing will be political in my remarks at all.

Hon. Mr. Kerr: Perish the thought.

Mr. Sargent: I don't have any shots to take at you, Mr. Speaker. I don't know about the other Speaker but I think it is bad to talk behind his back. I do want to say, in retrospect, that over the years I guess I have been kind of unkind to Speakers but this man we have—many of you don't know it—is a top jet pilot. He has checked out

in jet aircraft. Why I say that is that in the parlance of flying a good pilot has good attitude with the horizon and I say he has good attitude insofar as it concerns dealing with all parties in the House. I give him full marks for the job he is doing, especially now at a time when for the first time, I guess, in over two decades we have a minority government situation. It's a most trying time and I think he deserves our support and I'll try to pledge him more support along the way.

I want to say I'm glad there is not going to be much heckling here today because that group over there are very well-mannered.

Mr. Kennedy: We have never heckled you.

Mr. Sargent: I say, with apologies to the lady members, that there is a story about heckling which members have probably heard. This fellow was speaking to his constituents and he spoke at some length and every once in a while someone in the back would say, "We want more land; we want more land." This happened two or three times so finally some of the strong-armed members of his party went and grabbed this fellow who wanted more land. One grabbed him by the shoulders, the other guy grabbed him in front and the guy in front gave him a kick in the testicles. He said, "If you want more land there's a couple of acres for you." That's a bit of an aside.

There's a Chinese toast which goes something like this, "May you live in interesting times." I think all of us are going through the most interesting times in the history of Ontario and I believe we've all had a belly-full of interesting times.

We have runaway inflation. A lot of people are going hungry; they can't get their cheques. A friend of mine has an agency with 140 people working for him, and he said the other day that by Christmas he'd have to lay off 140 people because of the postal strike. We have strikes in every sector of our economy and this is building up to the fact that we need leadership.

About two weeks ago I was in a cab at the corner of Front and Bay; I had some heavy bags in the cab and I was going to the Royal York about 200 yards down the street. It took me half an hour to go that short distance because there were four different demonstrations on Front St.—shouting and fighting and going back and forth. We couldn't move; we were blocked.

I said to the cab driver, "What the hell's happened to our country?" It made me stop and think. I really think we've been going on so long believing these things are going to continue, but what has happened to our country? There's an old saying that if you don't know where you are going, any road will take you there. I say we are going downhill. I really believe that.

For example, our federal government has made an effort to set up controls. We have wage and prices pegged at 10 per cent increases. Pepin, heading up this Anti-Inflation Board, has written to 1,500 of the largest corporations saying, in effect, "Keep your records and executive salaries, wages costs and prices subject to review," and saying the board will mete out rough justice. But today we have the postal strikers asking for 71 per cent. They may stay out till Easter as Mackasey is talking about. He is trying to save face while thousands of firms are going to go broke, and this is a fact. Many of the Toronto teachers have turned down an offer of $24,000. Last week 93,000 rail employees have given notice that they are going to strike and not obey the wage guidelines. Ten days ago five of the largest unions in Quebec said that they will join the labour congress in Ontario and will rather go to jail than abide by the guidelines.

Where does all this lead us, Mr. Speaker? Have you ever wondered what you will be earning in the year 2000, 25 years hence, if salaries continue going up at their current rate of 9.3 per cent? By putting this into the computer and pressing the button I got some pretty startling figures. For example, if one is making $13,000 a year now, and the salary increase rate holds at 9.3 per cent, he will be pulling down $120,000 in 25 years. Going down the line, the salary of a person making $20,000 a year now at the present accrual will amount to $184,638. A person making $50,000 a year now will then be making $461,000 and a person making $80,000 a year will be making $738,000, and so on down the line to an executive making $100,000 now who will be then drawing down $923,000.

In effect, I am saying to you, Mr. Speaker, if you wanted to go to the restaurant to have a hamburg you would need to take a wheelbarrow full of money to buy it. This is a fact. So I say to you and to this learned House how do we stop all of this? At what point do we stop it all? I talked this over last night with the member for Sarnia (Mr. Bullbrook). I said to him: "What the hell is the answer? How do we do this? How does anyone do this? How do you stop it?"

Today when you drive in for a gallon of gasoline in Ontario, Mr. Speaker, they sock

you another five cents a gallon more, because of the government's failure to cope. In the US market they have a price war down there on gasoline now. They are charging less for gasoline but we are paying five per cent more. Related to the average person in Ontario this is about $50 per person per year more this year because of the five cents increase in gasoline tax.

Oil companies are enjoying the biggest profits in history. It behoves this government to say to all of these multinational companies that if they want to enjoy our economy they should open their books. We should say we are going to force them to open their books to show cause why we must pay these prices. We have them telling us on TV about the giant exploration programme they are doing for the future generations. What they are doing is spending hundreds of millions of dollars. That's not their money; that's our money. It is oil depletion allowances that are supplying that money. They should be using their own money in this regard.

Why are we in trouble in Ontario? I admire in many ways the Treasurer (Mr. McKeough) but, all of a sudden, this man is concerned and he is looking with alarm at our situation. He is down there flogging Ottawa, telling them to get cracking and moving on this deal. For the 13 years that I have been in this House many of us have been telling them what is going to happen. We had MacNaughton say we are facing a financial nightmare but they went tobogganing right down the road to hell to the situation we are in today.

[11:30]

Mr. Bullbrook: It's a tough place to toboggan to.

Mr. Sargent: And it's going to melt down at the bottom.

You talk about a credibility gap, and I am going to talk about that. The Treasurer's footprints are all over the scene in the past 10 years—past 12 years I guess. He is undoubtedly the world's most unbelievable politician, and I say this kindly. Indeed, one could have made a fortune over the past 10 years betting the opposite to everything that this man has been involved with, whether you talk about regional government or whatever—energy, or provincial Treasurer, economic controls.

Now we have watched the past month we have been here since the election. Going back, Mr. White had told me last year in the House that he would have a $326 million surplus in his budget. Exactly one year to the day, this year, in 12 calendar months, he had turned a $326 million surplus into a deficit of $2 billion. And that is a fact—going down the pike, losing $8 million a day, including the interest we owe.

I read in the press this morning, in the Financial Post, that he is going to bring in, shortly, a mini-budget to make sure that the Ottawa controls work. That is one of the reasons why we are in trouble in Ontario because of the fact the Treasurer has been part of the overall blue machine, in that they have been using public funds for political purposes, right down the line. If anyone wants to check that, all they have got to do is start with the Spadina Expressway.

So here we are in the richest province of Canada—in fact I say North America, including Texas. We are in the most serious financial mess since Confederation.

Mr. Kennedy: You are exaggerating.

Mr. Sargent: At the point in time when our technology can send a man to the moon, we commit ourselves to a $30 billion nuclear power programme, yet we can be so bastardly and dastardly negligent of the needs of people. In fact, the hospital charges across this province for, or right across the board to people—We are taking hospital beds away from people and they can't get their rights. You can put a man on the moon, but you can't get a hospital bed in my area and 345 people are waiting for elective surgery all the time. People are dying in the halls. They closed another hospital in my area last week.

The government is so corrupt that after 32 years in power, it has plundered the Treasury to the extent that we are $11 billion in debt. That's 11 thousand million I am talking about, piled up. For two successive years they have had a deficit of 10 per cent and 20 per cent, back to back. This, according to accounting principles, is treading dangerously close to insolvency. It is so corrupt that it has raided every pension fund to the extent of about $7 billion, and there is not a nickel left in any pension fund in this province.

Mr. Speaker: I am not sure that that's parliamentary language. I don't think one member should accuse any group of members of being corrupt.

Mr. Sargent: You run that chair and I'll run this chair, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: That is what I am attempting to do and I would suggest the member moderate his language.

Mr. Sargent: If you want to rule me out of order, you go right ahead. I am saying what I think, what I know to be true, and this is a fact. If you would do your homework you would know it's a fact.

Mr. Kennedy: That is a serious charge.

Mr. Speaker: I don't think it is parliamentary language.

Mr. Sargent: Well, I will continue to do it until they open the books and show us. We haven't had a public audit in this province, ever. They are afraid to open their books. It ill behoves the Speaker to take me apart when we are so badly broke that we are $11 billion in debt, and losing $8 million a day, and you take me to task.

Mr. Speaker: I am taking you to task for the language that you are using, I think if you are going to accuse someone of being corrupt, I think you should be prepared to back those statements up.

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Speaker, I have in my hand the report of the select committee on the Hydro-Electric Power Commission of Ontario on the investigation of the Moog and Davis hotel across here. If you want to have some good reading, if you want a best seller, put this in paperback form and sell it; it'll make Watergate look like peanuts. That is a fact. Study it, and then talk to me about ethics in addressing this House.

I've been in this business all my life and the most honourable thing a guy can do is open his books and show the public how his money is being spent. It isn't their money. It belongs to the people of Ontario.

Mr. Speaker, you got me off my speech. We have a case in Owen Sound. We had the great train robbery. They took away our trains up there. We have no trains to get into the place. It takes a person in Walkerton a day and a half to get to Toronto to hospital. We have bad roads; the worst roads in Ontario in my area. Now RCA Victor has closed down, putting 280 people out of work.

As all hon. members know, Mr. Winkler stood with the Premier (Mr. Davis) in my riding and told 4,000 people, "I have in my pocket a cheque for $500,000. I assure you all—" and television and radio were there and caught his speech "—I tell you all that this $500,000 will guarantee that this plant will not close, no man will lose his job and we will even expand the operation."

When that one statement came out in the press, it ended the career of one man who served all his life in politics. He had been a great citizen in many ways, but that one statement killed him. He tried to deny he had said that, but they did a playback on TV and radio and it was established that he made those statements.

I went back to them and asked the government if they would honour the $500,000 and they said no, they wouldn't. I said to the Premier one day in the House, "If Mr. Winkler had been re-elected, would you have honoured the $500,000?" He wouldn't answer that. But we do have a pal up at Minaki Lodge, in the north country. It has a book value of about $1.25 million. They had a preliminary loan of $675,000 and that didn't work, so they give them another loan of $5 million for a plant worth $1.25 million. There is no term on the loan, no interest, no payback dates. Part of the directorship is head of the conservative association in northern Ontario.

We have 300 jobs down my way going down the pipe because they won't give us a venture capital deal with the province. All we needed was $1.5 million to put this show on the road. We couldn't get it. That's the RCA Victor story. The Minaki story is beautiful. They still haven't paid back one cent on their $5 million. We have this ODC, which is the loans-of-last-resort programme. Who gets the money? Large American corporations in the excess profits brackets are getting millions of dollars. One firm, a US computer firm, got $6 million; it employed only about 20 or 30 people. When the yardstick is to loan money at the rate of $20,000 per job, what do we get? Do they even honour the promises they made?

We have a hospital in Owen Sound, and while $951 million in federal moneys is coming into this province, our portion's not going up there.

This morning, in the House, I asked the Attorney General (Mr. McMurtry) if he would take steps toward finding out whether it would be easier to go through the OPP or the RCMP to get a search warrant to get the records requested last night by the member for St. George (Mrs. Campbell). He had no opinion on this subject as to whether that would be possible. He had no opinion whether we should have to resort to those tactics. The facts are that the top land appraiser, as the Minister of Housing (Mr. Rhodes) mentioned last night, recommended that land in the Saltfleet development be pegged at $2,000 an acre. His appraisers verified all that but they ended up paying $4,000 an acre—$6 million instead of $3

million—and somebody made $3 million profit along the line. Right after they got the $6 million cheques, the firm went broke; it went out of business. We have asked repeatedly for the minutes of the meeting but the government will not provide these minutes. The fact is the man who was in charge of the land acquisition programme resigned from this department because in his quotes to me he said he could not stand the political pressure in letting these deals go through. Now he is in charge of a large department in federal housing in Ottawa.

Hon. Mr. Handleman: No political risks there.

Mr. Sargent: At least he will be investigated by the RCMP. That's something we can't do here.

Hon. Mr. Handleman: That's not my fault.

Mr. Sargent: I'm sorry. What I am concerned about in this economy is that we have here 40 per cent of the population of Canada and somebody has to be driving this province, making sure it works. If the Premier had been on the ball he would have had a postal service going a month ago.

We have a situation in this country in which the tail is wagging the dog and it's going to end up this way—either the unions are going to run the country or government is going to run the country, either one way or the other. I suggest with all respect to labour that it is no time for labour to become panicky; they must use their heads. They must supply some leadership in solving the nation's problems and getting our country back on its feet.

Mayor LaGuardia at one time said, "Labour always has problems which must be solved with employers and capital." It is fair to speak frankly on that point, too. He said:

> A strike is the last means of solution and not the first. It is justifiable only after the resource of discussion and negotiation has been tried and has failed. During strikes it must always be remembered that the public interest is paramount. The safety of great masses of people, not parties to the discussion, and the functioning of government can never be at stake in government; can never be at stake in a bargaining process. [Finally he says] Starvation is not a legitimate weapon for capital to use against labour. It is no more legitimate for labour to use it against the public.

We do know that currently Ontario is having trouble with the bond market in New York. The word is out that investors have told Hydro or told the government of Ontario that the $300 million it is after now is the end of the line. There will be no more moneys available for the Province of Ontario.

In closing, in the short-term view of this House and Ontario politics, I find this situation here a day-to-day process which, in my opinion, may last a week or three or four years. The fact is, none of us has any money, no party has any money, to have an election so the government is pretty safe, I think, but it can be a volatile situation in which we can be the key. I also hope that this minority government can be a meaningful one. In the past, minority governments have produced good legislation and I hope it can here. But I think we all agree very sincerely, that all of us have the intuitive feeling we have gone down the welfare road too long. The free meal you get may be the most expensive one you ever had.

[11:45]

Mr. Johnson: It is indeed a privilege and an honour to engage in this debate today. I would like to begin by expressing my sincerest congratulations to the Speaker on his election to the office of Speaker, and also to the Deputy Speaker on his election; and to you sir, in your position as Deputy Chairman. In the short time I've been in the House I have found you to be very fair and impartial, and I wish you well in the difficult days ahead. Without a doubt your task will be an onerous one, as partisanship will reach full bloom in the weeks and months to come.

To speak after the member for Grey-Bruce is indeed an unexpected honour; although indeed it will be a hard act to follow.

An hon. member: Don't try.

Mr. Johnson: Since I am new to the House I will confine my remarks to the part of Ontario that I know best, and that's my riding. I am proud to come before this Legislature as the successor to one of Ontario's finest and most sincere public servants, John Root. Mr. Root served this House and served the people of the riding well for 24 years; his diligence and hard work will be greatly missed. He has set for me a fine example and a high standard.

I enter this Legislature representing the riding of Wellington-Dufferin-Peel, an area of nearly 4,500 sq miles. Our constituency stretches over 90 miles from east to west and over 50 miles from north to south. It contains a population of over 60,000 people. This

riding is basically rural; there are hundreds of small independent farmers, numerous hamlets and little subdivisions; several smaller commercial service centres; villages and a few industrial towns, the largest having a population of fewer than 6,000 people.

In the last few years there has been quite an influx of commuters into this riding, especially in the southern and eastern sections. We have a very high percentage of senior citizens, many retired from the towns and villages and surrounding townships. There are also many city people who prefer the quiet country life for their retirement years. In fact, I would think my riding has one of the highest percentages of senior citizens in all of Ontario.

Therefore I am most pleased that the Throne Speech has emphasized our need to deal with inflation, rents, mortgage interest rates and tenant security, all of which effect our senior citizens as much, or more, than any single group in Ontario. We recognize that those on fixed or limited incomes are least able to cope with inflationary pressures and ever-spiralling costs.

I am most concerned with the position of the senior citizens in Ontario. No group deserves more consideration. They have made a life-long contribution to our country, our society and our community. They have created the quality of life we in Ontario are privileged to enjoy. The riches of Ontario should, and must, be shared with those who have lived through a depression and two world wars. Senior citizens have a demand on society that is not a call for charity but rather a claim on the resources they have created. There must be no such thing as a fixed income for senior citizens. Incomes must reflect changing living costs and our government has recognized this need in a number of ways.

For example, the Guaranteed Annual Income Supplement has been raised four times since the programme was implemented just over a year ago, and effective Oct. 1 of this year yet another such increase was approved to offset rising costs of living. In the area of health care, the Ontario drug benefit plan has been established to assist senior citizens in all parts of our province. Even moderate prescription drug costs can be a drain on a pensioner's income. For this reason the expense of essential prescription drugs has been removed thereby benefiting more than 750,000 senior citizens in Ontario.

Further health services, such as the visiting nurse programme and the home care programme, have done much to ensure that people are kept out of hospitals and in their homes. This range of services must be continued and extended to help people to remain in their own environment.

In an effort to offset the upward pressure on property taxes, both the property tax credit and pensioner tax credit have been increased. I am sure the new rent supplement programme for senior citizens which will be introduced during this session of the Legislature will receive approval from all parts of the province. A high priority should and must be placed on the building of senior citizen apartment units for this coming year. It is interesting to note that in 1964, or just over a decade ago when the OHC was created, only 36 senior citizen apartment units were in existence. Today there are 23,134 such units and another 3,971 under construction right now. I welcome the intiatives of our government in this area and I will strongly support the construction and improvement of such facilities.

Agriculture is the backbone of our riding and must be preserved. The retention of the family farm must remain a high priority of this government. Policies should be continued and improved to assist the farmers to survive against ever increasing costs of production. The Ontario young farmer credit programme gives assistance to young people wanting to get into farming. At the same time, the Gift Tax and Succession Duty Acts give big concessions to members of a farming family wishing to continue on the land. The land speculation tax has done much to keep the speculator out of the natural escalation of land costs. This initiative has been welcomed in all parts of my riding.

Loans for farm development and assistance in time of trouble further show this government's concern for the farmer. Programmes such as the tile drainage loan, adverse weather loan, beef-heifer loan, industrial milk incentive programme and the capital grant programme are all policies which will be of advantage to our farmers.

Many will benefit from the new beef-calf income stabilization programme. While the guaranteed 50 cents per pound for stock or calves is not high enough for some people, it will be adjusted in future years. We must remember that it is not intended as a quick way to high profits but rather as an insurance to soften the blow during lean years in this important part of the beef industry.

One important point I should like to make at this time is that every time a large wage settlement is made to industry, it nearly always comes back to the farmer in the form of increased costs of production. Small busi-

nessmen too must receive the backing of government if they are to survive against the corporate giants. Statistics Canada in a breakdown of incomes showed the average small retailer earning slightly over $9,000 a year. The small independent farmer earns just a few hundred dollars more, and in many cases the wife is also working without pay. They have no unions to demand 30 or 40 per cent increases and they have no job security or unemployment insurance. They need guaranteed loans now at reasonable rates of interest for renovation and expansion.

Many small businesses cannot operate on Sunday; most of them cannot afford the extra cost of operating seven days a week. It puts prohibitive pressures on them and will eventually cause many to close. We should not be exerting such pressure on small businesses, for their increased costs will subsequently be passed on to the consumers. That portion of the Throne Speech which seeks to reaffirm Sundays and holidays as days of restricted commercial activity is, in my opinion, excellent legislation. I hope the majority of this House will approve this bill.

The small towns and municipalities of our province desperately need an influx of labour-oriented industries; not large corporations but small, clean industries which can grow within their communities. This would have the two-fold advantage of providing employment for our young people and alleviating some of the congestion in our larger cities.

The Speech from the Throne suggests the establishment of an industrial parks programme which would offer financial aid to municipalities to acquire and service facilities for this purpose. I know this initiative will receive province-wide approval, especially in the rural areas. Many people—salesmen, labourers, professional people; and yes, even politicians—prefer to live in our smaller towns or in the countryside but are forced to find employment in or near the cities.

Young people and students who do not own cars and senior citizens who are not able to drive any longer are among those many people who need transportation to the cities, especially Toronto. The need for better rail and bus facilities for these people is essential. I would personally like to see the establishment of GO trains from Toronto to Guelph and from Toronto to Shelburne with connecting bus lines linking up the smaller communities.

Tourism is one of the neglected assets of our beautiful area, indeed most of mid-western Ontario. We promote our cities, lakes and ski areas but we neglect to sell our lovely countryside, the quaint little communities, the beautiful hills, the streams and the forests. With proper organization and promotion could we not sell family farm vacations, a week or two in a small town or country vacation home?

It is being done now, but I think it deserves much more scope, especially today when we're confronted by so much violence in the large American cities. A project like this would not only create employment and earn tourist dollars but, more important, it would not deplete any of our natural resources.

Speaking of natural resources brings me to one of the major problems in my riding, gravel quarries. I hope that before any more permits are granted serious consideration will be given not only to the controlled operation of these pits but to the effect on the areas involved. The consequences of these operations include noise pollution and extensive use of highways. I further hope that consideration will be given to a continuous rehabilitation programme to be carried out as the pit is being excavated. Much thought and planning must go into this very controversial issue before we misuse such an important natural resource.

[12:00]

In conclusion, I wish to express my appreciation to the voters of my riding for the confidence they have shown in me. With your help, Mr. Speaker, I will do my best to deserve it.

Mr. Moffatt: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It is indeed a pleasure for me to be here and to take part in this particular Throne debate in a minority situation. I would like to pay tribute to two or three people first, if I may. First of all to the Speaker, who is from the riding on my immediate east and whom I have known for a number of years; and to the member for Kingston and the Islands (Mr. Norton), who was a classmate of mine in high school. I don't know where he has gone wrong since. Somewhere along the line he ended up over there, but I wish to congratulate him nonetheless.

I would like to begin with a bit of an observation about the area, part of which I represent, known as the region of Durham. The reason I want to pay some attention to that particular area is because everybody else has been paying such great attention to it, particularly the provincial government.

Over the past several years, the region of Durham has been victimized, I think is the

proper word, by successive provincial government policies. I would like to list those policies and then suggest what some of the problems have been as a result of them.

I would like to go back to 1968 when the first problem of a massive provincial nature was visited upon the Durham area. That was the reorganization of the school boards into county school boards; something, by the way, which to a great extent is still not understood by the people there, particularly in the rural areas. People in the urban areas haven't noticed too much change and the only change they have seen, really, is that their taxes have increased and they don't understand why the thing happened anyway.

The next significant impact event on Durham was the announcement of the Pickering Airport in 1972. Of course, we are aware of what has happened with that, at least at this point in time.

Cedarwood was another area of provincial innovation, brought forth in 1972; supposedly at that time to have a population of 200,000 people on 25,000 acres of land at a cost initially of somewhere in the neighbourhood of $150 million to start.

The next little pipe dream, and I use the word advisedly, was the York-Durham servicing scheme which was announced in 1974. This was a 96 million gallon-per-day sewage plant which was to serve all of that Duffin Creek watershed and areas to the south of the Pine Ridge. Cost of that was to be $186 million, and that was dropped into the laps of those people in Durham.

In the same area were the Stouffville landfill site, which is operating; the Pickering landfill site, which has been approved; and the Port Hope landfill scheme, which was under review and has now been put under some kind of restraining order.

The next item which came along to make life easier for the people in Durham was Durham regional government; which if you recall in its initial stages was to stretch from the Rouge River to include Cobourg and Port Hope. Cobourg and Port Hope were in the final stages eliminated from that particular scheme; I would suggest because of the local citizen participation.

Highway 407, which is proposed in 1975, is to go through all of the region of Durham and split it into two segments, which will pose significant problems for the area. The Parkway Belt East is held over the heads of the people of Durham like some sort of Damoclean sword. Nobody really knows where it is going to be, how it is going to be, or indeed if it is going to be.

One of the other items, which is a follow-up perhaps to a previous mistake, was the development of Pickering nuclear plant number one. Then, in 1979, we have Pickering nuclear plant number two. To go along with that, we have the Wesleyville oil-fired generating system which is to come on stream in 1978 at a cost of $460 million. We have the Bowmanville nuclear station, which is to come on stream in 1980, and that cost is to be at least double the cost of the Wesleyville site; no one really is sure, it is skyrocketing each day. We have the central Lake Ontario fossil-fuel generating station which is to be somewhere in that area and is to come into operation in 1986. Apparently, the cost of that is estimated at $763 million, but nobody knows yet what it will be.

The Wesleyville nuclear station, which is somewhere in the mists of the future, is to come into operation in 1990. The whole business, if I may suggest, is the cause of a great deal of attention by the provincial government to the region of Durham; so much attention, might I suggest, that the people are fed up to the teeth with the attention they have been given. Every five or six months another scheme comes out to restructure, reorganize, restrain, change or give some kind of additional development to that particular area. It is significant that out of four seats in the last provincial election in the region of Durham three of them are held by opposition members. The fourth was very close, less than 200 votes, I think.

I might suggest that kind of citizen participation is the sort of thing the government should pay attention to. If I may suggest, the problems which have been foisted upon those people have been mainly problems of a government which is attempting to react to a post-industrial society that it doesn't understand. I have heard previous speakers in this debate on the government side refer to the problems of citizen or activist groups, or whatever term is currently in vogue. I think that's a phenomenon which the government really does not understand. It does not comprehend the fact that most of those groups are a direct result of government action or reaction, which has been at some point ill-conceived or ill-advised.

I am not one of those people who tends to think the government is a collection of Machiavellian figures, hell-bent on putting the people of this province into some kind of subservience to multi-national corporations or whatever. Whether that is the case or not,

I am not sure whether the action doesn't seem to bear out that kind of belief. Those people who believe those things listen to the various speeches from that side of the House and come to the conclusion that maybe those things are true. I would like to see the government in this particular situation act in a positive fashion to dispel some of those particular beliefs.

It seems to me if we are indeed going to have a province where people will be able to believe in peace, order and good government, we would have a government which would at least put forward some kind of overall provincial strategy which would let the people out there know what is in store for us over the next few years, not in specific terms but in broad-brush sort of terms which would give some sense of the direction in which this province is going to go.

I have been involved in education and in municipal planning for a number of years. At every point where a decision had to be made at the local level in planning or education or municipal government of any sort, we always ran into the problem of not knowing what the province had in store for a particular idea or site or location or concept. We would try to put forward some kind of plan for the community and then we would run smack into a parkway belt; and we couldn't, of course, find out from the government exactly where the parkway belt was going to be.

There are various reasons, I suppose, for that. The reason often given is that shyster speculators will move in and take over. Just as an aside, it is always amazing to me, whenever information is supposedly withheld it is because of those cruel and evil people, the speculators. Yet when we turn around, in the same breath the government seems to defend that particular group of people from time to time much more vehemently than it seems to me they really are capable of doing.

Mr. Grossman: The government put them out of business through the Land Speculation Tax Act, 1974.

Mr. Kennedy: Those who rent out apartments don't think so.

Mr. Moffatt: The interesting thing is that those particular people have constantly known ahead of time what was going to happen anyway. As long ago as six years I saw plans for the parkway belt and Highway 407 which were supposedly pilfered in some fashion from various offices in Toronto which really gave a very clear indication of where the parkway belt was going to be and so on. Those plans were held by a gentleman representing some Swiss investors. I think that whole business has been far overblown.

What I urge the government to do is, once and for all, put some guts into the real business of running this province and tell the municipalities and the people out there just where we are heading. If a parkway belt and a 407 and all of the other grand schemes are in store for us, approximately where will they be and when will they be? That's the kind of thing the municipal people need in order to have some kind of workable plan.

They cannot work in a vacuum. The vacuum they inhabit right now, it seems to me, is going to stifle their interest and their involvement to the point where eventually municipal people are going to say: "Why bother? There is no point in us planning, there is no point in us taking initiative because every time we do we run into a provincial government which seems to be able to shift its feet as quickly as some of the football players in last Sunday's game."

It seems to me that for a long time we have heard of the kind of province some people would like to have but we have no idea as to how we are going to get there. I implore the government to go back to the kinds of thinking that Richard Tollman advocated before he was turfed out or sacked or whatever the philosophical statement was. Tollman came up with some very good ideas as far as regional planning and regional development was concerned. He separated those two ideas and he advised this particular government—he was an employee of the government—in his writings and his documents that thtre is a good concept for the Province of Ontario which could be modified and put in place within a relatively short time span.

Nothing seems to happen. We heard about the Toronto-centred region and then it disappeared. It keeps coming back in little dribs and drabs, altered and modified in various ways. I urge the government to act on that particular concept in the next few months.

I'd like to talk for a few minutes about some of the legislation which has come in. I find it intriguing that the people on the other side are concerned about what will happen with that wild socialist idea called rent control. It is going to put down all of the developers and all of the renters in this province and is going to create of this province a land of chaos.

It's intriguing that all the arguments made against that particular bit of legislation seem to change from this side of the House to that

side of the House and then back again, depending upon whose idea it currently is. I think every person in this House has grave reservations about rent control. There may be the odd variation in the degree of reservation but everyone realizes that rent control is not the answer to a housing shortage.

That's obviously a situation which has been created when houses are in short supply and rental accommodation, in a great many municipalities, is in short supply. The government did not bring in that legislation because of the screaming of this particular opposition party or the opposition party on my left. The government realized part-way through the election campaign, in the same fashion as every other candidate realized, when he got 100 phone calls a week from people whose rents had doubled and tripled, that there is a problem.

That's why, all of a sudden, all three parties were talking about rent control. That's why all three parties had to react and support that particular legislation. The rent control situation deals with the problem of rent gouging only. Let's not be confused and talk about rent control legislation as solving the housing problem. Of course, it doesn't.

I call upon the government and the other party to make sure that initiatives to put new housing in place are begun in the very near future. I don't want to hear in the next short while all of the old saws about leaving it to free enterprise and they'll produce the housing; or, on the other hand, nationalizing all the land and that will produce all of the housing—

[12:15]

Mr. Grossman: You will hear it.

Mr. Moffatt: —because we will hear both stories, I am sure. I am trying to say that what we need to do is to embark upon this problem in a creative fashion, rather than in an ideological fashion. The problem is one of housing shortage, and the problem needs to be solved by action, forthright action by the government, supported by the private sector when it's possible. But if the private sector, as they have been doing for the last five years, continue to remove their investment funds from housing, then there is no alternative but for the public sector to take the housing problem squarely by the horns and to go into the business of solving it.

I am not suggesting that that is the first alternative. I am suggesting that that is an alternative that cannot be put aside because of some antediluvian philosophical nightmare that various members may have from time to time.

I realize that there are many people who are pensioners, who have worked for a number of years in factories and so on. In my particular riding I know it's the case that these people have saved up enough money to buy a second home, a duplex or whatever, and they use that as their retirement property. Those people, for the most part, have not been involved in the speculative kind of whirlwind that has pushed prices of rent to their present levels. But those people are as concerned about rent control as are the Cadillac developers of this particular province.

Those people didn't create the problem. The people who are into the business of ripping off the particular renters are the ones who created the problem. I would hope that we will be able to separate the wheat from the chaff when we listen to the arguments of various people as regards rent control. It's a situation which has brought a violent public reaction demanding rent control. I think the situation needs to be cleared up, not just the particular reaction.

I would like to comment on a couple of other pieces of legislation which have come forward. The legislation dealing with seatbelts is before the House and I am going to deal with that at great length on the next legislative day. I think, though, that as a companion to that legislation the Premier (Mr. Davis) announced on the particular day when he announced the seatbelt legislation, that we would have reductions in speed limits, which were to act in a two-fold way. They were to solve the tremendous number of accidents being caused on the highways. That was one thing they were to do. The second thing, of course, is that lower speeds are supposed to save fuel.

I think that the second argument is perhaps specious, to say the least. It has been calculated that about one per cent of the fuel used at present will be saved. And if we have such a tremendous energy problem in petroleum, as the Minister of Energy (Mr. Timbrell) seems to indicate, I would like to see the documentation which can prove to us exactly what our energy reserves are and which can show us what we are going to do to guarantee supply in specific terms, and what this particular government is willing to do in order to make sure that the business of petroleum continues to be a Canadian and an Ontario business, rather than a multinational one.

We are caught in the hands of international gangsters and it seems to me that the reluctance of the government to act on that particular issue is one which the public perceives as being, at least, gutless. It seems that if the government wants to regain the credibility that was so evident in 1971, there is one area where it might well take a pretty strong stand.

If we continue to fritter away the resources of this province in the way we have, we won't have to debate very much longer. We won"t need to worry about who supplies the oil; we won't have to question prices, because any price will be possible. I suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, and through you to the government, that those particular interests which now dominate and completely control our energy in petroleum terms in this country, need to be taken on by this government and in very clear terms made to understand that the people of Ontario will not tolerate the kind of cavalier treatment we have received in the past.

I'm concerned about the document tabled by the provincial Treasurer (Mr. McKeough) last week, dealing with the review of the government programmes. Never in my experience—and I admit to being a novice in this—have I seen a document which attempts, so carefully and in such a direct fashion, to take apart every programme which the government has bragged about over the past 10 years, in the delivery areas where people are directly affected. I would hope, as the debate goes on with regard to that particular document, that we do have some clear statement by the members opposite as to how far we're prepared to implement what, in my view, is a completely reactionary document.

One particular comment in that document was that university grants should be severely curtailed and students should rely more upon loans and their own resources in order to enter university. I say that is not a statement which we should hear in the 1970s; in the Victorian age perhaps. Even then, I suspect there were people who questioned whether entry to a university or a college should be determined by the size of one's father's pocketbook rather than one's ability. That kind of statement in that document will return us to that sort of thing more quickly than anything I can imagine.

I really think we have gone a long way in the past 20 years in encouraging people who are able to go to university in order that they may contribute to our society.

Mr. Grossman: The last 32 years.

Mr. Moffatt: With some speed, in 32 years it should be possible to do many things. If the member for St. Andrew-St. Patrick wants to refer to the progress we've made in 32 years, that is fine with me; I'll say 32 years.

Mr. Grossman: It's not enough time.

Mr. Moffatt: What is happening, of course, is at the end of 32 years we're going to take it apart and we're going to go back to where we were before that 32-year period began. I don't want to pursue that argument because I'm sure the member is aware of the consequences of that sort of thing. It seems to me there was another gentleman who was Premier at that time and he's been the subject of great debate ever since. I don't want to return to those days and I suspect the member for St. Andrew-St. Patrick might not like that spectre hanging over his head.

It seems to me, to touch on a couple of more items, that there is a significant problem in our society which is not being dealt with at all. This problem relates to a great number of people who live in my riding. It doesnt relate to indecision; it relates to wrong-headedness, if wou will.

People in my particular riding range from those in the highly urbanized downtown core to a very rural area. We have all of the problems of rural people who want to protect their particular environment and we have all of the problems of people living in slum conditions in the city.

It seems to me that until we start to deal with people instead of dollar figures in this province we will not be working toward the kind of society I'm sure all of us would like to see. I think we deal in a very negative fashion with the farm community and I think we deal in a negative fashion with small businessmen. We say to the small businessmen, "You're great independent people. You believe in free enterprise, whatever that is." They say, "Yes, we certainly do. We heartily endorse free enterprise." And then we let free enterprise take them apart. We see that with the small gasoline dealers right now who are being totally dissected by the exploitation built in to a particular system.

We see that in the farm community, too, where the exploitive nature of the present system is willing and able to destroy completely what was the strength of this province. I talked at great length with the Minister of Agriculture and Food (Mr. W. Newman) about what we need to do. I'm confused because that man has so quickly forgotten that before he was elevated to his

present position, he used to obtain his living out on the farm. I would challenge him today to go back to that particular business—indeed, I hoped on Sept. 8 that he would be able to do that, but he was not—because it seems to me that if he had to go back to making his entire living from that farm, he would be the first person to realize that it is not possible today to do so with any kind of security or any kind of future.

The people who are farming today are farming in a part-time fashion, not by choice but by the circumstances into which they have been forced. Unless we in this province are willing to attack the problem of farm income very quickly, we are going to see the complete disappearance of the farm community—and that will be a loss that none of the members in this House will applaud.

I cannot understand the reluctance of this particular government in dealing with the farm income stabilization programme. The farm community itself has pleaded for it. I could quote an editorial from what is regarded in eastern Ontario as the Toriest of Tory newspapers. It is owned by Dr. Johnston, a name that I am sure is familiar to members on the opposite side. In the election, Dr. Johnston advocated that the farmers of eastern Ontario think twice before they "go blindly out" at election time to vote Tory again because "the Tory government has not looked after the interests of rural Ontario." That's not me; that's one of the Tories' own people. If they cannot see the writing on the wall, what can they see? When is the government going to move in a direction that will protect the farm community? They have wasted away a resource and when it finishes, if they do not do something, it will be on their heads.

In closing, I would like to talk very briefly about what was my profession for 15 years, what I think has happened and what I think will happen. I refer to the education system which has been built up in this province.

I am concerned that, with the advent of the county boards, we got into what I think has been referred to as a businesslike system of education. And you can see it. Boy, can you see it. If you go into any school board, the most important thing that happens in any particular school board is what goes on at the board office. We build an edifice and stuff it with people with degrees and long service records who style themselves as directors, superintendents, co-ordinators and so on.

But when we finish with the particular system, what have we got? We've got a system. We then go out into the community and say, "Boy, have we got a system for you. We are going to be able to programme people through our schools. We'll use computers; you won't see a report card any more. A computer will now print the kids' report cards. You will get a photostat, instead of that old-fashioned report card, because that is efficient in business terms. We can hire a bookkeeper, an auditor, an accountant and all of those people in the realm of business and we will be able to tell you at a minute's notice how much money we plan to spend. We will be able to tell you at a minute's notice what our plans are for the next five years as far as capital expenditure goes. We will be able to tell you how many rolls of toilet paper the school board purchased in 1972"—and what happened to it, I suppose.

Nowhere in the entire process, however, do we talk about what the schools were originally supposed to be about. What we need to get back to, it seems to me, is the business of a school being nothing unless it does something for the young people who happen to be captured by it every morning at 9 o'clock. I hear so many discussions about the rights of this group and that group. What are the rights of the kids? It seems to me that somewhere we must get back to the point where a school is oriented to a particular community and that the teachers in that particular school get to know the parents and the kids on a personal basis. What we have now are gigantic factories with orange feeders running to them each day. We bundle the people into a bus and push them into some school 15, 20 or 30 miles away, and they emerge at 3:30, unchanged from the way they went in in the morning. That's a failure. The member can shake his head if he wishes, but I have seen that happen so many times.

[12:30]

The biggest problem, it seems to me is the fact that we want to create a facade of efficiency when all we need really to do is talk about the kind of thing we want to go on in that school, which is the relationship between the teacher and the student. I don't really care how many inspectors we have or how many superintendents we have, because all they really do is make sure nobody steps out of line. That's all they really do. They become apologists for the system rather than creators of the system, and that's wrong.

I listened to the Minister of Education (Mr. Wells) in his estimates explain to me the most marvellous philosophical statement of what he thought education should be in

this province. I endorse wholeheartedly the words that man spoke that day, but they do not get transformed out there in the classroom into something meaningful. Every time one turns around the teachers are frustrated by decisions taken at some other level. The directive that the minister gives out starts out at his office, goes to the Mowat block, goes to the regional office, goes to the director, goes to the superintendent of instruction, then to the superintendent of an area, then to the principal, then to the teacher and just maybe it then goes to the students.

That's a complete failure. It doesn't do anything at all for the people who are the key to it all. I submit that the government won't solve the problem by creating bigger units. What it emphatically must do is create in each local school the kind of atmosphere that allows the teacher to feel secure, challenged and worthwhile. When that happens, we'll have happen with students the thing that's called education, where people suddenly start to learn because there's something worth learning. What is going on now is custodianship. We're more concerned about keeping the people off the streets. If the government listens to the cries about the current problems in Toronto with regard to the secondary schools, the biggest single complaint is the fact that the kids are home all the time. That's an atrocious kind of thing.

Mr. Gregory: Teachers aren't teaching.

Mr. Moffatt: I don't understand what you said.

Mr. Jones: That makes two of us.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Mr. Moffatt: Would you like them to agree. on what they disagree with me about, Mr. Speaker, and then I'll continue?

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member will continue.

Mr. Moffatt: I'll be glad to. In closing, it seems that what we need is local involvement. I think every member over there talks about it from time to time, though it's not stylish to admit that the government has been less than successful. In every single case, we talk about involvement at the local level. This party talked about it in the election. We gave lip service to it; so did members opposite. We all said: "We are giving back local autonomy." Thats a truism—everybody talks about doing it, but nobody does it. When it comes time to take the risk of giving the local people a chance to do something, we back up and say "Just a minute now." Members know that's what happens and that's exactly what's wrong. That's what's wrong in the schools, that's what's wrong in the municipalities, and that's what's wrong in this province. We don't have any faith in the fact that people can once in a while come to a conclusion and a decision themselves.

I know for a fact that the member who is chipping in all the time, when he gets back to his own riding will talk exactly this way. He'll want community involvement. If there's a problem, if somebody wants to push through a new highway and it goes through his riding, boy, will he have community involvement. He'll be the biggest advocate for it. We all do that, every person in this House. When it suits us we fight the government. We're setting an example for people by doing that, when, instead, what we should be doing is encouraging people to take the initiative themselves by providing the opportunity for them so to do and then backing them up.

People make mistakes in those situations, but when they make the mistakes they're willing to accept them as their own and they don't boot out half a government, which happened on Sept. 18. If the government continues in the present fashion, whenever it happens again that we go through all of that door-knocking business, if it doesn't change its ways, they're going to take care of the rest of it.

Mr. Williams: Mr. Speaker, I would ask the members of the House to recognize and join with me today in welcoming to the Legislature, 33 grade 8 students and their teacher, Mrs. Nyilas from St. Madelaine French School located in the fair riding of Oriole.

Mrs. Sandeman: May I take this opportunity, Mr. Speaker, to ask the House to join with me in welcoming grade 9 and 10 students from Millbrook High School, with their teacher Miss Harridge.

Mr. S. Smith: Mr. Speaker, in speaking in this debate, regarding the Speech from the Throne, I'm very pleased to bring greetings from the citizens of Hamilton West and the best wishes of those citizens to all members in all parties in our deliberations here. The election was quite a difficult one, a closely and well-fought election and I think that rather than bring in bitter partisan feelings, my electors would like me to come in with constructive suggestions whenever I possibly can. That's a message which I shall try to convey as accurately as possible within the confines of this House.

I want, of course, also to preface my remarks by conveying greetings and congratulations to the Speaker, the Deputy Speaker and, of course, to the member presently occupying the Speaker's chair and to wish all three gentlemen every success in their decisions and deliberations.

Hamilton West is part of the urban industrialized city of Hamilton and of course now part of the Hamilton-Wentworth region. It is a very interesting riding and the problems which we encounter there are problems which I would hope would be of interest to members of this House, not only because it is part of our great province but because in a way, Hamilton West is a microcosm of urban Ontario. It has a very wide distribution of incomes. There are a great many ethnic groups represented in the riding in great numbers. There are many interesting traditions represented in Hamilton West.

There has been a fair amount of building going on in the core of the city in terms of highrise apartments. There have been some real concerns with preservation of neighbourhoods and all the urban issues which so many of us are familiar with in different parts of this province.

I would like to say that there is a particular problem in the whole city of Hamilton which I want to bring to the attention of members of this Legislature—a problem with which you may or may not be familiar. I would ask you just to think for a moment of the place of Hamilton in Ontario. You know that heavy industry has been quite a boon to Ontario. You know also that we've all profited from being an industrial centre for the rest of our great country. I know it's not news to anyone here that a good part of this heavy industry is located in the city that I have the honour to represent.

This heavy industry, however, used to be considered nothing but a virtue since, after all, it brought economic benefits to an area. In view of the changes which have occurred in politics, we now know it to be a mixed blessing. I'm sure everyone here realizes that heavy industry brings with it certain costs and certain difficulties which can be somewhat oppressive to a region unless they're given a little help in mitigating these effects. The effects I'm speaking of, of course, have to do with the social cost of heavy industry, the health costs related to pollution, the problems in terms of property values and so on, the need for recreational space and the need for some relief from the metal and concrete, the smoke and the fumes which of course are a necessary part of heavy industry as presently constituted. I would put it to the members of this Legislature that the citizens of Hamilton have not really had an utterly fair deal in this regard.

I think we have been bearing the burden of heavy industry in that particular region and have really not had much help in mitigating some of the negative effects of these industries. We know that despite reasonable efforts on the part of the Ministry of the Environment and of the industries concerned, what could have been a precious natural resource in that area, namely Hamilton Bay—those who know Hamilton will be aware of the beautiful setting of that city, comparable to some of the most beautiful cities in Europe, where you have a mountain and a fine location surrounding a bay with some beautiful views—has almost been ruined. It has almost been totally destroyed by the way in which the effects of heavy industry have been allowed to go unmitigated.

Mr. Nixon: That's where the Minister of the Environment walked on the water wasn't it?

Hon. Mr. Kerr: No, he had a good swim.

Mr. S. Smith: I intend to make a few comments about that later on, as I am sure the minister expects me to. I do want the people in the Legislature, if I might just have their attention for another moment, to understand that there are problems which are not totally the fault of the provincial government and never have been. They are as much the fault of short-sighted municipal governments, as much the fault of the federal government over the years and as much the fault of such agencies as the CNR. Somehow or other, governments in general have failed to serve the people well in Hamilton from the point of view of mitigating the effects of these industries. Hamilton, for instance, has a much lower parkland-to-population ratio, particularly in the part of the city below the mountain, below the escarpment, than should be the case in any modern city. It is really quite tragic that, in the industrial areas in particular, there is simply no relief from the overburdening effect of the surrounding industries.

The health care costs have been proven in Hamilton to be related to the air pollution. The incidence of cancer and of various lung conditions clearly increases as we approach the industries located in the industrial part of our city. They are much higher than should otherwise be the case, in an ordinary urban environment. There are social costs, in-

asmuch as people wish to relocate, of course. They flee the industrial areas. Property values go down. There is a kind of residue effect, whereby social problems end up in the core of the city.

All these costs, apart from their terrible human consideration, are also economic costs and they are economic costs which are borne by the public sector. We know very well, both in the government and in the two opposition parties, that these health and social costs end up coming from the taxpayers. Whereas it is really the concentration of unmitigated heavy industry which is the original cause of these particular costs. Please understand, I am not opposing heavy industry. I would not wish to be misunderstood. What I am saying is, you need to mitigate the effects of it sometimes.

We need, in Hamilton, recreational facilities and I put it to you that the municipality there requires help and understanding from the Province of Ontario. After all, we have borne this burden of heavy industry which has benefited the whole province. I think it is time for the province to look at the municipalities of the Hamilton area and offer a bit of assistance, so that we can mitigate the effect.

I don't think we have had a terribly good deal from the province—and as I say I am not singling out the province; there are many other governments to blame as well—we haven't had a terribly good deal over 32 years. We have had very little in the way of improvement in our waterfront. Toronto, and I don't begrudge Toronto this at all, has had some development on the waterfront which I think has been very good for the people. There is parkland. They have had the Science Centre up in the northern part of the city which is an excellent benefit for Toronto as well as for the province. Ontario Place is perhaps a more questionable benefit, but in the long run I suspect we will be happy with that. There is the Harbourfront park and so on. Yet, in Hamilton, we don't even have access to our own waterfront. There is virtually nowhere where the people of Hamilton can have access to their own bay. There are no recreational facilities to make use of that marvelous resource. I think it is just not good enough.

[12:45]

Hon. Mr. Kerr: There is the Hamilton Yacht Club and Leander Boat Club accesses.

Mr. S. Smith: I draw to the attention of Hansard, lest they missed that particular interjection, that the one particular access the citizens of Hamilton have to the bay is the Hamilton Yacht Club. I hope that is recorded in Hansard.

Mr. Nixon: Well, these people from Burlington.

Mr. Reid: Ninety-nine per cent don't have any access.

Hon. Mr. Kerr: You said they didn't have any recreational facilities.

Mr. S. Smith: The other interesting interjection by the Minister of the Environment is that all the citizens of Hamilton have to do is drive around the bay to Burlington and they can set foot in the water there the way he did.

Mr. Ruston: Wearing a fancy bathing suit.

Mr. S. Smith: Do members know why he suddenly discovered that his swim should take place in Burlington? This is a very interesting story which I know the members at least of my party, being interested and educated persons, would like to hear about. The Minister of the Environment had decided that he would like to jump in the bay, and we certainly can't quarrel with his judgement in that regard.

Mr. Reid: I offered to lend him an anchor.

Mr. S. Smith: He was undoubtedly responding to many of the wishes spoken and unspoken.

Mr. Deans: The Minister of the Environment should tell them about public access to the waters. Anybody can get in there.

Mr. S. Smith: That is right. He decided he would go off the pier my hon. friend from Hamilton Wentworth is talking about, and that he would jump in. That was the agreement with the major. Unfortunately, it turned out that the count of dangerous bacteria and other contaminants in the water was some hundred thousand times what it should be for safe levels.

Mr. Nixon: The minister would have made it worse.

Mr. S. Smith: He then made a point of finding out where the least unsafe part of the bay was and he found it, lo and behold, in Burlington and he suddenly remembered, "That is the riding I am representing. What a great chance to jump in the water there." Of course, even there it was 10,000 times what it ought to be.

Hon. Mr. Kerr: No, that's exorbitant.

Mr. S. Smith: That is a slight exaggeration. What was the figure?

Mr. Reid: Nine thousand nine hundred and ninety-nine.

Hon. Mr. Kerr: Approximately a quarter of that.

Mr. S. Smith: Only a quarter of 10,000? It was only 2,500. I stand corrected before the people of Ontario. It was only 2,500 times too dangerous for human beings to go in. But the minister went in; we can draw our own conclusions from that.

Mr. Nixon: What was it after he got out?

Hon. Mr. Kerr: Zero.

Mr. S. Smith: The fact of the matter is we are being diverted here by a certain levity and I want the House to understand.

Hon. Mr. Kerr: Stick to the facts. Tell the truth. If you want to be leader you have to tell the truth.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The hon. member for Hamilton West has the floor.

Mr. S. Smith: I stand corrected in front of this pillar of truth. I tell the House that the Minister of the Environment jumped into water which, by his own admission, was only 2,500 times too dangerous for human beings to use for recreational purposes.

Hon. Mr. Kerr: No. You are not telling the truth again.

Mr. S. Smith: Please correct me.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Hon. Mr. Kerr: The question was whether or not it was too dangerous for recreational purposes; not the condition of the water. Human beings can put up with a lot depending on whether it is for drinking or swimming. It is two different things.

Mr. S. Smith: Please inform me how many times does one have the chance to have the Minister of the Environment tell us how many hundreds or thousands of times too dangerous for swimming was the water in which he decided to swim as a publicity gimmick? Please inform us.

Hon. Mr. Kerr: I didn't say it was too dangerous for swimming.

Mr. S. Smith: How many hundred times? Please. One hundred times?

Hon. Mr. Kerr: Maybe 100 times for drinking.

Mr. S. Smith: Maybe 100 times. Merely 100 times. My heavens, it is amazing as we continue along the way.

Hon. Mr. Kerr: It depends how much you swallow or if you have a festering wound.

Mr. S. Smith: We have swallowed enough up to now. We have swallowed it and we are fed up swallowing it. The people of Hamilton demand that they have some access to that recreational facility other than the Hamilton Yacht Club which the minister seems pleased about.

Hon. Mr. Kerr: Speak to the city of Hamilton—

Mr. S. Smith: They want to have water they can swim in the way they used to be able to.

Hon. Mr. Kerr: —or the federal government.

Mr. S. Smith: I want to mention as well another aspect of our natural environment there, and that is Cootes Paradise. Cootes Paradise may be something unfamiliar to a good many members here. It is a type of marshland in the corner of the bay where the water is very shallow and it was declared by the province years and years ago as a natural sanctuary for wildfowl and for various species of wildlife. It is a lovely natural setting and is extremely highly valued by the citizens of Hamilton.

This particular area is being polluted extremely rapidly by sewage from the neighbouring town of Dundas. This is well understood by the ministry and by the citizens in the area, and the citizens of Hamilton demand that that natural sanctuary be rescued and be saved. The only way that is going to happen, I tell you—and we have had many scientific reports on the matter—will be for adequate sewage treatment to take place before the sewage is dumped from Dundas into that marsh.

Adequate sewage treatment, in this instance, will have to be a tertiary process rather than the usual, albeit expensive, secondary process. Tertiary treatment of sewage is quite expensive but it has to be done. I am here to tell you that the citizens of Hamilton want you to understand that tertiary treatment of Dundas sewage has to occur to save that precious natural resource. And they rather suspect that if Cootes Paradise were located in some other part of the

province, such as Toronto, it would now be a major national attraction rather than become a refuse dump and a cesspool.

I want to mention a few other items that were of concern to the electors in Hamilton West which they brought to my attention during the time it was my privilege to be running in the campaign there. I have already mentioned in this House the question of the regional government and the way it was imposed on the municipality of Hamilton-Wentworth. I made the positive and constructive suggestion in this House that in view of the way in which the municipalities have taken very fixed, rigid positions against each other, particularly the city of Hamilton on the one hand and the neighbouring municipalities on the other—I don't blame either group for that, frankly. I think the way in which they were threatened with the imposition of a system they did not want, had not learned to understand and learned to want, and the way in which it was imposed is directly the cause of all this hard feeling today. Nonetheless, there is hard feeling. This particular hard feeling I have studied very carefully. I know something about human nature. I have worked 14 years in a certain profession, not for nothing. No, the fact of the matter is—

Mr. Deans: I am glad it wasn't for nothing.

Mr. S. Smith: You are damned right it wasn't.

Mr. Deans: In fact, how much was it for?

Mr. S. Smith: I'll be glad to tell you, Ian. And if I could—

Mr. Nixon: And we have a special rate for you.

Mr. S. Smith: No, I wouldn't. I only take on cases that have some possible hope.

Mr. Reid: Give them a group rate.

Mr. S. Smith: My friend from Hamilton-Wentworth is terribly keen to know what it is that I have been earning.

Mr. Deans: I don't care how much you have been earning. I knew you didn't work for nothing, that's all.

Mr. S. Smith: The difference is that what I have been getting, I have been earning. What he has been getting, it is very questionable how he has come by it.

Mr. Reid: This is a subjective analysis.

Mr. S. Smith: You are right, absolutely right. In any case, let's get back to attacking. I am much more interesting in attacking, because I actually happen to like my friend from Hamilton-Wentworth, but—

Mr. Deans: Please, please don't.

Hon. Mr. Welch: Now the fix is on you, Wentworth.

An hon. member: Somebody has got to like him.

Mr. Deans: My defeat is imminent.

Mr. S. Smith: You are right about that. You are right about that too.

The hon. Treasurer (Mr. McKeough) rose in this House to say that my suggestions about this had simply not been thought through. Well, I have thought my suggestions through. I am telling you the only way that we are going to actually save the taxpayers'—and let's remember them once in a while—the only way we are going to save the taxpayers' money in Hamilton-Wentworth will be for someone to sit down with those who represent the municipality of Hamilton and those who represent the surrounding municipalities to try to, in some way, arbitrate some agreement by which at least the duplication can be removed.

I don't think that's terribly silly. I don't think that is outrageous and I don't think it is something which needs to be thought through much further. As far as I am concerned, that's a very reasonable suggestion. But the Treasurer is so convinced, in his own self-satisfied and smug way, that he has somehow or other, by dint of great study and wisdom and by the help of several civil service people, come to the solution of all problems. He simply says: "Oh, that is just ridiculous. He obviously hasn't thought about it. It can't be done."

Mr. Nixon: Regional government is his baby.

Mr. S. Smith: I am telling the members that that baby of regional government is going to keep being brought back. and put in a basket on his doorstep. One of these times he is going to understand the consequences of taking this smug and self-satisfied attitude about everything, this slippery way in which he will simply stand up and tell us all to eat cake when we are trying to make reasonable suggestions to put bread on the tables in Hamilton and other parts of this province.

This is the same Treasurer who made a statement a few days ago saying that that huge volume, which tells us about all the government excesses and excessive government spending, is not an indictment of the past at all but rather simply a blueprint for the future. That takes colossal gall. Who, in heaven's name, has been spending all that money for the last 32 years, and particularly for the last few years that he's been there? Who has authored all those expenditures if not the Treasurer?

Mr. Nixon: Right.

Mr. S. Smith: But he doesn't regard it as an indictment of the past; he regards it only as an indication for the future. That's marvellous. He can call black white if he wishes, but we know what the truth is. He is going to have to deal with the regional municipality of Hamilton-Wentworth, he is going to have to deal with the tax bills that are going to rise there in an astronomical way and he is going to have to accept reasonable suggestions about eliminating duplication and waste.

Another issue of great interest to the people of Hamilton and, I would imagine, of similar interest in other urban industrialized centres and in places like Sudbury and so on, is the issue of industrial health. This has been touched on before, and I will not go into it in great length, but again, do we really have to wait for the newly appointed advisory council on industrial health to have a long series of discussions, to interview experts and to go through the whole matter over and over again while people are still being affected, even at this very moment, by various hazards in their working atmosphere? I would hope that we don't have to wait for that.

I would make the suggestion, as I did the other day, that the working people of this province ought to have the right to know of any hazard to which they are being exposed, and anything that is going to be breathed in the atmosphere ought to have some sort of clearance, from a body such as the Food and Drug Directorate before people are permitted to work in such a hazardous environment; they should have the same kind of clearance you presently need for foods, medications, cosmetics and so on. Surely it is just as important, if not more important, for the working people to know what hazards they are being exposed to via their pulmonary system as it is for everybody to know what hazards they are being exposed to via the digestive system. What is magic about the digestive system?

To wait 25 years in order to find out which things cause cancers and which substances turn out to be dangerous is cruel and unnecessary in present times. We have enough scientific experience right now that it ought to be possible for us to set up monitoring stations within each industrial environment, to have a list of both the inventories and processes within each industry and simply to make it necessary to put the onus of proof on the industry that they are not subjecting the workers to an unnecessary hazard.

I look forward to the time that a report will be brought in about the advisory council but I hope we can act before then to bring in a bill of rights for working people in terms of their industrial health. I propose this; I hope the Minister of Health (Mr. F. S. Miller) will hear about this a second time and will reconsider his intentions simply to wait for the advisory council.

Mr. Speaker: Perhaps if the hon. member has further remarks to make, it might be appropriate at this time to move the adjournment of the debate.

Mr. S. Smith: I would be very glad to so move, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. S. Smith moved the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to.

Hon. Mr. Welch: Mr. Speaker, before moving the adjournment of the House, I might indicate our programme for next week.

On Monday we will go back into committee of supply with the estimates of the Ministry of Natural Resources, to be followed by the Provincial Secretariat for Resources Development; and, of course, from 5 p.m. to 6 p.m. is private members' hour. There will be no session Monday evening.

On Tuesday we will do legislation, second reading of Bill 27 and second reading of Bill 34, and then work in committee of the whole House with respect to legislation. If we finish our legislation work on Tuesday, and there is still time, we will do some Throne Speech debate.

The House will not sit on Wednesday, but the committees, of course, are organized.

[1:00]

Thursday we'll go back into committee of supply and finish the time that has been alloted for estimates—Resources Development and the Premier. If there is any legislation

still carried over from Tuesday, we will complete it; and then the Throne Speech debate.

Friday will be the Throne Speech debate. The committees that are organized have a fairly extensive programme for next week and those notices will be posted as usual.

I would draw attention once again that the standing committee on estimates have made some arrangements among themselves to deal with the Workmen's Compensation Board for that particular day; that is, Wednesday, Dec. 3.

Mr. Deans: Before the motion is put, Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask, as is my custom on Friday, whether we might at some point in the near future see the resolution on the order paper dealing with the provincial government's response to the federal guidelines and know early next week, as I had anticipated we might know early this week, when we might be prepared to debate that.

Hon. Mr. Welch: Mr. Speaker, perhaps we might deal with that, as I thought we were going to last Monday, at the meeting of House leaders. It is the question of whether or not it takes the form of a resolution, or rather is to be a discussion prompted by the tabling of some documents—this is the sort of thing we would talk about. There was always some understanding that we would find some vehicle to provide for some discussion of that particular programme. If that would be all right we will talk about that on Monday.

Mr. Deans: One final question then. Is it possible for the government House leader to indicate by Monday exactly what documents it is that he intends to table? Quite obviously there would have to be some period of time between the tabling and the debate in order that we could have an opportunity to read the documents and prepare for the debate.

Hon. Mr. Welch: I think that explains the problem. As the Treasurer indicated in his report—was it Thursday of this week?—it is in respect to agreements, legislation and so forth, as far as the federal House was concerned, that is creating some problem. I'll do what I can for the meeting on Monday.

Hon. Mr. Welch moved the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to.

The House adjourned at 1:05 p.m.

ERRATUM

No.	Page	Col.	Line	Should read:
21	829	1	20	must be aware the investigation being con-

CONTENTS

Friday, November 28, 1975

Health of Stelco coke oven workers, questions of B. Stephenson: Mr. Lewis, Mr. Laughren 1067

Aid to third world, questions of Mr. Davis: Mr. Lewis, Mr. Nixon, Mr. McClellan 1068

Toronto teachers' negotiations, questions of Mr. Wells: Mr. Lewis, Mr. Nixon 1069

Mortgage interest tax credit, questions of Mr. Davis and Mr. Rhodes: Mr. Nixon, Mr. Lewis 1071

Speech of Minister of Labour, question of B. Stephenson: Mr. Germa 1071

Payment of funds to municipalities, questions of Mr. McKeough: Mr. Shore, Mr. Good 1072

Hospital budgets, question of Mr. F. S. Miller: Mrs. Sandeman 1073

Ontario Housing Corp., questions of Mr. McMurtry: Mr. Sargent, Mr. MacDonald 1073

Enteric-coated aspirin, question of Mr. F. S. Miller: Mr. Godfrey 1074

Eggs imported from U.S., question of Mr. W. Newman: Mr. Ruston 1074

Breathalyser tests, question of Mr. McMurtry: Mr. Kennedy 1074

Reduction of speed limits, question of Mr. Snow: Mr. Bain 1074

PCBs and Toronto water supply, question of Mr. Kerr: Mr. Reed 1075

Salary increases for Members, questions of Mr. Davis: Mr. Williams, Mr. Deans 1075

Dow Chemical action, question of Mr. Kerr: Mrs. Bryden 1076

Milk producers' subsidies, question of Mr. W. Newman: Mr. Sweeney 1076

Relief for impoverished senior citizens, question of Mr. Taylor: Mr. McClellan 1077

Niagara police commission's deficit, questions of Mr. MacBeth: Mr. Kerrio, Mr. Bullbrook 1077

Resolution re supply for Ministry of Housing 1078

Point of order re supply committee, Mr. Bullbrook 1078

Income Tax Amendment Act, Mr. Meen, first reading 1079

Resumption of the debate on the Speech from the Throne, Mr. Warner, Mr. Sargent, Mr. Johnson, Mr. Moffatt, Mr. S. Smith 1080

Motion to adjourn debate, Mr. S. Smith, agreed to 1099

Motion to adjourn, Mr. Welch, agreed to 1100

SPEAKERS IN THIS ISSUE

Bain, R. (Timiskaming NDP)
Bullbrook, J. E. (Sarnia L)
Bryden, M. (Beaches-Woodbine NDP)
Davis, Hon. W. G. Premier (Brampton PC)
Deans, I. (Wentworth NDP)
Ferrier, W. (Cochrane South NDP)
Germa, M. C. (Sudbury NDP)
Godfrey, C. (Durham West NDP)
Good E. R. (Waterloo North L)
Gregory, M. E. C. (Mississauga East PC)
Grossman, L. (St. Andrew-St. Patrick PC)
Handleman, Hon. S. B. Consumer and Commercial Relations (Carleton PC)
Henderson, Hon. L. C. Minister without Portfolio (Lambton PC)
Hodgson, W. (York North PC)
Johnson, J. (Wellington-Dufferin-Peel PC)
Jones, T. (Mississauga North PC)
Kennedy, R. D. (Mississauga South PC)
Kerr, Hon. G. A. Environment (Burlington South PC)
Kerrio, V. (Niagara Falls L)
Laughren, F. (Nickel Belt NDP)
Lewis, S. Leader of the Opposition (Scarborough West NDP)
MacBeth, Hon. J. P. Provincial Secretary for Justice and Solicitor General (Humber PC)
MacDonald, D. C. (York South NDP)
Martel, E. W. (Sudbury East NDP)
McClellan, R. (Bellwoods NDP)
McKeough, Hon. W. D. Treasurer, Minister of Economics and Intergovernmental Affairs (Chatham-Kent PC)
McMurtry, Hon. R. Attorney General (Eglinton PC)
Meen, Hon. A. K. Revenue (York East PC)
Miller, Hon. F. S. Health (Muskoka PC)
Moffatt, D. (Durham East NDP)
Newman, B (Windsor-Walkerville L)
Newman, Hon. W. Agriculture and Food (Durham North PC)
Nixon, R. F. (Brant-Oxford-Norfolk L)
Reed, J. (Halton-Burlington L)
Reid, T. P. (Rainy River L)
Renwick, J. A. (Riverdale NDP)
Rhodes, Hon. J. R. Housing (Sault Ste. Marie PC)
Ruston, R. F. (Essex North L)
Sandeman, G. (Peterborough NDP)
Sargent, E. (Grey-Bruce L)
Scrivener, Hon. M. Government Services (St. David PC)
Shore, M. (London North L)
Smith S. (Hamilton West L)
Snow, Hon. J. W. Transportation and Communications (Oakville PC)
Stephenson, Hon. B. Labour (York Mills PC)
Stokes, J. E. (Lake Nipigon NDP)
Sweeney, J. (Kitchener-Wilmot L)
Taylor, Hon. J. A. Minister of Community and Social Services (Prince Edward-Lennox PC)
Warner, D. (Scarborough-Ellesmere NDP)
Welch, Hon. R. Culture and Recreation (Brock PC)
Wells, Hon. T. L. Education (Scarborough North PC)
Wildman, B. (Algoma NDP)
Williams, J. (Oriole PC)
Yakabuski, P. J. (Renfrew South PC)
Young, F. (Yorkview NDP)

JOURNALS AND PROCEDURAL RESEARCH BRANCH
DIRECTION DES JOURNAUX ET DES RECHERCHES EN PROCÉDURE
ROOM 1640, WHITNEY BLOCK
QUEEN'S PARK, TORONTO, ON M7A 1A2